



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 28th May 2015

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

Volume 4, No. 15

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2PB. © States of Guernsey, 2015*

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St. Peter Port South

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

St. Peter Port North

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,
R. Conder, 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, G. M. Collins

The Castel

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

The West

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

The South-East

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

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

D. A. Knight, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)
Deputy M. J. Storey (*indisposé*); Deputy A. Spruce; A. H. Brouard (*relevé à 10h 12*)

Business transacted

Evocation	1127
Billet d'Etat X	1127
I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret School Site – Post Review – Debate continued	1127
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 2.30 p.m.</i>	1163
I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review – Debate continued .	1163
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.34 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 4.56 p.m.</i>	1191
I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review – Debate continued .	1191
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 4.58 p.m.</i>	1192

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'Etat X

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret School Site – Post Review – Debate continued

The Deputy Greffier: Billet X, Article I. Education Department – Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret School site, Post review. Debate continues.

5 **The Bailiff:** We continue the debate on the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey.
Deputy De Lisle and then Deputy Collins.

Deputy De Lisle: Thank you, sir.
10 The La Mare education project is a utopian dream for the 21st century where the population base is expanding with a vibrant economic base. That is not the present situation. The population is decreasing because the Island's economic base is shrinking.

Those are the facts. The Independent Review Panel is indicating that there is currently significant excess capacity in the existing Island's secondary schools to the tune of 600 places. The fact is that the Education Board has to be honest with the people of this Island as to its intentions.

15 The project tabled by the Department is for the construction of much more than originally intended. Not only a 600-place secondary school that I have always been in favour of, but a new 420-pupil primary school, a pre-school nursery, a communication autism unit block, a major sportsplex and provision of community facilities; adding costs to what was originally intended – a high school comparable in terms of building and facilities with the Guernsey Grammar School –
20 estimated construction costs of £20 million only.

Sir, I ask, with regard to the Education Board being honest, will the Grammar School or Beaucamps fall victim to the current Board's rationalisation of the educational estate which is to include recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools? Secondly, will this Department of Education close La Houquette and the Forest primary schools?

25 This Bill will have an effect on the entire Island student base. It will affect both the primary and secondary education sectors. The decline in population base, sir, will not support the proposed

educational facilities; there will not be enough pupils to fill the classes. We need this report on the future of secondary education in Guernsey before construction goes ahead. Until such time we have to adequately maintain La Mare de Carteret schools.

30 Bricks and mortar, sir, do not education make; it is the teachers and their belief in the students that has produced outstanding young adults at La Mare that are, and continue to be, a great benefit to this Island.

Thank you, sir.

35 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Collins and then Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

I shall be brief as I think most things have been said. I wanted to declare that I have a niece at the Grammar and one at St Sampson's and, coming from a very large Guernsey family, cousins
40 around many of the other schools including some at La Mare de Carteret.

I shall not be supporting this amendment and Deputy Fallaize for me summed it up very nicely. I personally attended St Sampson's Secondary School and can reply to Deputy Dorey that portable cabin classes for teaching was not great and when I visited La Mare de Carteret recently, I can tell you the memories flooded back and were not great.

45 Well, as well as visiting the school, I have met with the Independent Panel, the Chairman at the second briefing, the Education Minister, a Deputy Minister and the Chief Officer of Education, and I feel I have engaged in this topic. Not as suggested by some of those blank e-mails addressed to all of us, sir.

I have supported Education's vision from day one and shall continue to do so. Please,
50 Members, reject this amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

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

First, I need to declare an interest as the Vale representative on La Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee, of which I am President.

Next I need to address a few very misleading and inaccurate comments made by some Members in their speeches yesterday.

60 In terms of girls painting the toilets, the students asked to paint the girls' changing rooms last summer as part of their activities week. They wanted to put their stamp on it and this did happen but not because of disrepair and that is quite important that message goes out.

It is unfair to say no repair, as it has certainly not happened. I have seven pages here –

65 **Deputy Dorey:** A point of correction, that is not what the person who showed us round said. She said that they were so fed-up with the condition of them: that is why they painted them.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe to continue.

70 **Deputy Lowe:** It was certainly part of an activities week that they asked to do it, sir.

I have seven pages here, from 2012 right up to date, of maintenance that has taken part in that school. So if anybody doubts that maintenance has not been taken, you are free to read the seven pages here.

75 But I will give you an example: the continuing thread of ceiling tiles were replaced in the boys' toilets, as the inspection of the building showed yet again that water had been seeping through the roof; the carpet was replaced in one of the science rooms where stools had worked through and made holes in the carpet; the entrance to the graphics room and the PE office needed some attention due to the wet weather and mud at the entrance rotting the carpet; fire doors replaced;

80 the roof in the ladies' toilets; a skylight fitted in the top floor due to a leak; reinforced railings; replaced all missing ceiling tiles yet again and you will find the missing ceiling tiles go all the way through in the last three years and in the previous time before that.

85 The lower floor boys' toilets were refurbished, new lockers were fitted, again the new ceiling tiles were replaced when necessary – that is the following year – plaster board was replaced and painted, flooring and heater repairs as well, boards were fitted to practice areas and walls were repainted.

90 There is a whole list here so, please, get away from the fact... and that has come from some quite senior Members of the States who have said that they believe this school has been left to rot, to be able to get the replacement building through. That is absolutely and utterly wrong, and perhaps if some of those had taken the opportunity to come and walk around the school, they may have seen otherwise.

95 One of the difficulties in terms of just keeping the buildings going, as per the Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey amendment, would be a concern of the asbestos which the building is riddled with and this would need to be considered if any large repairs were needed other than the temporary repairs which we have been talking about here and we have been throwing good money after bad now for several years. Do we really want that to continue?

But if you need to actually try and address the water coming through the roof while yet more plans are taking are taking place, there is no doubt that the students would have to be moved to temporary accommodation because of the health and safety risks of the asbestos.

100 Both the primary and high schools desperately need rebuilding and only a few months ago water seeped through the primary school and wet all the bean bags and books on the day that we went to visit. The list of problems with both buildings goes on and on.

105 There is a huge downside to this project publicly as so many believe the States is considering spending £60 million on one school rebuild because the focus has been so much on La Mare High. If only the message clearly sent out many times was this amount is not just for one school but two schools, a high school and a primary school, an autism centre, a pre-school, sports hall and community centre.

110 Yesterday, a Member stated that a new school does not improve education; a new school would only improve the building. If only Members have taken up the invite to visit the school when in operation and see how the students have the books under the table as four sharing a table does not allow enough room for their reference books and files, hence all are on the floor or on the table. Having a decent size classroom will address this so, yes, a building does make a difference.

115 Having a building with air conditioning will make a huge difference to so many of the students who currently are far too hot in the summer whereas some work with their coats on in the winter as the nine huts are really cold. So, yes, the building does make a difference.

So saying a building does not make a difference and it is down to the teaching staff is not entirely true, although they, along with the headteacher, are brilliant and do an excellent job. But both the high school and primary school buildings are not fit for purpose, with far too many small classrooms or huts.

120 If La Mare de Carteret or any other 600-capacity school was in operation there would be cries of, 'This school is far too small!' There must be room for flexibility. I find it quite astonishing hearing about the numbers game that has been going on about X amount of spaces here and there. Surely there must be vacancies in all schools to operate with flexibility and efficiency.

125 I now move on to the Review Panel that consisted of one accountant, one architect and one retired educationalist. Now, I am not questioning the integrity or ability of any of them but wondered why a retired educationalist was appointed when the States are looking at value for money on a modern school.

I would have thought that an advisor from the currently recently built modern schools in the UK may have been more appropriate or, if not, one from the various schools the education had

130 connections with and are operating curriculums similar to ours to establish the amount of space and classrooms needed and being proposed in the current state of schools.

I must say I find it very disappointing that this panel were allowed to go beyond their terms of reference and return with far reaching recommendations without anyone from T&R guiding them to remain within their remit of looking at the rebuild being value for money. One has to ask the question: why was this allowed? As a result, the worrying concern from parents, pupils and teaching staff has been evident for all to see.

T&R, as indeed Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey, are looking for more delays and for more reports, but at no time during the last three years have T&R Members brought a report to the States to direct the Education Board to review on whether the number of schools should be reduced. They allowed the project to continue.

140 So now I ask yourselves, do you really believe there is public support to close the secondary school? I may be wrong but I doubt there will be any of the schools closing for many years to come. You have seen the public outcry from Beaucamps and the Grammar School parents, pupils and teaching staff who are now serious worried about their school closing.

145 I have enjoyed attending various schools, as have other Members who have been on panels facing questions from young people about the States and various policies. There is also the great website at the States on which we promote and encourage as many as possible to get involved, as it is their Island. We spend time wanting to hear their views so when some of the students send us an e-mail expressing the views on the rebuilding of La Mare or possibly closing schools, they are criticised or accused by some that the e-mail was engineered.

150 I personally want to publicly thank the students for sending their e-mail and hope that this is the start of many. Let's have their feedback to help us to decide their future and how their Island will be run.

Apart from the Grammar School, La Mare de Carteret High School has a catchment area covering eight parishes. All eight parishes have an election every three years to appoint a parishioner to represent their parish on a school committee. Putting that into States' perspective, it is only six Members from the south east, St Martins and St Andrews who do not have young people from their parish in the school.

160 Somebody said yesterday they were looking forward to seeing how the West Deputies would vote, bearing in mind the children in their district attend La Mare de Carteret School. I would say let's broaden that, let's look at the six districts here in the States who have children at La Mare de Carteret School: from St Peter Port North, St Peter Port South and St Sampson's, Castel and the Vale.

165 As the years go by, in all walks of life things change. Progress must be welcomed. Just reflect on the last 15 years while we have been waiting for this school to be built and think of some. Good news on new health treatments available, the finance industry has changed quite considerably over the last 15 years, education systems have also changed quite considerably over the last 15 years.

170 The world does not stop still. Progress should be welcomed and we cannot hold back building a school for 'just in case this happens in a few years' time'. There will always be a 'just in case'. Changes in progression happen all the time and we need to move on now and get these schools built.

Please reject this amendment. (*Applause*)

175 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher:

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir, Members.

Where to start? I would like to start off with the introduction given by Deputy Bebb in his amendment where he came up with his favourite cliché, 'We are where we are!'

180 Well, some months ago now at a T&R Board meeting I amended that now to another one which will become a cliché and it is, 'We are where we do not want to be!' (*Laughter*) And I am

dead serious about that and I have used it on more than one occasion in my inputs at Board meetings.

185 So why are we where we do not want to be? (*Laughter*) Well, the immediate issue has been the lack of the reports which were promised for 2013-14 from the Education Department, and we have been given a reason why they have not been forthcoming. But they were critical to making an informed decision.

Going back even further, this whole saga started when the Education Department decided to publish their report before their outline business case was validated – and there we are.

190 There are several issues which I think need to be brought to light. What we are voting on today is possibly perpetuating two things and basically it is uneconomic education provision. First of all, we have over-capacity and that will be perpetuated unless there is a change in the education or the State.

195 Now, I am going to pick up on something that Deputy Fallaize said yesterday and I have made a few notes because I am going to have to make a quote. But he was basically saying that we have got a policy, nothing has changed, there is nothing coming forward to get rid of the 11-plus, so we stick with the policy we have got, I think, with the current provision of small schools, if you like.

200 But I think what he forgets is that this model at this scale is no longer valid; it does not work. We do not have sufficient pupils to anywhere near fill the schools, other than possibly at the peak, which is just an estimate. Things have really moved on since 2002. The way the system is being –
Do you want me to give way? (**A Member:** Give up.) No, I will not give up. I will give way.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Kuttelwascher.

205 I do take the point that he is making, although it is fair to say that the capacities of the schools have changed as well since 2002. Education has stuck to the model that was agreed in 2002, but it was for three high schools each with capacities of 720 pupils. Well, of course, Beaucamps was built for fewer than that and the proposal to build La Mare is for fewer than that, so they have adjusted their projections based on changes in people projections.

210 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** That is fine –

Deputy Hadley: A point of correction, Mr Bailiff.

215 It is not actually an estimate because the children are born, they are on the Island; we know they are going to get older and go to the secondary schools, so it is not an estimate.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

220 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, Deputy Hadley once again is making a gross error. It is an estimate because there is a presumption that those who are born are going to be staying here! (**A Member:** Precisely.) Now, if you remember, the last two years we have had a population decline. There is no guarantee anybody born today or tomorrow or next year is going to remain. But there we go, it is an incidental point.

225 What I also find interesting was Deputy Fallaize' statement that he would be supportive if there was some definite proposal to, shall we say, get rid of the 11-plus or review selection. Now, this current Education Board, I would say, by a majority would like to do that and there is nothing to stop them coming back with that proposal in this term. So I think his prayer might well be answered. So maybe he is wavering again and going back to where he felt he was yesterday morning rather than after lunch! (*Laughter*) (*Interjection and laughter*)

230 But the other point regarding the capacity is this, that because of the capacity issue and the fact that the schools are not filled to capacity, what has been introduced to maintain, as best they can, educational outcomes, is federation. And that has required them to go from their model or their policy of having 15 teachers per pupil down to somewhere near 11, because that is the only

way they can provide the breadth of curriculum by teachers and pupils actually going between schools – to get the breadth of curriculum.

235 Now, that is an expensive option and not only that, when you think of the pupils and indeed the teachers who spend time on the road, that is dead time, I would suggest, as far as education goes; and a figure that has been quoted as the cost of this extra teaching capacity to try and make the smaller schools work, is somewhere around £2 million per annum until you change it – *if* you change it.

240 Also, I mention service Guernsey. One of the issues of that is to try and improve service provision to the public but hopefully at the same time obtain value for money. Now, this is one of the options which could be delivered as a service Guernsey proposition, if you like. We will consolidate our school estate so that we do not have to have a federation and we can provide the breadth of curriculum at individual schools. Are we going to not support this? Are we going to
245 continue with, as it says in the LMDC report:

'... without significant future increase in school population or rationalisation would, in our view, perpetuate uneconomic provision.'

Interestingly, on a recent phone-in people got very excited about a word I used – 'decanting'. What is interesting is I sit on the Property Services Sub-Committee and it is a word that is used
250 quite regularly when you talk about moving people from one building to another. It is not just used in relation to wine.

In relation to wine, it is interesting, the purpose of decanting is to improve the bouquet and the taste and the whole experience of drinking. (*Laughter*) And I am all for improving outcomes. I did think afterwards when there was that reaction, I thought, 'Oh dear, if that is the only reaction I
255 thought it went quite well because it was just plain semantics.' In fact, in the opinion poll in the *Guernsey Press* it was stated that it was a slip of the tongue. Well, it was not! (*Laughter*)

The educational estate is vital and I will now venture into an area which again is another one of these T&R issues that everybody is referring to, and that is the State capital investment Portfolio Process. It is just a process, but I remind Members that it is a process that was approved by this
260 Assembly. The fact that T&R manage it according to the rules that were agreed just happens to be the case.

I sometimes wonder maybe we should hand it over to Public Accounts Committee. They do not have the staff but they could sit at the head of it. But that will not happen, we have got the Property Services sub-committee, we have got Property Services and whatever so we manage it.
265 But we manage it because we are charged with doing it.

Now, what has happened in this case unfortunately is the results of that have not been palatable to one other Department – at least one Department – and what is being challenged today is the whole process. So –

No, I am not giving way at the moment.

270 What is being challenged is the process which may have some unintended consequences. And I am fully aware that this States can do what it likes. Those of us in the last Assembly, former Bailiff, Sir Geoffrey Rowland – how many times did he say, 'You can do what you like so long as it is legal!?' He did! He said it on numerous occasions and that is fine, I accept that, this is the democracy of our Assembly. If you want to, on this occasion, bypass the advice of the States' Capital Investment Portfolio that is fine, you can do that.
275

As regards the States' Portfolio of Properties – the Education Portfolio – there is something that has been brought up by the SCIP process which is interesting. One of the areas which it looks at is, is there any sort of value to be gained from looking at things in the round? And what it has actually done is looked at the next expected lot of buildings that have come on line and there is
280 this projected £50 million spend on the College of Further Education.

Now, there is – Somebody is saying no, but there is and there is somebody else saying no; I am not surprised! But, to me, the potential saving of a consolidation of the education state could run

into tens of millions and therefore I think the review of the education state and its consolidation, if you like, is going to be necessary to make substantial savings.

285 What is wrong with that? That is one of the requirements of the process – to look at where you can have some sort of holistic savings when you look at everything. In fact, Deputy Hunter Adam said yesterday, ‘You have got to look not at just one or two or three but look five or 10 years ahead.’ Well, we are looking to the next SCIP pipeline projects which will be coming.

290 I was a little concerned with Deputy Lester Queripel’s comments. He was talking at one stage about refurbishing the school, which is something you might do if you wanted to keep it for another 10 years or more and see how long you can keep it going. I think the purpose of the amendment is nothing more than a care and maintenance issue. It is to keep it useable. If there is a leak in the roof you fix it. My neighbour recently had a leak in the roof. He did not knock the house down he put up the scaffolding and fixed the leak.

295 Although Deputy Lowe has mentioned some areas of maintenance, it is no good replacing ceiling tiles if the rain is still coming in. Then I go back to Deputy Queripel who said in the not-so-distant past they were asked to do work on the cheap. So where are we with all this? Certainly the school has been described as rat infested. Well, why hasn’t it been shut down? You know it is extraordinary some of the comments being made – sort of strange.

300 One of the things that has also happened recently, especially in the exchange of e-mails, is there has been a change in emphasis, in that rather than playing the issue that individuals have been personally attacked. I do not think suggesting that somebody... Well, there have been insulting personal e-mails, not just to the odd Member of T&R but indeed to Deputy Bebb, making all sorts of strange accusations.

305 And playing the man is unfortunate because it tends to happen when you have lost the argument. **(A Member: Hear, hear.) (A Member: Yes.)** And Deputy Fallaize recently, when some of these e-mails have been forthcoming, has actually replied to put people straight – put them right, I say – and I thank him for that. **(Several Members: Hear, Hear.)** People were making all sorts of unfortunate assumptions.

310 Not only have political Members been, shall we say, insulted, they have also started playing the Review Committee Team and started insulting them, saying, ‘Well, they do not really know their job.’ But I do remind you that the Education Department did agree to the membership of this Review Committee.

315 Going back to what Deputy Lester Queripel was saying, care and maintenance is the issue and the school is still going to be there for the next three years whatever happens, because 2018 is regarded as the earliest date that we would... So what are we going to do for the next three years?

Well, all that it is saying is that we are going to maintain it. We do not want holes in the floor, we do not just want to replace ceiling tiles, if the roof needs cleaning, as Deputy... and there are ways of covering flat roofs with a life of five years, say... we will have to do that. Now, it is no surprise that T&R Members have supported this amendment, because if you look at our letter of comment, which runs to – I do not know – five pages, in the conclusion it says that the optimum situation would be to get the reports that we are awaiting from Education, and then make the decision. Well, they are not there. The second best option would be the reason why Deputies St Pier and myself have made the second amendment, but we will see whether we have to lay that or not.

325 So what is before us is this: do we vote to perpetuate uneconomic provision of education, I say for not necessarily any educational benefit at all – namely the federation; and do we continue to perpetuate an over capacity in terms of the number of places provided for our pupils – neither of which serve any great useful purpose and they all cost quite a lot of money and will continue to cost quite a lot of money into the future?

330 So I would hope that Members actually make the right decision and I will not say what that is. Now, I am happy to give way now to Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Deputy Kuttelwascher.

335 I just wanted to clarify, because he mentioned the word 'decant'. In fact, to 'decant' is an educational word. If you look at the 2002 April report they did following the 2001 proposals, amendment, which was being discussed, which was their Development Plan, the word 'decant' appears four times in that and is specifically about moving pupils between schools. So I think it is an educational word.

340 Thank you.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Well, I thank him for that! (*Laughter*) Yeah, that was good, wasn't it? (*Laughter*)

345 I will finish on one thing. Another thing I have said in the... I mentioned the possibility of the closure of a school. Now, obviously if you are going to reduce the education state from four to three schools, one of the schools will have to close, basically, or be merged with another school. That is a fact of life. There is nothing exciting about that.

350 Now this was actually mentioned in March of this year by former board member, Mr Mulkerrin, and he wrote that there were various options – and all I was suggesting was a possible option – Beaucamps pupils could move to La Mare and St Sampson's schools. All I mentioned was La Mare. Now, if La Mare is built to a larger size – which is, I think, from an educational outcome point of view more appropriate – then that could happen.

355 So this idea that repeated just a couple of weeks ago was actually put forward in March 2015, which is only a few months ago... was in the public domain. There is nothing new about that. It was unfortunate that somebody on the BBC, when they report what you have said... they said I said, 'It should happen' but I said 'could'. Now, we all know the difference, I would hope, between 'could' and 'should', but I find it is unfortunate sometimes that one is misquoted in a way that fires up the situation, because it makes everybody very excited. But I am so used to it.

360 I once, in this Assembly, said I support fiscal discipline and in the *Press* they said the next day I did not support fiscal discipline! (*Laughter*) (*Interjection and laughter*) Now, all I remember was them saying, 'I am sorry'. I did not make a fuss about it. Nobody seemed to notice and it died. But, you know, where do you stop? I mean I have given up about moaning about misreporting and misrepresenting. It just happens all the time and I find the quickest way to deal with it is to forget about it and everybody forgets it anyhow. (*Laughter*) If you make a meal of it then it perpetuates.

365 Now, something may perpetuate after what I have said today and we will see, but again I thank Deputy Dorey for his wisdom.

Sir, I hope Members make the right decision.

Thank you, sir.

370 **The Bailiff:** Yes, Alderney Representative Jean and then Deputy Rob Jones.

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you, sir.

375 I would like to start by thanking Education Council for all they have done for Alderney lately. We have had our share of problems in Alderney – federation, validation, various things, headteacher. There have been many issues and Education Council and its staff have been most helpful and they have come over and had public meetings in Alderney and settled some of these items for us, and at the moment are involved in looking for a good headteacher for us.

380 I am concerned when I look at this review. When we decided those few months ago to embark on this, I was led to believe that there would be as well, for all of us, some reduction in cost. I cannot see that coming through and yet when I read the review here it says things like:

'We recommend a review of the design and layout of the Autism and Communication Unit to ensure it fully meets the service users' requirements.'

They also recommend – and I am on page 1067, I should have said that first:

'n) ... a review of the design and location of the community facilities following clarification from HSSD of their scope and purpose...

o) The overall size of La Mare de Carteret's development and the way the areas have been calculated should be reviewed. The current design appears over-sized for the high school but may be restricted elsewhere...

p) The design of the high school in particular should be reviewed to ensure it is sufficiently flexible and innovative to support effective teaching learning and a modern and relevant curriculum in line with the Education Department's vision statement and generic design brief.'

I go to page 1068:

'd) The need for community facilities should be further discussed with stakeholders to determine their use and location on site...

e) Enhanced sports facilities are highly desirable, but an options appraisal and a business case should be completed, a management plan agreed...'

385 I am very concerned about all this. I cannot get this to tally up. It is just not marrying up for me. I do not feel that the value for money is there. I feel that more needs to be done. This is going to have to go back. I do not like doing this. I am not at all happy about doing it.

I understand the state of La Mare de Carteret, but for the time being tiles can be put back in place and roofs should be fixed. If there are leaks or anywhere is leaking in that school that should be dealt with under its maintenance programme.

390 Whatever state a school is in, it should not leak and it should not be left with tiles hanging out. When I see the channel television coverage of this and I permanently see this tile in the corner with a stain of water and a piece of the tile missing, I just think to myself as a builder with experience, I would not want to see that, I would want to go and get my step ladder and put that tile back (*Laughter*) and fix that leak!

395

A Member: You might have to do it!

Alderney Representative Jean: Well, yes, I might have to do it. Somebody is saying I might have to do it. (*Laughter*)

400

The point is, for me, I need Education to do more work. I need them... but also what is so important for me is that these men are good men and they have done a lot of good work. In fact, probably if anything is wrong there it is that they may have had far too much to do and these men still have more to do for us. I urge them to stay with us. I urge them to do that work. I urge them to be patient.

405

I am sorry about La Mare, I really am. I am going to have to vote for this amendment and I thank Deputy Sherbourne for the open way in which he points out and has been so helpful to this Assembly in his clarity of the things that even he admits are yet to be done. The benefits of federation are being felt in Alderney and I am sure they are being felt in Guernsey. I know it is a good thing. We have only one problem in Alderney and that is our broadband, which they say soon in June they are going to try and fix for us.

410

I just cannot vote for this. There is no change in cost, no change in direction. It has got to go back. I am very, very sorry about that. But I respect Education Council; they are doing a lot of good work. I urge them to stay with it and let's get there in the end but with the *right* solution.

Thank you.

415

The Bailiff: Deputy Robert Jones.

Deputy Brouard, do you wish to be relevé?

Deputy Brouard: Please, sir. Thank you.

420

The Bailiff: And then do you wish to speak or – ? (*Laughter*)

Deputy Brouard: No, sir.

425 **The Bailiff:** No. You have already spoken so that is all right. *(Laughter)*
Deputy Robert Jones.

Deputy Robert Jones: Thank you, sir.

430 My interest in La Mare de Carteret I think is well known. My son has attended for the last five years and is currently doing his GCSEs. The progress I have seen that school take over the years, despite the conditions... and I thank Deputy Lowe for highlighting that and she has highlighted the small rooms and the problems they have had with maintenance and various issues. So what they have achieved despite those conditions has been phenomenal. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

435 I think there has been excellent teaching. There has been a buy-in from the pupils as well to the teaching. Parents have been requested to attend workshops to help them understand what is being taught and how it is being done.

440 I think I said in my manifesto back in 2012 that I felt education of children is about that three-way agreement between the pupils, the children and the teachers, and I think La Mare de Carteret, along with all the other schools in the Island... that is an example of how that three-way agreement works. So we congratulate the school on doing that.

My problem is that I am not convinced that, with the conditions – and I agree with Deputy De Lisle that a building is not necessarily the key to the problems but I am not sure that – them remaining in that building in the condition that it is in is sustainable.

445 I agree with Deputy Fallaize that if we were to disregard this amendment and follow the Propositions that Education have put before us, we may well be enhancing these problems and kicking the problem of... Sorry it is the other way round. If we accept the amendment we will be kicking this problem of the rebuild down the road and continuing with conditions that really do not help the children and the teachers at that school.

450 In terms of my deliberations, I have always supported Education in their implementation of the existing policy – and that went back to another issue that Deputy Fallaize raised yesterday; that we have a policy in place and one of those elements of that particular policy is the rebuilding of La Mare. So I focused on the reports and I paid a lot of emphasis on their option which was to rebuild La Mare de Carteret as a 600-capacity building.

455 But obviously it came with the recommendation that we look at the rationalisation of the educational provision and maximising the use of the full educational estate; and when I interpret that, the full educational estate would include a rebuild of La Mare de Carteret. So that is the emphasis of the report that I wanted to follow.

460 The problem that I have got is that I did not attend the three meetings, I think, that the Chair of that review panel held and I do not know whether it was true because I was not there and maybe this will be drawn out in the summary by Deputy Bebb or Deputy Sillars... is that he has now qualified his opinion in terms of the sequence of building and then assessing whether we rationalise the estate, to rationalising the estate with an agreement in principle to build the school.

465 So I am a little bit confused at the moment. I congratulate everybody on this debate because actually this has been a debate that I found really informative. It has ebbed and flowed. We have got –

I will give way.

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

Deputy St Pier: I am very grateful to Deputy Rob Jones for giving way, but I think it would be useful to just intervene on the basis that this point in relation to the presentations which he referred to, that he was unable to attend...

475 It was made very clear by the Chair of the panel at that point that the rationalisation or the recommendation to proceed with the rebuild of a secondary school of 600, was conditional upon

a rationalisation of the estate from four schools to three. That was firmly the view of the Independent Review Panel.

They had toned down the wording in the text of the report, very much at Education's request, in order to help manage the community and expectations and concerns of the staff and so on. But the review panel were clear... their views were crystal clear in the briefings they gave, that if rationalisation was off the table then they would have to put all the other options back on the table, including option 1, which of course was *not* to rebuild La Mare at all. (*Interjection and laughter*)

Deputy Robert Jones: Well, I will probably continue actually, Deputy Sillars, because I suspect you may be able to address this in the summing up. (*Interjection and laughter*)

Look, I am going to continue actually because I think Deputy Sillars will be able to address it and I know Deputy Dorey was trying to get in there but I think the proposer of the amendment may well be able to address those issues as well.

I think at the end of the day it is an example of how... I felt I had made up my mind before we came into this debate in terms of supporting Education, but this is a prime example of keeping an open mind when we are faced with debates like this, because the amount of information and the qualification of some of the issues that have been raised has helped me.

I do wait to listen to the summaries by both the proposers of the amendment and the response, I suspect, that Deputy Sillars will... he will actually have an opportunity to respond because otherwise I would have just let him intervene.

But there we are. I will listen to the rest of the debate. I think I am still undecided but (*Laughter*) we will see how we go in the next 20 minutes.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green and then Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Green: Mr Bailiff, thank you very much.

Can I just start by referring to some comments that Deputy Kuttelwascher made a moment ago? He referred to what he described as personal attacks on T&R Members and Deputy Bebb. Can I say I do not condone any of that whatsoever and I completely deprecate any personal attacks? It really is completely inappropriate and I think we are concentrating on the issues, not on personalities.

He also referred to the use of the word 'decant' and I take no issue with that either. It is an educational word, a technical word; perhaps not the best choice of words in trying to communicate to a wider audience, but nonetheless I make no criticism of the use of that word particularly.

Just a moment ago there was a discussion about the findings of the independent review when the Treasury Minister intervened with Deputy Rob Jones' speech and I think – I was not going to address this issue but I think I have to – the issue of whether there is an issue of conditionality, I think all Members can really go on is the wording of the text in the independent report; especially if they did not go to the presentations that were put on, which were presentations by a single member of the panel – it was a panel of four.

I think any suggestion that the wording was adapted to reflect a different reality is not the case and I think Members have to base their deliberations on the wording in the actual Report, particularly 5.27 which is at page 1097 of the Billet. But I mention that in passing.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, a point of correction.

Sir, I do think Deputy Green is in danger of misleading the Assembly because he well knows... In fact, I am not sure he will know because I do not know whether he was at the joint meeting – Ah, well, in that case he may well not know, but he is nonetheless in danger of misleading the Assembly because at the joint meeting of the Education Board and the Treasury & Resources

Board, at which he was not present, the wording of the Report at that stage was different to what is now in 5.27 and it did change following that.

530 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, the wording may well have changed but I would suggest that the substance of the recommendation is as it is in the report and that is the focus that Members should have on that in this debate.

535

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

Deputy Sillars: Thank you for giving way.

540 I just wanted to... The Report is the Report. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) What was said before, what was said afterwards (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) may have been private views. We, as the Education Board, were uninvited to go to the first Report schedule and things, so we were asked not to go.

545 But at the end of the day, what is written in front of us is what is written in front of us and this is what we must act on. One person, the Chairman, came over and said what he said. That is fine. That may well be his personal view, but we must surely go on this Report. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you.

550 **Deputy Green:** Sir, I want to bring the focus back to this amendment because I think things have strayed off and I want us to focus like a laser beam on the wording of this amendment, because this amendment really is all about needless procrastination and I think what we really need to do today is to make a firm decision on the rebuild and not yet another delaying motion. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

555 There are, to my mind, three reasons – three good solid reasons – why the first Proposition in the Deputy Bebb/Deputy Dorey amendment is simply not needed, it is ill judged and it is a recipe for further delays.

First of all, whatever system of secondary education you adopt, and whether you retain the 11-plus system or not, realistically it does not change the number of school places that we need to provide for 11- to 16-year-old children in this Island.

560 The future of secondary education is of course much wider than the question of the 11-plus alone but ending the 11-plus system does not change the number of places or children in the system and neither does it alter the sort of facilities a school ought to provide in the modern world.

565 So in the context of the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret High School, I would suggest that the 11-plus issue, as such, is not as relevant as some might think it is. The rebuilding of La Mare High is, to use another educational word, selection-neutral in that the case for it stands irrespective of what you do with the 11-plus.

570 But whatever future strategy or structure is adopted for secondary education, a 600-pupil high school at La Mare is still necessary and hence why the Independent Review Panel recommended that it should be rebuilt subject to the considerations that we have heard. So I do not think it follows, Mr Bailiff, that you have to have your new secondary education structure set out completely before you rebuild La Mare because you need the places.

575 Whilst we are on the independent review, I think it was Deputy Harwood yesterday, towards the end of the afternoon... he helpfully referred to paragraph 5.26 of the Report, which is on page 1097 in the Billet, which illustrates the great flexibility of the site. I think it may be worth just going back to that paragraph again briefly now, and I will read the whole of it so there is no suggestion of me being selective with what it says:

'5.26 Building as currently proposed would allow the wider social and community objectives of the project to be realised (subject to our comments elsewhere in this report on the justification, scope and scale for these proposed additional facilities). However, as highlighted above, providing a 600-place school does create some surplus capacity in the system both now and in the longer term. It does, however, ensure there is long-term flexibility to cope with changes in policies on selection and migration and the LMDC site also offers an opportunity in the longer term to increase the size of the school, should changes in policies result in the need for additional capacity. It should be designed therefore with the capacity to do this.'

And of course, it has been.

580 Incidentally, Mr Bailiff, and more broadly, the independent panel did not conclude that we should put the rebuild on hold before you determine your wider structure. Perhaps Deputy Bebb might want to reflect on that and consider how he would respond to that in his closing speech; because the fundamental point is there is no necessary connection between the rebuild of the high school and wider secondary reform; it is not as clear cut as some Members want it to be.

585 Secondly, this amendment –
I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Green.

590 It is rather confusing for Members because there is a sort of subliminal debate going on about what was said in a report which most of us have not read or have not seen – the original report.

In order to erase any doubt or misunderstanding about whether the review panel's report, which was eventually circulated to Members, differed in any way from the original text, can I ask somebody who has the original text – and I suppose that means Members of Education or Members of T&R – to share it with the States so that we can see whether there was any change made please?

595 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Well, I cannot answer for the Board. That may be something that we can consider.

600 What I would like to do, sir, is complete the speech and maybe if somebody wants to seek an adjournment for that to be done later on... I am looking at the Minister for Education. I do not know whether he wants to ask me to give way. *(Laughter)*

605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sillars.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you for asking me to ask you to give way! *(Laughter)*

Surely the whole point is, yes there was a verbal draft, there were various drafts of various machinations going through, but that whole panel came back with their final Report. That is what their end delivery was.

610 So for goodness sake, you know, we either discuss this Report or let us look at what they might have said or did say. You know, there were meetings we were not allowed to attend; we were encouraged not to attend as the Education Board. This is a nonsense! This is the Report we have in front of us. For goodness' sake, let's focus on this Report. Let your laser beam focus on this Report. That is what is here for us to do.

615 Thank you. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

620 **Deputy Green:** Sir, yes. *(Laughter)* Members will know... I am saying this amendment should fail on three grounds. I have just given you the first ground and I am now going on to the second ground. Just so that there is no confusion in terms of where I am.

The second reason why this amendment really ought to fail is because it is, in reality, unreasonably late in the grand scheme of things. **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) Members of the States

625 have had plenty of opportunity in time this term to steer Education to a schedule of dealing with secondary reorganisation first and the rebuild of the high school later.

But no such move has been actioned until now. I give Deputy Bebb credit for that –

I am not going to give way. I may give way later to my friend, Deputy Dorey.

I give credit to Deputy Bebb for actually seizing the moment now, but it is very late in the day and it is far too late in reality.

630 Can we just go back in time? I bet we all wish we could do that! (*Laughter*) The ‘today’s learners are tomorrow’s world’ vision. The vision document made it pretty clear that the proposals for La Mare were always going to be developed alongside the wider secondary reform. We have always maintained that there was nothing inconsistent between, on the one hand, the planning for La Mare High and, on the other, the plans for consideration of the overall secondary education system.

635 But the reality is that we must do our very best for the learners who are currently in our schools, as well as for future cohorts, because all children deserve good quality opportunities, including those currently at La Mare High and of course the vision document was passed unanimously without amendment in this Assembly. There were no amendments to force us down this particular road then.

640 Then in June of last year the Education Minister made a statement on the progress of the vision which updated the States on the La Mare rebuild and also on the fact that the secondary review would not happen in 2014. Did we hear a peep out of Deputy Bebb and Co on that occasion, Mr Bailiff? No, we did not.

645 This amendment today was not even moved in November of last year when the rebuild policy letter first came before this Assembly and, again, Deputy Bebb and others – not just Deputy Bebb, but others – have failed to take their opportunities to change our schedule previously. That failure meant that Education felt confident and assured that there was merit in pursuing the rebuild first and then secondary reorganisation later, as indeed there is merit in that.

650 But now (*Interjection*) beyond the... I am glad that – Ah! (*Laughter*) I am going to give way, for the last time in this speech, to Deputy Trott. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

655 **Deputy Trott:** It was very kind of Deputy Green, sir.

During the last debate on La Mare, I repeatedly requested Education Members to advise when their long-promised debate on selection at 11 would come before this Assembly. No Member of the Education Department sought to give me an answer. So to say that queries were not raised by at least one Member of this Assembly is not correct and I thank him for giving way.

660 **Deputy Green:** Mr Bailiff, there is a difference between queries being raised and proper moves to actually bring an amendment to change the schedule of the Education’s plan. There is a fundamental difference. We can all raise concerns, we can all raise queries, but actually doing something about it is actually a step beyond that. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Interjection*)

665 This is at the eleventh hour and this amendment is basically insisting that we should look at everything before we can do anything and I think that is inappropriate.

I think, Mr Bailiff, it is always a soft easy option to put off making a decision in order to wait to do something else first (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and waiting for yet more strategy in this States is simply not needed.

670 In any event, even if Members want to criticise the Education Committee for failing, to date, to bring forward proposals on secondary reform – and I accept that we may be open to genuine criticism on that; I do not seek to persuade people otherwise – it should be clear that our number one priority since 2012 has been to focus relentlessly on improving educational standards and on results and we have started to see the fruits of that approach and I make no apology for that approach. I think that is an approach that is supported by a reasonable section of the community

675

in which we live in. We have focused on standards and we have perhaps not focused on structures, but that is what we have done in the last three years and I make no apologies for that.

680 But, having said all that, the kind of report envisaged in Proposition 1 of this amendment will be forthcoming in any event, but it does not need to be done before you press 'go' on the La Mare rebuild.

Mr Bailiff, the third reason why this amendment should fail – and indeed Deputy Harwood and Deputy Fallaize both made valid points on this issue only yesterday – is this amendment will only have the effect of deferring the rebuild even further, because resolving secondary education and what secondary education should look like in future will not be easily or quickly resolved in this 685 Island, particularly when there is no consensus on what that future shape or structure of secondary education should be.

I did not agree with everything that Deputy Fallaize said yesterday, but I did agree with him when he said his judgement was that there was a – if I got him right – that there was a low likelihood of this States voting to scrap selection at 11 any time soon, but certainly not before the 690 next election in 2016.

Indeed, Deputy Bebb referred to the BBC Radio Survey that was done a few months ago, and I think that the figures on that tend to bear out the point that I have just made which is that something like 14 Deputies were in favour of retaining selection at 11; 14 were opposed; quite unbelievably, 15 were undecided – and I do not quite know how that works; (*Interjection and* 695 *laughter*) Deputy Gollop is undecided on that; I am not surprised, I am not surprised on that, Mr Bailiff – and one other Member said something slightly unfortunate that I will not repeat, although Deputy Bebb did actually use the somewhat unparliamentary word. All of that bears out the point I am making.

Of course we aim to bring a report on secondary education by March of next year but even if 700 significant decisions were to be taken by this States before the election, it could still take years to implement the decisions properly. Indeed, the full impact of the decision to close St Peter Port Secondary School took years before the school was finally wound down.

Given this reality, it is really rather optimistic, and I would suggest simplistic, to pretend that a new system of secondary education, underpinned by broad community support, capable of 705 fulfilling all of our strategic objectives, is going to be (1) agreed by this Assembly and (2) put in place reasonably soon thereafter and thus enabling the La Mare project to commence without more unreasonable delays. The possibilities for delays here are absolutely substantial in my view.

The broader point, sir, is that reviews and policy formulation in Guernsey seem to take a long time to be done properly even at the best of times. Controversial areas like secondary education 710 are perhaps particularly vulnerable to delays.

I speak as somebody who is persuaded that the 11-plus system really stems from an economy and a society that no longer exist, and I do doubt the system's ability to promote social mobility. But it is quite evident that a lot of people in our community, a lot of people in this Assembly, do not agree with that and that is the point. 715

So, Mr Bailiff, there are three very cogent reasons there as to why this amendment is floored. I want to just address briefly the second Proposition. As regards the second Proposition, that is clearly something of a crowd-pleasing tool which is... (**A Member:** Oh!) It is quite ironic, Mr Bailiff. Deputy Bebb does not normally seek to please the crowd (*Laughter*) and I give him credit for that because sometimes we perhaps sway a little bit too much with the breeze. 720

But actually the second Proposition is a crowd-pleasing tool and it does somewhat miss the point, in my opinion, because no amount of additional funding from the States will change the fact that many of the classrooms at La Mare High are too small, that there is very poor ventilation, the specialist classrooms do not support the way the curriculum is now being taught etc.

It really must be stated that the problems with La Mare go much further beyond just simply 725 being in the state it is. It has been configured for a previous age and I really must state that the schools in question have been maintained adequately; Education has spent considerable sums of money on keeping those buildings going.

730 Mr Bailiff, all in all, this amendment might seem superficially attractive but really it forces Education to do any number of things first before getting on with the vital rebuilding of the schools that we so evidently need to have.

Back in November of last year, the need to avoid delay in the rebuild was uppermost in the minds of many Deputies in this Assembly and I am sure that many Members are similarly keen to avoid further delay now. Because the only thing that has changed since November is that Education was pretty substantially vindicated by the independent review.

735 There is an opportunity to honour the 2002 Resolution today. Mr Bailiff, we will be coming back to this Assembly with our options and proposals on secondary reform as soon as we are practically able to do so.

740 Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Sherbourne yesterday talked about trust. At the end of the day, I am asking you to give the Education Committee a bit of trust. Let's have a bit of trust and let's reject this amendment. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille and then Deputy Jones.

745 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

750 **Deputy Dorey:** I think it is misleading what the States... the timetable that was in the vision report. It said, 'We will submit proposals to rebuild La Mare as a Capital Prioritisation process in Q1 2013.' That is very different to approving the rebuild of it. It is silent on the rebuild of it, but what it did say is we will bring a States Report during 2004 on a new structure for secondary education.

755 So I think he is wrong to say that Members did not try and change the order because it never said that we were going to have this debate before we had the report on the structure which included the review of selection.

760 **Deputy Green:** On a point of order, sir, what I was saying was that it was very clear from the vision statement that we were going to be progressing the La Mare rebuild alongside the wider question of secondary reorganisation. I do not think I have misled anybody.

The Bailiff: Deputy Domaille.

Deputy Domaille: Thank you, sir.

765 Just on that point, when we talk about trust, actually I took Education at its word, that it would be coming back with this strategy in 2014 and it has not, and it has not in 2015. That said, I happen to think this Education Board is a particularly good Board and much better than many of the previous Boards, if not all of them. (*Laughter*) But nevertheless, in support or in noting this vision, I did believe that this secondary strategy would be coming in 2014.

770 Sir, I am going to be brief because actually I think both sides have made good points and there is no point in repeating it. For myself, I endorse the comments of those that are asking for a delay pending the submission of this much delayed review of secondary education. This must be a fundamental requirement before we agree to spend further tens of millions on new buildings to meet what many now accept to be a flawed strategy. Maybe for different reasons but nevertheless I do not think... anybody giving full support to our current strategy and I certainly do not.

775 We owe it to all pupils, all current and those pupils who are not yet born, to get this right and we have got to think of their futures and the future of the Island. So this is a very, very important matter to get right. Education – to paraphrase and I am perhaps not being quite fair here – is saying, 'No, let's press ahead. We will pick this review up later.' I just do not think that is the right approach. I just do not.

780 Also, just on some of the other comments, I think we have got to make it clear that this independent review... Incidentally, I did attend one of the presentations – the Deputy Minister, Deputy Conder, was in attendance, as was Deputy Hadley and actually as was Deputy Quin. In fact, I think I annoyed Deputy Hadley because I kept interrupting with questions. *(Laughter)* I quite enjoyed that actually because the more annoyed he got the more questions I asked! *(Laughter)*

785 But I think it is fair to say that the words of the Chairman of the panel – and it was only the Chairman of the panel – were very clear to me – very clear – and the Education Members there could have challenged it but did not. I think in fairness to them, they had given a promise they would not interrupt, but nevertheless I found that quite telling.

In fact, he actually, with some of his comments has persuaded me to reconsider my position on 11-plus, frankly. I was a supporter and I thought some of the comments he made made eminent sense, and my wife and I had some disagreements over that. *(Laughter)*

790 Can I just turn back to page 1105 of the Billet which includes the conclusions and recommendations of the independent review? Deputy Sillars has said we must look at the review. I do not entirely agree with him but I do agree that is what is in the Report and so we should pay it a lot of attention.

795 It is not a ringing endorsement of these proposals; it is not a ringing endorsement. It says:

‘Our detailed recommendations are contained in the text above...’

– well, we have all read that –

‘A 600-place secondary school with the potential for expansion should be built *subject to* the comments above and in the context of consideration of the opportunities for rationalisation of educational provision and optimising the use of the educational estate.’

That is not a ringing endorsement of these proposals.

It goes on to say:

‘A two-form entry primary school should be built *subject to* the comments above.
Co-located autism and nursery provision should be built *subject to*...
The need for community facilities should be further discussed...
Enhanced sports facilities are highly desirable, but...’

800 It goes on about options and appraisals and whatever.

This is not a ringing endorsement of this project. It goes on to say in its final paragraph on page 1105, 9.2, that they ‘do not wholly concur’ any delays will take a long time.

But finally, and this is where I will finish, is this very last statement. The very, very last statement is, the very last sentence, ‘Getting it right must be the overriding objective.’ **(Several Members:**
805 Hear, hear.) Sir, that is what we should be doing.

Please support the amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dave Jones, then Deputy Perrot and Deputy Langlois.

810 **Deputy David Jones:** Oh dear, where are we with this? Well, I will tell you where I am, sir. I have been with Education on this from day one and I have not changed my views thus far.

The fact of the matter is I could care less what somebody from the UK who was on the Island for about five minutes has to say on this matter. The rationalisation of the estate was always going to be part of Education’s remit; even they agree that La Mare should be rebuilt.

815 It is in a shocking state. It is the children that matter here. The reports of these numbers of Siberian hamsters running around the estate that we have heard about appear to be fairly accurate. We either care about the children at that school or we do not and the future education of children who will go to that school, or we do not.

820 As far as I am concerned, these reviews... most of what has damaged Guernsey in the past has been damaged by people who have come from another place who cannot run their own affairs

properly who have said, 'Oh yes, we think you should do this and we think you should do that and that will make things much better,' and quite frankly, it never has.

825 No I will not give way Deputy Fallaize. I was just going to refer to your speech next, because I think that what you said yesterday about the fact that this will be delayed and it will be delayed for an undetermined period, possibly up to three to four years, is the most accurate statement that has been made in this whole debate and that is the thing that really upsets me most.

830 The people who say that the rebuilding of La Mare is 11-plus neutral or selection neutral, or whatever you want to call it... I think we recognise that. There will be a debate at some point in this Chamber on the future of selection. But that in no way, in my view, negates the problem that we have that we will have to build another 600-pupil school. La Mare de Carteret is that school; it is that site and, quite frankly, we should make that decision, get rid of these amendments, make that decision and get on with it.

835 Now, I hear what Deputy Bebb has to say. I listened to him for terminal hours in this Chamber – a man who has got a brilliant political future behind him! (*Laughter*) He is forever telling us how we have got it all wrong and what would be better – Sorry, Mr Bailiff, you are glaring at me -

The Bailiff: I was a bit concerned that you might be entering into some... [*Inaudible*]

840 **Deputy David Jones:** No, no, I would not. No, no, it was a throwaway comment which I have thrown away (*Laughter*) and I will now move on.

But I have listened to him and I listened to him on the radio the other day talking about what is the best education system for this Island, in his view, and all the rest of it and I do not believe a word of it. I want what Guernsey has always done and it has always done better than most other places. In fact, we have out-performed most of the places in the world, in my view.

845 Okay, Deputy Dorey is shaking his head. We had a problem with results. We are starting to get on top of that and the results now that are coming through are infinitely better than we have seen in this Island for a long time. But that does not mean to say that the model for Guernsey is wrong. It just means that we do it differently to lots of other places and as far as I am concerned, long may that continue.

850 So, while I respect the people who came on the panel and they are probably all good professionals, the fact of the matter is I could not be less interested in what they have got to say about the education of our children in this Island.

Thank you.

855 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot and Deputy Langlois, Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Perrot: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

860 I do wish that Deputy Jones would stop this 'diamond geezer' stuff and make really unfortunate remarks about Deputy Bebb. That really was uncalled for. Normally we allow this thing to go through. I mean such is my respect for Age Concern that I would not interrupt Deputy Jones (*Laughter*) when he is making one of his comments!

865 But I think first to say that Deputy Bebb has got a good future behind him and then to say that he does not believe what Deputy Bebb was saying on the radio, I think that goes too far. I mean we all ought to be able to accept what each other says at face value and good faith ought to be presumed. There we are. That is my little lecture to Deputy Jones over.

870 I had half a mind – actually people will say that that is the reason why I am a lawyer because I have got half a mind, (*Laughter*) but I had half a mind – not to speak at all in this debate, because I know that the outcome of this debate has already been decided. I am not entirely sure what the result is going to be, but I know that the outcome of this debate has already been decided and that what I say is not going to persuade anybody to a particular point of view.

I think that people's minds were very much made up before they came into this Chamber yesterday. I know some say that they go through a cosmetic process –

No, I will not give way.

875 Some go through the cosmetic process of saying that they are going to be listening to the debate but one suspects that their minds are made up already.

For Treasury & Resources, of which I am a Member, this is actually a puppy strangling debate. I mean there is nothing that we are going to be able to say which is going to put us into a good light. We are merely carrying out our mandate and I am going to read part of our mandate later on.

880 But, given that we are talking about one of the largest projects which Guernsey has looked at – we are talking about either £60 million or if we take this with the College of Further Education about £110 million plus – it is right that everybody should state his or her position and I would like to state mine.

885 There is no point in my speaking *for* the amendment because I think all that I had to say *for* the amendment was very ably said by Deputy St Pier and by Deputy Dorey in two, I thought, powerful speeches. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So anything I had to say was ably captured by them in favour of the amendment.

890 But I did, as I was going through, note a couple of comments which I really cannot let go unchallenged. I even tried to make a note actually of what Deputy Harwood had to say but he was so excited and spoke so terribly quickly that my pen ran out of ink! (*Laughter*) So I have not got a full note of it but I think it was to do with his food again and he has been on the E numbers and I really must speak to Mrs Harwood quite severely about his diet! (*Laughter*)

895 I appreciate that Deputy Hadley and factual accuracy are sometimes uncomfortable bed fellows! (*Laughter*) I am pleased that I did not speak actually yesterday afternoon, because I would have woken him up after he had been speaking. But some of his comments I cannot –

900 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, on a point of order, does Deputy Perrot perhaps regret the first few words of his speech where he was critical (*Laughter*) of people making personal attacks? This has just been a litany of personal attacks! (*Laughter*)

A Member: But it was enjoyable! (*Laughter*)

905 **Deputy Perrot:** Could I thank Deputy Fallaize for his usual helpful intervention? (*Laughter*) What I am seeking to do is to reply to personal attacks by Deputy Hadley impugning the integrity of Treasury & Resources and misleading the Assembly about Treasury & Resources.

One of the things which he said was that Treasury & Resources wish to look tough. He said that in the context of there being a General Election of Deputies next year. So he is therefore explicitly impugning the motives of Treasury & Resources.

910 My response to that is that Members of Treasury & Resources are merely carrying out their mandate and what the mandate says is this. This is in the Pink pages on page 28, paragraph a(ii), the mandate of Treasury & Resources is:

'... to be responsible for:

... Receiving and commenting as appropriate on the resource implications associated with all proposals and reports which are to be placed before the States by Departments and Committees.'

And we have genuinely tried to do that in an objective way.

915 Deputy Hadley also said that Treasury & Resources wishes to delay the school because funds are not available. Again, he is impugning Treasury & Resources and its Members. He is saying, in effect, that the wording we have used disguises some other base motive and that is simply untrue.

Deputy Hadley: On a point of correction, Mr Bailiff, this followed from remarks that Deputy Adam had made previously on the availability of money and so I think it was quite a fair comment to make.

920

Mr Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

Deputy Perrot: It did not follow from the remarks made by Deputy Hunter Adam. Deputy Hunter Adam was talking about the Capital Prioritisation process in the round and he was talking
925 about the total availability of monies to meet all of those projects.

No-one in Treasury & Resources is saying that if this Assembly approves the building of a secondary school at La Mare, whether it is for 600 pupils or for 960 pupils, that the money will not be available. That is simply untrue.

He also said – not in this Chamber, but he said a week or so ago by e-mail – that Treasury &
930 Resources had forced the closure of St Andrew’s School. It did not. The Education Department put forward proposals for the closure of St Andrew’s School. He retracted that e-mail partially after I had telephoned him. I telephoned him again actually when even that partial retraction was not a proper retraction and so he made a further retraction which even then did not retract that statement – not fully.

935 So there I am saying he is playing the man rather than the ball, and certainly in referring to Deputy St Pier as the ‘four Ps’ one of which included procrastination... Well, actually, that is what one could level at the Education Department, of which he is now a proud Member, because Treasury & Resources have been asking questions of the Education Department since 2012, which have not been properly answered, and that is why we are in the position in which we are today.

940 Procrastination is, of course, one of the subjects raised by Mr Mulkerrin when he resigned from the Education Department, because he said that the continued procrastination by the Education Department was no longer acceptable.

Returning to Deputy Hadley, he seems to have a knack of thinking that any Department with which he is at variance is acting somehow dishonourably and I say that says more about Deputy
945 Hadley than it does about those Departments.

Now, Deputy Brouard said that the outcome of the review was different to that wished by its commissioners. Two things to be said about that.

One was that the States were the ones who originally required the review to be carried out by Treasury & Resources but the States were the instigators of the review as a result of the debate
950 last November.

The second point to be made about that was that there was no preconceived outcome by Treasury & Resources. It was as much a surprise to Treasury & Resources as it was to the Education Department when the review body actually announced what it was going to recommend. In fact, that frightened the horses somewhat and it was as a result of the Education
955 Department asking for it to be toned down a bit, that it was toned down.

Originally the Review Panel did say, in express terms, that the building of La Mare was conditional upon their being a review from four secondary schools to three. Indeed, it was as a consequence of that that the Education Department – the political Education Board – requested a meeting with Deputy St Pier and me. I do not think any of the other Treasury Board Members
960 were available then and we had a meeting in confidence; so I am not going to tell you what was said at that meeting, but the whole purpose of that meeting was that the Education Department had realised the significance of the Review Panel recommending that the number of schools be reduced from four to three.

Deputy Laurie Queripel also said critically that Treasury & Resources were directing education
965 policy. No, we are not! I challenge him to find somewhere where Treasury & Resources are actually directing educational policy. What we are doing is carrying out our mandate in accordance with the paragraph which I read out, which is to advise the States in relation to projects. We do not hold ourselves out to be educators and that was one of the reasons why it was being suggested that there be an Independent Review Panel.

970 Deputy Soulsby also accuses Treasury of being infantile – and some of you chuckle when I repeat that. When I think of the huge amount of effort which has been put into this project by staff at Treasury and by the political effort which has been put in by the Treasury Board sitting

around the table with political members of the Education Department, I think that that sort of remark actually is deeply insulting.

975 Deputy Fallaize said that the supporters of this amendment are actually supporters of the 11-plus. Well, yes, of course they are – a number of them are – but the point is we know that selection is going to be debated at some time, so what we are saying is, 'Right, if there is going to be this further debate, bring it on!' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Because it is the unfortunate fact that we know that selection is to be reviewed again.

980 The trouble is there is a danger when one refers to selection because one can go back into this old stilted idea of there being a binary choice but there are quite a few ways of there being selection. Of course comprehensive schools evidence one of the ways in which there is massive selection, because comprehensive schools set and that is their way of carrying out a selection process.

985 Deputy Fallaize says that there is every chance, he thinks, that any proposal to get rid of the 11-plus will fail. I take quite a different view. I think that there is every chance that when the matter comes before the States the 11-plus in its present form at least will go. The point is what will replace it?

990 So when we have sneering comments about whether or not people do respond to a BBC survey, I am quite prepared to say I did not actually respond to that BBC survey because it is no business of the BBC for me to speculate at the moment as to how I will respond when proposals are put forward in relation to selection, because there are so many permutations of them, I do not know how I am going to respond. So what I did say to the BBC was, 'I choose not to answer your simplistic question,' and I suspect that there were others who took their decision in the same way.

995 All of this brings me rather neatly to Deputy Sherbourne who asked the question, do western Deputies have the nerve to tell people that there is to be a further delay? Talking about the west and the backdrop to that sort of remark was, 'Well, there is an election next year. We are in the west. The catchment area falls into the west.' Do I have the nerve? Yes, I do! (*Laughter*)

1000 But actually it does not come down to that; it is a question of whether you vote and make policies in accordance with our conscience. When we decide things in here those decisions ought not to be a reflection of whether or not we are standing for election for Deputy next year. That ought to be remote from our minds. Deputy Le Tocq, when he was speaking yesterday, spoke about courage and I think that whichever way a person speaks and votes ought to have its basis on courage.

1005 People ought to vote in accordance with their conscience. We ought not to be bothered about the fact that there is a General Election next year and I do pity, I have to say... because of the way which populous arguments develop as a result of there being an election, I wish to God that we went back to the Conseiller system. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) We will never do that, I know, but I do hope that at some stage we do go back to the idea of there being parochial elections combined with some Island-wide elections, (**Several Members:** Hear, Hear.) because at least that will guard against populism and electorate-pleasing remarks.

1010 As to the recommendation of the Review Panel... By the way, I know I referred to it earlier on and what was said at the joint meeting, but I went to one of the meetings at Les Cotils and it was at one of those meetings that a direct question was asked of Dr Nicholls – 'is it conditional upon the transition from four schools to three that you are recommending La Mare be built?' – and the direct answer to that was 'yes'. And of course that merely reiterated what had been said to us originally at the joint meeting.

1020 Although Deputy Rob Jones says that this has been a good debate – well, I suppose it has been a good debate in the sense that people have spoken their minds – but in getting to this debate there has been something of an unedifying process.

Some of the most egregious remarks have been directed personally at the Treasury & Resources Minister and, again, I think that is unfair. He has comported himself through the whole of the debate outside of this Chamber in his usual measured way and with a high degree of

1025 courtesy; and it is abundantly clear to anybody who listens to him that he is well on top of his brief. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I am not saying this to crawl. He knows I do not do that sort of thing, (*Laughter*) but you have got to give credit where it is due. I really, really do criticise awful, anonymous, cowardly remarks made in social media anonymously (**Several Members:** Hear, Hear.) I deplore anonymous letters in the *Press*.

1030 Incidentally, it is now so much easier and quicker to read the letters page in the *Press*, because all you have to do now is to read... it is either one of the usual names of somebody who writes in either every week or every fortnight, or it is name and address withheld. So actually you have only got a couple of letters to plough through and job done – it is wonderful! But I still think it is wrong for there to be this very high level of anonymity.

1035 It was a great pity I think that somebody who had been a Deputy in this Chamber and had been a headmistress herself chose to make personal remarks about Deputy St Pier. I think an element of dignified silence on her part might better have been called for.

1040 For me, this has been a damascene episode. I never ever thought that I would recommend executive government rather than a consensual one. But I now see that there will never be other than silo politics within this Island and I think that our system has become dysfunctional and I am ashamed of that because I was very much in favour of the good consensual government which we used to have.

1045 For the purposes of record, let me say that there is absolutely no secret agenda on the part of Treasury & Resources in relation either to La Mare – what you read is what we think; there is no secret agenda either about the grammar school which, as far as I am concerned, is a centre of excellence. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1050 I was very sorry to hear that some of our comments had amazingly, when we were so clear about it, been distorted when Treasury & Resources were invited to meet the PTA at the Grammar School and someone subsequently said that we were actually trying to do away with it. Nothing could be further from the truth, as far as I am concerned anyway.

Yes, I should have mentioned that I was a duty Deputy at the Forest Douzaine on Tuesday which was in favour of the Bebb amendment and I believe – I was not at the meeting because I am no longer a Douzenier, but I believe – that the St Saviour's Douzaine was also in favour of the Bebb amendment.

1055 Deputy Lowe implicitly was critical of the Review Panel when she spoke about having a retired educationalist on the Panel. Well, I am not an educationalist but all I can say is that the constitution of that Panel was agreed upon by the Education Department; there was no problem of that and everybody to whom I have spoken about Dr Nicholls holds him in the highest regard and I have never heard anything to the contrary. Of course, this could easily be an example of, 'Well, you criticise the Review Panel when it does not come up with the recommendation which you wish it would come up with.'

Deputy Lowe: Could I make a point of correction or a point of order?

1065 I did not actually criticise the gentleman concerned on his ability or credibility. All I said was that I was surprised it was a retired person rather than somebody working within the current operation of the education system; nothing against the gentleman personally.

Deputy Perrot: Well, that was a helpful correction! (*Laughter*) It was implicit in the Deputy's remark that she was being critical of there being a retired educationalist on the Panel.

1070 Finally, and this is a point of no great significance, Deputy Lester Queripel was saying that you could not carry out work whilst children were in school. Well, actually you can and we do, and we have done it on any number of occasions. Work is best done, of course -

Deputy Lester Queripel: A point of correction please, sir.

1075 I did not say you could not carry out work in term time while children were in school, I said it is
not advisable because it could impact on their health and I did say later on in my speech, because
I was aware that work did take place in schools in term time and that we do have some Members
of this Assembly on the Board of Governors and directors of schools... and it is considered that
those repairs are done and completed effectively. But then I did go on to say, 'But did those
1080 Members from this Assembly sit with the teachers and the students every minute of the day in
that environment?'

So I would ask Deputy Perrot to withdraw that I did not say 'you cannot'.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

1085

Deputy Perrot: Perhaps the word I should use is 'should not' rather than any other word – you
should not do it.

Anyway the point that he was making, that it somehow affects the health of children, I think is
a wildly exaggerated comment. Major work has been carried out. For example, a huge building
1090 was erected at Les Beaucamps whilst the school was actually in operation.

I saw it during my childhood. I also saw it at Elizabeth College where the Ozanne science block
was built whilst we were still at school and we were in classrooms next door and I do not think it
did... Well I was going to say I do not think it did us any harm, but thinking about what...
[Inaudible]

1095

Deputy Lester Queripel: Point of correction please, sir.

Deputy Perrot: – yesterday, maybe it did do us some harm after all.

1100

Deputy Lester Queripel: A point of correction please, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I do wish Deputy Perrot would listen to what I say.

1105

What I said was, it is a completely different dynamic when you are trying to focus and listen
and learn within the confines of a building site. It is a totally different dynamic to a building being
built outside on a separate site.

The Bailiff: Deputy Perrot.

1110

Deputy Perrot: Right, well, just in case anybody misunderstood that, it is a totally different
dynamic when work is being carried out next to a school site.

Thank you.

1115

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois and then Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

Well, welcome again to the world of difficult decisions. The difficult decisions in politics tend to
be characterised in terms of States meetings by a situation where a proportion of people have
very strong views on either side and we enter the debate and then we sort of creep towards an
1120 overall decision, a number of people say, 'Well, they have not quite decided yet,' and it has been
suggested that some of those are fairly cosmetic comments and then eventually we get back to
the actual point.

Well, let's try and get back to the point. There has been a very broad-ranging debate, complex
1125 – I would not want to use a term like 'meandering' because that could be taken as offensive to

some of the speakers, but we have got to where we currently are today. And so I would like to take the opportunity to remind you of the precise key wording of the amendment, right.

1130 The Proposition 2 actually speaks for itself. If you go with Proposition 1 then there has got to be money made available as in Proposition 2. But the key wording is to direct the Education Department to submit to the States, *as soon as is practicable* – that, to me, implies speed – a policy letter concerning the future of secondary education in Guernsey as detailed in appendix to the vision document, 'Today's learners, tomorrow's world'. And the quote is:

'We will bring a States Report to the Assembly during 2014 on a new structure for secondary education.'

1135 Now, this seems to me like, sort of, Education directing itself to do something and it has been brought out in the debate a number of times that that has not been done and there are two areas, clearly, that would be implied in that review. (1) relates to the area of selection – the future of selection in the Island; and (2) refers to the number of schools and the number of schools has become highlighted since the independent report.

1140 Now, sir, surely these decisions must come before we go through with a now totally inappropriate conclusion to a 15-year-old plan. I risk treading on toes by suggesting it, but I think I am the only person in the Assembly who was actively involved in that 15-year-plan. Apologies to Dr – Oh Dr O'Hara! Promotion! – to Deputy O'Hara at the very start because as a Member of the Education Board you sit there with the future in sight and you make – oh, well, apologies to several other people as well who are all sort of saying, 'And me and me!' (*Laughter*) – the best decision you can with the information available at the time. You also make the best decision you can with regard to the sort of timescale that is going to be involved.

1145 Let us tackle those two issues separately. The selection issue is due to be revisited. I could not agree more with Deputy Perrot that we need to keep an open mind about that. A lot of assumptions are made about who would want what to come out of the selection debate. It will happen. It is not, to my mind, dependent on buildings; it is very much more a pure educational issue.

1150 The outcome of it remains, in my view, very uncertain because essentially we have an education system that is much loved by many of our population and much hated by many others and therefore there will be disagreement about that one. Many assumptions are made about the position of the independent colleges in that debate and they should not be made because the independent colleges move with the time – that is why they are so successful and provide excellent education – and their position in any system will need to be considered carefully.

1155 The colleges, I am sure – and I know that is actually acknowledged and agreed by people on both sides of the selection debate – are open to educational changes and that is one of the reasons why they remain as some of the most successful schools in the British Isles.

1160 So let's put that one to one side. It is ideal if we could have that debate first and some people feel very strongly that we must get that one sorted, but the overall pattern of the structure for secondary education involves more than just selection because the number of schools is another part of it and certainly the revision of that structure has been promised.

1165 So, sir, the whole of the stakeholders in education – all the stakeholders in education; some would say that is every citizen of the Island but certainly the key stakeholders, the pupils, the parents, teachers and the broader community – need some longer term certainty.

Now, we turn then to the question of delay and certainly a figure of five years has been mentioned as an outcome of accepting this amendment. I think there is very limited evidence of the term of that delay stretching that far.

1170 With regard to buildings as one component of the educational equation, should this school have been built earlier? Yes. After being its building would there have been recriminations about the cost, size, suitability of build, facilities included or omitted and so on? Yes, that would have happened as well. Are these reasons for going for the wrong building solution now? No, we have got to be looking, sir, to do the right thing here.

1175 How on earth is T&R expected to sign off a formal business plan with integrity and within their mandate, that Deputy Perrot has just reminded us of, if they know that Education is preparing reports that will change the educational secondary landscape? We need to get this project right. It is unfunded and it would impact on money available elsewhere.

1180 The Alderney community requires improvements to the runway, the Hospital needs re-profiling by HSSD, sea walls and buses are needed by Environment – sorry in conjunction with each other; they are two separate projects – and I could list many, many other projects that will require funding.

1185 These are just examples of the broader view that we need to take in this decision. It must be looked at in the context of effective financial management. Education has not seen fit to produce the reports of its vision and yet, extraordinarily, the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, our Government's spending watchdog, says we should just get on with the build.

1190 We are in danger of taking a peculiarly static view of the world here. Things change in 15 years and in this case, the changing pupil numbers are one key to this decision and the changing attitudes to education and evidence of educational appropriateness of the size of schools – as mentioned strongly in the independent report – are the changes we should be taking account of. The question of the number of schools has been posed by the Independent Panel and must be answered.

1195 So, sir, please will everybody, before they vote on this, re-read the precise nature of the Proposition. To me, it says very clearly what the necessity is and to go with this is certainly not a soft and easy option, as one of the Education Board suggested this morning. It is a very hard decision. It is a hard decision because of the heartfelt comments we have all received and we have all heard and we have all listened to, but it does not make it the wrong decision – absolutely the opposite.

1200 Let's get this right for the whole Island and in order to follow all logical governance processes, please support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

1205 In 2001 I sat in the Public Gallery when the then Education Department proposals were being debated. I sat in the Public Gallery with the former Deputy Fletcher, as she was then, who went on to be Deputy Steere, the Minister for the Education Department.

1210 We were in the Public Gallery because we had formed a group called Fair Start that was opposed to the 11-plus. The Education Department proposals were being debated and there was hope – *hope* – in the Public Gallery that the 11-plus would be dealt with and that there would be a resolution and the Education Department would move on.

1215 Sat in the Public Gallery, we sensed a mood in the Chamber moving towards broad support for the new direction of education. That started to concern some Members in the Assembly at that time and so the famous, infamous last minute amendment was placed to help those Members of the Assembly who were struggling to make a difficult decision.

So then, as now, the fickle political butterfly settles on a subject matter that they have a passing interest in and in a brief political spotlight, or their moment briefly in the political spotlight, they fundamentally changed the direction of the Department. Then what? Well, that is for another day. More delay, more reports, more unknown knowns.

1220 Let's just reflect briefly on the waste debate. We agreed no incinerator – okay – but how far from a resolution, a solution, and how much will the revised proposals cost? But when we all supported the requête the mood at the time was clear. Last minute intervention was a positive thing and solutions were there to be had. But what I have learnt, sir, in my time in this Assembly is that optimism, the good will, the energy imbued in the vote dissipates. The process drags on as reports are written and procrastination erodes democracy. Last minute amendments such as this

1225

do long-term damage and when the unforeseen consequences emerge, the butterflies have long since moved on. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1230 Deputy Kuttelwascher says – and I think he said this, sorry – we are where we do not want to be or words to that effect. I would go further – Thank you. I would go further and say that the Education Department, well, they are where they were and they have been treading water for 13 years and the buckets have been collecting water at La Mare for the same period.

1235 And yet in this Assembly I hear impatient voices regarding Education, saying, ‘Make your mind up. What are you doing about the 11-plus? Make a decision!’ But let’s not pretend, because I would contest that some in this Assembly who were harrying and snapping at the heels of the Education Department want to retain the 11-plus, they want to retain the Grammar and they want to retain the colleges. So let’s not pretend about that.

Because when I say, ‘Bring it on. Let’s have a debate about the 11-plus,’ my intention is clear; it is wrong, it should end, it should stop. But some of those who are saying bring that debate on want to underpin to reinforce the foundations of that system.

1240 Deputy Langlois, in his speech, said ‘the broader view’. Well, I have a broader view on the consequences of this amendment and the Education Department’s proposals, and it is this: that this is not a £60 million spend on a school; it is much, much more than that. It is a £60 million investment; a fiscal stimulus package for an area that is in desperate need of projects that will enhance community cohesion.

1245 HSSD, Education and the Home Department are more than aware of the issues that arise from the absence of real community cohesion and that comes at a real cost in more ways than one, both to T&R and to the taxpayer and to all of the above Departments.

1250 With elements of the community, individual families become dysfunctional and that comes at a cost to the community in the real sense. But specifically I would make one reference: that when the consultant employed by the Policy Council, that predated Ruby Parry’s involvement, was present to look after Children’s Services she gave a presentation to the then Children and Young People’s Panel, of which I was a member, and she sited specifically this area; and she remarked... children and families who went through the care process – she had particular concerns about indigenous local families and remarked that their parents had been clients long before them.

1255 Deputy Langlois also posed the question, ‘What has changed in the last 15 years?’ Well, with those families, nothing has changed in the past 15 years. They are where they were and where they have always been. This fiscal stimulus package in this area is more than a school and it must be seen in that light.

1260 Also, sir, builders are laying off staff. Also we hear recently that a long-established marine engineering company are laying off staff, apprentices – apprentices that would be involved stainless steel engineering and fabrication; and we know that there is a growing skills gap on the Island and yet these hands-on tradesmen – young men, particularly – are losing their employment opportunities and apprenticeships.

1265 This is, sir, an opportunity to invest in children, invest in families and, yes, there is a high up-front cost to the community. But what we can never do, and we fail to do in my view, is ever put a real cost on dealing with a number – in fact a vast amount – of very real social issues that arise now and the cost to respective Departments.

1270 This is an opportunity to begin to address some of that. I hope, sir, in fact I implore Education to focus on this estate like a laser beam, as Deputy Green has said; for it is just a reality that Education will need to offer something back to the centre to offset the revenue costs of any new development for this school’s community project. I know the Coutanchez site has been cited, and I know people say, ‘Well, isn’t that great for social housing?’ but let’s be careful what we do here. If we can get planning laws through, if we can have covenants, then my concern sometimes is, in dealing with one social housing provider, you end up with a grant funding system or you gift land, rather than realising a benefit other than nothing, if you follow. So if we could have mixed tenure with covenants then that would be preferable. Sorry for that tangential departure.

1275

1280 Just in closing, sir, I feel I have to comment on the changing political environment and how T&R, in particular, have become the shadow Education Board. Before then they were the shadow HSSD Board and I sort of understand why that happens. Fiscal control will dominate, but I have to say at the cost of Departmental mandates and that does concern me. I know we are going to have a review of the system of Government (*Interjection*) (*Laughter*) I do not know whether that was an intervention or a cry for help! What was it, Deputy Gollop? (*Laughter*) No, is there a medic in the House?

1285 But I stress that, because there is this encroachment into Departmental mandates that do stymie, close in, impact negatively on the mandates of individual Departments. And I know there is a broader argument out there that says, 'It is the taxpayers' pound. Nobody has the monopoly. It is a rare commodity,' but if the Departments have mandates, it is important that we try to respect them.

1290 In closing, I would just allude to those remarks made by Deputy Soulsby, because actually it is said a lot in this Assembly but a lot of this is about trust and I am sure when HSSD Members are sat around the Board, I am sure when Education Department Members and T&R Members are sat around the Board, they believe they are doing the right thing.

1295 Well, I passionately believe Education are doing the right thing. They have waited long enough to do this. The children have waited long enough. And this is not a motive – families and communities have waited long enough. We owe it to them! We owe it to them to do something about this now, so I please ask you: do not send the families and everyone once more around the block for a process that will become increasingly opaque despite, I think, words... Deputy Langlois said, 'Despite words that imply speed'. We just know what process does and what amendments become following their departure from this Assembly, if I can put it that way.

1300 So please do not support this amendment and support the Education Department's proposals, sir. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Deputy Ogier.

1305 **Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

Listening to the debates, I do have a lot of sympathy for Education but, for me, many of their arguments have centred around questioning why this level of scrutiny is being applied now, which does not really get to the heart of the matter.

1310 I take Deputy Brehaut's analogy of a butterfly in a spotlight. This scrutiny is occurring now because this is what is in front of us at the time and this is what we need to give scrutiny to and many of us in this Assembly are being put in a position where questioning a policy happens at the very last minute and I do feel for Education on this.

1315 We received a considerable number of mails on this subject – a considerable number! – and most advocating a rejection on any proposed amendment by Treasury & Resources. But many others telling us that in the author's view we should reject T&R's amendment because we should have a proper process. We should have a clear and transparent impact assessment on education policy. We should have a more detailed look at the long-term ramifications and we should have the formulation of an overarching plan on secondary education.

1320 I am a supporter of Education and I have spent time on the Board. I supported the St Sampson's rebuild and I supported the Beaucamps rebuild. But I am drawn to the amendment as proposed by Deputy Bebb and one of my key manifesto pledges was that I would play my part in this Assembly's work to bring the Island's finances back into balance. And I told the St Sampson's electorate that I would make the difficult decisions I needed to make and I have made those decisions where required.

1325 My heart screams at me to rebuild this school for the benefit of the children currently there and for those who will go there, but my head tells me we have not seen the reports we need to see in order to assure ourselves that the model, as proposed so long ago, is still the right model; and I can see an argument that debating Education's vision for secondary education, as well as

1330 visiting the 11-plus could have serious ramifications for the infrastructure model, as recommended by Education.

On the 11-plus, my position has changed. I benefitted from the 11-plus but I, please, do not want to start off another Latin bout *in antiqua insula*. (*Laughter*) I am, however, by no means sure now – in fact I have grave doubts now – that the 11-plus is functioning well in its aims of providing a level playing field for all.

1335 The answers listed by Deputy Le Lièvre on how many children from social housing were at the colleges – zero – and at Grammar – around 10, from memory – tells me our education policy in this area, for whatever reason, is failing certain demographics of the Island (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and this needs to be revisited.

1340 With those doubts in my mind, unfortunately no matter how my heart screams at me, I do not think I can do anything else but support the amendment as proposed.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Wilkie and then Deputy Inglis.

Deputy Wilkie: Thank you, sir.

1345 This has been a fascinating debate with many interesting speeches. Not many of them have anything to do with this amendment but they have been very interesting! (*Laughter*) And I want to focus on this amendment briefly and if we go to Proposition 1:

'To direct Education Department to submit to the States as soon as possible, a policy letter concerning the future of secondary education in Guernsey...'

1350 Now, I attended the presentation by the Independent Review Panel and Dr Nicholls said that one of the biggest savings we could make was with our secondary education and tertiary education facilities. Now, that is not included in this amendment, so many people thinking we are going to make lots of savings by reviewing our secondary education without tertiary – it is simply not going to happen. This amendment is not going to do that.

1355 If we look on to Proposition 2 it says in here obviously, 'The condition of the... buildings is such that they are no longer suitable.' Then it goes on to say that Treasury & Resources and Education Department will somehow agree a routine capital allocation. Now, we have already heard that this decision may take three, four, five, six years – we do not know. If this debate comes back to the States there could be amendments, there could be a sursis, we just cannot guarantee how long we are going to have to keep this school going.

1360 We have already heard from Education that they think it could cost hundreds of thousands, millions, to get it up to spec in the next five to six years. We have not heard from Treasury how much they would expect to spend on a school that is going to be pulled down eventually, but I am willing to give way to any Member of Treasury who can give me a figure that they might be willing to spend. No, so I think we have a situation where in Proposition 2 Education will be up here somewhere, Treasury will be down here and I think it is going to be very difficult for the two
1365 of them to come to an agreement. So what is going to happen?

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Wilkie: I did not realise Deputy Bebb was a Member of Treasury, but there you are.

1370 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you Deputy Wilkie for giving way, but would Deputy Wilkie agree that it is implausible to ask Members of the Treasury & Resources Department as to how much money is required to maintain the state that is not theirs? It is a bit like asking the Treasury & Resources Department to confirm how much money they are willing to spend on the hospital when it is not theirs. Indeed, it is almost as logical as asking Members of the Health & Social Services
1375 Department how much money they are willing to spend on La Mare de Carteret.

Realistically, it will be for the Education Department to determine how much money is necessary and to actually discuss it with the other Government Departments. Is that not how we deal with these issues?

1380

Deputy Wilkie: I thank you, for Deputy Bebb's comments there, but I think we all know that Treasury & Resources have wholeheartedly supported this amendment, so they must have some sort of figure in mind if they are going to support Proposition 2.

1385 I have just had a note here. I should declare an interest as I am a member of the management school committee on La Mare de Carteret.

I give way to –

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

1390 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you.

Having thrown down the gauntlet for a Member of T&R to intercede, I am grateful to Deputy Wilkie for giving way.

1395 There is, of course, a very well-established process by which routine capital allocations are set for Departments and that is, in essence, what this Proposition in this amendment is seeking to do. And, of course, there is a similar Proposition in the amendment which may or may not be laid after this particular debate.

1400 All I think the amendment seeks to do is to say that routine capital allocation process and, indeed, the cash limit through general revenue spending – because some of the normal maintenance activity would be through general revenue rather than routine capital – needs to take account of the fact that La Mare was going to need to be continued to be occupied for at least the next three years – maybe a little bit longer – and that is all the amendment does. How that money is spent is, of course, down to Departments.

The Bailiff: Deputy Wilkie.

1405

1410 **Deputy Wilkie:** I thank the Treasury Minister for that. However, if that was the case, then the way I am reading Proposition 2 in this amendment, it is put in there because some extra money will be needed, rather than just routine capital and I do not know how much money that is going to be. I think if we are agreeing to Proposition 2 we could be writing a blank cheque for a school that is going to be pulled down and rebuilt (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I think we need to think about that very carefully. And I do not think Proposition 1 is going to do all the things that everyone thinks it is going to do in reducing the school estates.

So I would say, just stop; stop this madness and vote against this floored amendment.

Thank you.

1415

The Bailiff: Deputy Inglis.

Deputy Inglis: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1420 Members, there have been some very passionate speeches made yesterday and today, and I do not particularly want to go over those particular items, but it is worth highlighting the speech from Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Soulsby and my good friend Deputy Trott, who seems to have left the Assembly. (*Interjection and laughter*) I am sure he will.

1425 I would like Members to absorb two words in this debate because it is very important and the two words are 'time' and 'change'. Now, I use the word 'time' because 10 years ago I saw the state of the La Mare de Carteret School and time has not helped it, time has eroded a lot of the infrastructure that we clearly know needs to be redeveloped.

I actually feel guilty of being one of the people who voted to ensure that the review takes place, to make sure that the spend was correct; and we were assured that it would not hold back

1430 the development. We have lost a year. It is that quick – what is happening around us. So time is very important.

The rebuild, if we do make a decision, is going to take three years minimum. Time is important. Time is important to the young people who move through that school. We all say our school days were long and hard, and they seemed to go on and on forever, but actually they are a very short period in our life and that is my main concern.

1435 Deputy Bebb in Proposition 1 says that he would like the States as soon as practical... a report concerning the future of secondary education. That is time. I would honestly question what a practical time is in producing a report. We have constantly heard from Members who have been in this Assembly for long periods and heard that comment, that a report was forthcoming.

1440 I think it is important to say that I am disappointed with Education in not providing us with that information prior to making a decision such as this but, as Deputy Sherbourne highlighted yesterday, yes, they as a Department have had a lot to encompass. It is possibly an excuse but it is, like everything that we have to do in life, a matter of creating a priority.

1445 When we did go through the Capital Prioritisation I felt slightly misled, in that the prioritisation was to rebuild the La Mare de Carteret School and, as has been highlighted, we recognise how important the rebuild is to the western parishes. I immediately supported that, thinking that was exactly what was going to happen but of course the enhanced area of development is now where we are and where we have to make a decision. It is not just about the school, it is about a community within Guernsey, which is very important.

1450 So, from that point of view, I would like Education to give us the reassurance that what is going to happen will happen and will happen in a manner that will provide the time right for the students. We have heard mention today about change – things have changed since 2001, of course they do, but we now live in a society where things change yearly and we have to be able to adapt. I struggle with the long periods of consultation, which are right and proper but the period of time associated with producing those results I find very frustrating.

1455 I cannot support this amendment but I have been telling people in reply to the numerous e-mails that we have all been receiving, that I am supportive of a three-school arrangement because the cost and implication of supporting four schools is something that I clearly understand where T&R are coming from. They are right in that. We could be handing on a legacy to the students of today, of trying to support a system that is over-provided in capacity and therefore we would be wrong in handing that on.

1460 Having said that, what the Education Minister is assuring us is that, to start the work now – and within a nine-month period, I am led to believe – the report on where we are going to go would allow the change in the build from a 600-student premises to 960, without holding anything up. Now, that, for me, is positive and is moving forward without wasting any more time. So I would like the Minister, in his summing up, to guide me on that.

1465 Probably one other comment I would like to bring out – and it has been mentioned by a few people – is T&R's role in this. I totally understand that Treasury & Resources need to ensure that the taxpayer's money is wisely spent and used in the right areas, but scrutiny, I feel, should be brought into play a lot sooner rather than an after-event, because they could clearly identify the value for –

1470 I will give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Rob Jones.

1475 **Deputy Robert Jones:** Is Deputy Inglis talking about the Scrutiny Committee and the PAC Committee? Because, in my view, if Scrutiny were called in we would have done exactly what T&R and Education have already done, which would be to commission an independent review.

Secondly, if PAC were brought in they would be looking at value for money which, if you look at Proposition 2 in the delegated authority, that is exactly what T&R would be doing.

1480 So I am a little bit uncertain – and I look forward to the debate in July – as to exactly where people want Scrutiny to go. But in this instance I do not think Scrutiny would have added any particular value at this stage of the process.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inglis.

1485

Deputy Inglis: I thank you for that and, yes, I understand exactly the way the structure would work. That being said, it is something that I do not feel should fall into the Treasury & Resources' mandate. Their mandate clearly says that taxpayer's money should be spent wisely, but they need guidance from Scrutiny or PAC, which probably, as you rightly say, will come out in the debate in July; but it could give more emphasis on the importance of Scrutiny and therefore allow some better form of resources that should allow you to do that.

1490

Members, I make the decision, based on what I said right at the beginning... it is on time. I want to see this development get under way but I do want the reassurance that it will be done in a manner that the public of Guernsey are happy with and that we do ensure that we get good value for money.

1495

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Gillson.

1500

Deputy Gillson: Thank you, sir.

I came to the Assembly yesterday with the intention of voting against this amendment. That was until I heard Deputy Bebb's opening speech, which I found very persuasive. What has made me reconsider the amendment was some of the references he made to timing and the commitment within Education's own recommendations for their review of secondary education.

1505

Last November we were in a position where, had we given the go ahead with the redevelopment of La Mare, it would have opened by September 2017. Due to the review, we are now in a position where if we give the go ahead today it will be open by September 2018 – one year later.

1510

Therefore, logically, if an opening date of September 2017 could have been achieved following the November 2014 decision and opening in September 2018 could be achieved... which is what we are currently looking at, following a decision to go in November. Therefore, we have got until November 2015 to make this decision without delaying the opening from September 2018.

1515

Arguably, we could be a little bit later because, if memory serves me right, had the independent report been submitted and agreed by both Boards in, I think, February, then that could have also achieved a September 2017 opening.

So at a push – and I accept it would be a push – we have really got until February next year to make this decision without delaying the opening of the school from September 2018, using Education's own timescales that they put before us last year.

1520

So, given Education's timescale from last year, the next question has to be can Education produce a report, and what sort of report, within that timescale? Now, I think it is possible. Firstly, for their proposals within this report say they will bring back a report by March and I forget whether it was Deputy Sillars or Deputy Conder who made reference to this by saying, 'by March or earlier' so there is an expectation or hope by Education that they may bring this report back earlier.

1525

I think another reason is that much has been mentioned about the 11-plus... it is central to any review and earlier this year or late last year Education said that they were going to bring a green paper on the 11-plus to the Assembly by November this year. I have not heard anything to say that timescale is not happening, so work must be underway. So probably the biggest and one of the most contentious parts of the review, they are still on schedule to bring to this Assembly for November anyway.

1530

So I think it does sound as though it is possible and I think that when we come to looking at the review that Education brings to us and this statement... and since there is going to be a review looking at all of... a review is common on all the proposals, I have a plea to Education and that plea is about being open with your beliefs.

1535 To go out to consultation on a review of education on a blank piece of paper-type suggestion, I think would be wrong because that would be slightly disingenuous to the public because that would imply the possibility of you returning to the States saying that you would support continuing with the 11-plus.

1540 Now, I am a traditional supporter of the 11-plus and I accept that there is evidence for it and there is evidence against it. It works in Kent comprehensive schools and it works elsewhere. We also know that the majority of the Members of the Education Board are openly opposed to the 11-plus.

1545 I recall a meeting in St Sampson's School, a public meeting – I think it was in relation to the closure of St Andrew's – where Deputy Green said the 11-plus was not part of the solution and Deputies Sherbourne, Conder and Le Lièvre, who was then on the Board, agreed. The Minister said he was open to the facts and open to some research... and await the evidence.

So if we have a situation where we have got evidence that is balanced, public opinion in the past has been balanced, but four out of five Members of Education do not favour the 11-plus, it is pretty obvious what the recommendation is going to be.

1550 Now, there are some things I agree with Education over, some things I do not agree, but one thing I do accept is their integrity and the integrity of their beliefs. So, given their public opposition to the 11-plus, do we really expect them to come back with anything other than to recommend removal? We can have that debate in the Assembly.

1555 But why I ask them for this plea to be open is, the cat of the question is out of the bag; there is concern out there at the Grammar School and at all the schools, and so we as a Government have got a responsibility to keep the time frame where that concern is going, as minimal as possible; and if you go out with an open blank paper consultation exercise, you are being slightly disingenuous and lengthening the time.

1560 So I would plea, if that is what the majority of you believe, and even if it by a majority, bring a report saying that... your report, whether it is in March if your proposal goes through or whenever, we will then consult on your Propositions and debate them, but that way you can keep the timescale of the review as short as possible and the concern the public has as short as possible, so that the decision is made as quickly as possible.

1565 So I think that, given the timescales we were told last November, there is a possibility of a report coming back, especially since Education's own recommendations say they will bring something back, which is effectively a review of secondary education, by March.

1570 So I am tempted to support this. I await the final speeches because any concern on La Mare does concern and worry me but my mind keeps coming back to the statement – and again I am trying to remember whether it was the Minister or Deputy Conder who said they want to come back with the report by March or earlier; and if that can be done then I think we are not necessarily looking at a long five or six-year delay of La Mare, and we may not actually be looking at any delay at all.

So I am looking forward to speeches. At the moment I am minded to support the amendment.
Thank you.

1575 **The Bailiff:** Deputy O'Hara.

Deputy O'Hara: Thank you, sir.

1580 Could I first answer the query that Alderney Representative Jean had in connection with the Review Panel's recommendation that the Culture & Leisure Department should provide an option appraisal and expanded business case in connection with the national sports facilities?

Just to say – he has probably seen it but – it is included in appendix D of the Report and although I am very tempted to talk about sport today, I will not expand on that because it was fully debated in November.

1585 Well, sir, as people have said, there have been some excellent and passionate speeches here over the last 24 hours and it is difficult not to repeat any of the points that have already been made. But there is no doubt in anyone's mind here today that we all share one common denominator and that is the education and welfare of our children. Of course, we all have our personal and political agendas on the subject, but the overall factor is that we must secure the
1590 future of our school children's education.

Strong opinions from both Education and T&R have resulted in the situation we now find ourselves in. However, there is no doubt whatsoever that this has caused the utmost anxiety, not just within La Mare de Carteret School but also the other schools who find themselves locked into these disagreements. Sir, the depth of anxiety is obvious by the number of e-mails we have all had
1595 from parents and teachers and also other interested parties.

We heard from the T&R Minister that he had received three e-mails of support for the T&R proposals. However, this is far outweighed by those very concerned families –

Deputy St Pier: A point of correction.

1600 Sorry, just to be clear, I did not say I had received three – I received considerably more than three; I merely referred to three.

Deputy O'Hara: I stand corrected. However, I am sure we all received those e-mails as well and I still maintain that they were far outweighed by those very concerned families who wished
1605 for the Education proposals to be approved.

It is these families, parents and teachers who I feel we must give support. As Deputies, we cannot ignore their comments and concerns. Sir, our decisions today will affect the future of all our children tomorrow.

Sir, it seems to me that it is a matter of trusting Education to fulfil their intentions and bring
1610 back their proposals as outlined in Proposition 3 of their Report. Well, I am completely happy to trust their judgement. It would be incumbent upon the Education Department to bring back those proposals earlier or by March 2016 and it will be up to this States to approve or disapprove those proposals at that time.

The Bebb/Dorey amendment seeks to delay the project totally. I am afraid I cannot agree with
1615 this. I am concerned that this delay could result in further delays leading to kicking the can further down the road for another States to discuss in 2016. Well, I am not prepared to take that risk.

I said before that I am prepared to trust Education to bring back their proposals for debate to this Assembly, which will take in full consultation.

I refer Members to page 1070 of the Report, item 59 which clearly states:

'The Education Department is firmly of the view that any consideration of a four to three-model of secondary education requires full public consultation.'

1620 – full public consultation –

'The Department believes that such an important change to the structure of education delivery on the Island requires the full engagement of *all* stakeholders, including professional staff, parents, students and the wider community.'

It goes on to say:

'This is wholly consistent with the UK Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services which the States of Guernsey has also signed up to us. Most specifically the final core Principle of Good Governance... "... means engaging stakeholders and making accountability real" – it is particularly pertinent.'

This item refers to professional staff indeed we cannot and should not ignore the advice of the professional staff. They know what they are talking about and they know what is best for our

1625 students. With the exception of a few Members here today, and in particular Deputy Sherbourne, I would respectfully say that we do not. I repeat we cannot ignore the advice of the professionals.

Sir, we have heard from the Minister of Education and Deputy Richard Conder that the design of the school is such that it can be extended with neutral cost, other than the obvious building costs.

1630 Deputy Trott made a point about architect's fees. However, he will agree that it is not impossible for fees to be negotiated and determined at the commencement of any project which could involve a further extension.

In view of the fact that the school can be extended without any problem at a later date, there seems to me to be no reason why building cannot commence. It is described as selection neutral. Further education decisions will not affect the building of the school and this is outlined quite clearly in item 5.8 on page 1070. I will not quote that.

1635 In connection with T&R, I will agree with Deputy Brehaut. You know, Members, T&R are not infallible. They could have it wrong. I am sorry, I am looking at Deputy Kuttelwascher and he obviously thinks he is right every time but you are not right every time! *(Laughter)*

Sorry. I will not give way –

1640 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** A point of order, sir.

Deputy O'Hara: A point of... Okay.

1645 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** A point of order, sir.

I need to make a correction. I, at no time, have said I am right every time. In fact, in aviation, one of the things you said is you are quite often in error and you are very pleased that the co-pilot has put you right because you live to fly another day.

1650 So that is complete nonsense and I think it is rather a personal attack which I object to. I do get things wrong regularly! *(Laughter) (Interjection and laughter)*

Deputy O'Hara: Well, you are wrong this time! *(Laughter)* I am sorry, but with the greatest respect, we have a Member of T&R today – my good friend, Deputy Perrot – who has been quite critical of people here in his replies back, so the time has come when I have to say it, once and for all, that there are times when T&R interfere with the mandates of other people's Departments.

1655 This is what we have got here. I know it is said or was quoted that they are entitled... or the mandate of T&R is to look at resources. That is one thing but to start telling Departments how to run their Department is wrong. That is my opinion. I am entitled to my opinion and I am voicing it.

1660 Deputy Bebb said in his opening remarks we are where we are. Well, we are where we are but we must move on. Sir, we must move on to focusing ourselves on the concerns and thoughts of those students, parents and teachers who have been severely affected by this difficult situation.

1665 We also must move on to provide all the other facilities surrounding the school. Deputy Gollop and others have made it clear to the Assembly that this is not just about the school, it is also about the primary school, the pre-school, the communication and autism base, location of community facilities and all the national sports facilities. Voting in these proposals will enrich many aspects of the community.

1670 Members, the time has come to listen to all these concerned parents and families. The time has come to listen to the professional staff. The time has come to allow Education to fulfil their mandate to carry out full consultation to provide us with full evidence of their educational plans for the future and, importantly, sir, the time has come to support Education and develop La Mare de Carteret into the school that the pupils and teachers richly deserve.

Members, vote out this amendment and support Education.

Thank you, sir. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1675 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Le Pelley.

Deputy Le Pelley: Thank you, sir.

1680 I will be very brief. I have come here today not really sure exactly which way I should vote. My heart tells me one thing, my head tells me another. I have had 30-odd years in Education – something similar to what Deputy Sherbourne has done. I do not like huge schools; four times 600 is about right for me.

1685 Some people might say three times 780/800. Others might say two times 1,500. I have been in some of those schools – only as a visitor, not as a teacher – and big schools, for me, are too big and I am talking about 1,500 or so. When I was teaching I liked to be able to know every single student in the school and 600 is about, for me, a comfortable number to deal with.

I am really still sitting on the hedge here. I really want to hear the responses from Deputy Bebb (**Deputy Gollop:** Me!) and from Deputy Sillars. No, not from Deputy Gollop! (*Laughter*)

1690 The two speeches today that really, sort of, I can associate with have come from my two colleagues in St Sampson's. I do sympathise with a lot of what Deputy Ogier said and I certainly can align myself with what Deputy Gillson has said.

So at the moment I am really listening to the summing up speeches before I pass my vote, but I am really minded to follow the two speeches of my two colleagues from St. Sampson's.

Thank you.

1695

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: There have been some excellent speeches. They are excellent because they have succeeded in getting me to change my mind and change it back again! (*Laughter*) And again! And even now I do not know which way I am going to vote.

1700 I agree with the Treasury Minister that the order in which we are doing things is patently bonkers. I would vote for an amendment that could be guaranteed to finally get shot of the 11-plus but I also think that the children – many of whom come from poorer backgrounds – should not have to tolerate the poor conditions any longer than absolutely necessary (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) when their peers at Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's have much better facilities.

For me, the discussion is not about £60 million, as there seems to be a cast iron case for the primary school to be rebuilt, it is about the secondary school and whether that could be better conceived as extensions to the other three schools.

1710 I think Deputy Gillson's comments on timescales merit further consideration and I am still none the wiser on which way I will vote.

The Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Duquemin.

Deputy Duquemin: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

1715 Sir, I attended the meeting at Les Beaucamps High School that was held last week, obviously as a Deputy but also as a new parent as of September.

1720 For me, that meeting was very interesting in the sense that we were talking largely about the closure of a school even before another school had opened and, in a way, it demonstrated for me the difficulties about this debate and the complexities of – as I think Deputy Kuttelwascher has said – the mess that we have got ourselves into, we would not want to be where we are now, and I would agree with that.

1725 One of the quotes from one of the parents on the evening was that often used phrase, 'You cannot put a price on education'. But of course people always say that you cannot put a price on health. The simple facts are that we need to. We have to put a price on everything we do as a Government. Education, health – just those two combined account for more than half of our States' spending and we cannot simply always think that we can sign a blank cheque.

1730 In many ways, I would also, I think – and Deputy Le Pelley has shone a light on the speech of Deputy Ogier and I would do likewise... For me, a common theme that I have explored, with both Members of T&R in discussion but also Members of Education in discussion with the Chief Officer, is that it is a question of head and heart.

It was interesting that not so long ago we were sat here talking about St Andrew's School and St Sampson's Infant Schools and it was certainly a case that Education back then were telling us to think with our heads and not our hearts and I cannot help but think that things have somewhat been reversed in this debate.

1735 One of the quotes that I have scribbled down was from Deputy Sherbourne where his phrase was, 'We need to be allowed to put the cart before the horse,' and that really did ring alarm bells with me. Yes, Deputy Sherbourne, yes, Deputy Sillars and all the other Members of the Education Department, I do trust you but when it is accepted that, in any way, we are putting the cart before the horse, I am concerned.

1740 I would also, for the reason of balancing things out, like to shine a light on that meeting at Les Beaucamps School where, for me, I think Education were a little bit naughty in... I know they were playing to a crowd that was very much on their side, but in a way the idea of moving from four to three was not T&R's initiation, albeit with their amendment; it was, and remains, in the original Propositions that are before us. And I think it was ever so slightly disingenuous to play to the crowd and to think that it could not happen. But having said that – and I know we should not talk about an amendment that has not been laid – I cannot and would not support the T&R amendment.

1750 But we start in November with our agreement in principle to rebuild La Mare de Carteret schools and in a sense, what I did back then, and many others... we gave an agreement in principle, subject to the independent review. Perhaps we were not giving a green light, we were giving an amber light to proceed with caution and, subject to the independent review, we would then make our decision.

1755 In a sense, rather than probably provide clarity, it has probably provided more confusion. Because I do take on board exactly what Deputy Sillars said – the Report is a Report – and I, for one, would not want to be swayed by perhaps the peripheral personal viewpoints of Dr Nicholls that I know that he gave to some Members at the briefing, because what is in print is important and whilst we may have discussed, I know, before the semantics of probably the phraseology, I am sure the mechanics remain the same.

1760 But what is in print can be looked at in lots and lots of different ways and standing here now, I, like Deputy Burford and others, have swayed one way or another. But I would probably... Deputy Perrot highlighted the words of our Chief Minister in saying that we do need courage. We need courage to make the right decision and I, at the moment, am coming down on the side of supporting Deputy Bebb's amendment because this is a sorry state, this is not reflecting well on the Government; I think we have been handed a baton from previous States which means that we are trying to right the mess but I cannot almost... two wrongs do not, certainly, make a right.

1765 One thing that I did say and I think I recounted the story at the Castel Douzaine on Saturday morning when we had our surgery, was that it is very... I do take on board the comments and the concerns of a lot of the parents, particularly from students that... parents that are from Les Beaucamps High School that is theoretically threatened with closure.

1770 But in many ways what we must remember here is that those people will be making a decision based on perhaps one child, perhaps two children, and I, as I say, will have a child at the school as of September.

1775 But I, as a politician today, have to make a decision not based on my daughter, but based on the 63,000 people that live in this Island and it is for that reason, having listened to what I think is an incredible debate and I think it is probably the best debate that we have had in this term of the States in terms of shaping people's votes... and I do take issue or I argue with Deputy Perrot's thinking. I do not think everyone has come in here having made their mind up, (**Severall Members:** Hear, hear.) I think people will have been swayed by the debate and that is what it is.

1780 So, having given the amber light back in November, do I have enough confidence, having read the independent review, to give it the green light? Sadly not and I do also take on board the comments of Deputy Gillson, that hopefully we can be in a position where we do not delay the possible opening, if it is the right thing to do – and there still remains an ‘if’.

Thank you, sir.

1785 **The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy James.

Deputy James: Thank you, sir.

1790 I will be brief in view of the time, sir. We have heard some very, very interesting and persuasive arguments in the debate. I am only sorry that I missed Deputy Bebb’s introduction to the amendment yesterday, but I am sure that he will send me a copy. *(Laughter)*

I think I can share views of Deputy Burford and others in having waived to a certain extent but I was fortunate, I also visited La Mare School and attended the presentation, and I do not think anybody in this Assembly can doubt the fact that that school either needs to be demolished as quickly as possible, rebuilt, whatever.

1795 However, in having said that, I am also very mindful of his Assembly being heavily criticised for reckless expenditure and I think that we have to be mindful that when this Assembly takes decisions to spend huge amounts of money, we need to be absolutely certain that it is, in fact, the right decision for the children of this Island.

1800 I cannot associate myself with Deputy O’Hara’s comments in his huge criticism of T&R, because I thank heavens for T&R that they at least have an oversight of the expenditure of this Island. I hope I do not live to regret that comment, as a Member of HSSD. *(Laughter)* I have no doubt it might just turn round and bite me at some future point.

1805 However, I do need to be absolutely assured that this is the right decision in terms of expenditure. I need to understand clearly and fully what schools are proposed to be built and what potential schools are to be closed. I desperately want to have a clear understanding from Education on its strategic direction concerning its future education.

So, yes, my mind has been made up and I willingly support this amendment.

1810 **The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak? No, well then it will be for the Minister... I suspect he will wish to exercise his right to speak immediately before Deputy Bebb replies.

Rather than start that now, I suggest we rise now and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.30 p.m.
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools’ Site – Post Review – Debate continued

1815 **The Bailiff:** Members, we continue the debate on the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb, seconded by Deputy Dorey, and the Minister for the Education Department, Deputy Sillars, will now speak.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, sir.

This may take a little while because I think it is important to go through all the responses to all the questions in these excellent speeches.

1820 I start off by saying thank you for all the support. There have been some excellent speeches. I do not really want to make it even longer than it is going to be but a big thank you to some very excellent speeches; and some of my partners' speeches were excellent as well. So thank you everyone for your support.

1825 I would like to thank Deputy Lester Queripel for giving us some excellent golden nuggets in his speech which was unnecessarily interrupted and stopped his flow. I would like to re-emphasise some of his key points.

The disruption to the schools and the students for major refurbishment during the school day, because it could not all be done in the holidays. That is a very valid point.

1830 The flat roof would certainly need to be replaced and that must be at a large cost. We could not do all this work this summer without breaking all the States' procurement rules, and even if we did we would have to pay an inflated cost, so how is this value for money?

In response to Deputy Laurie Queripel, you say that the school is in a very bad state. I, of course, agree. These schools are not designed for the education curriculum to be well delivered in today's world.

1835 I would like to say that we have spent more than £1.1 million since 2001 on the La Mare de Carteret High School. This amount has been reduced the closer we have come towards replacing the schools. We have carried out major structural work. For example, phased recladding of all exterior sides of the building, heating replacements etc as well as the regular maintenance and cosmetic works.

1840 With regard to the Chief Minister's comments – I will talk to his chair because he is not here – we all want to provide an exciting education for all our students. Your last amendment in November, we were told, would cause no delay if the Report supported the building of a 600-school. The Nicholls Report does just that.

1845 I would like to remind the States that it would have been this month that a spade went into the ground and if you vote for our Report a spade will go into the ground in exactly one year's time. If you vote for this amendment I cannot even guess when a spade will go near the ground. I was saddened and surprised to hear the Chief Minister advocating more delay.

1850 Just picking up some of those comments in the primary school, I would like to remind everyone that when we have bad weather the staff tell us – and they told all of us – they have to take the soft furnishings, books and other educational items home with them in the evening to dry them out. This is not acceptable, for both pupils and staff.

On my last visit to the primary school only last week, to try to reassure the teachers, in the main entrance of the foyer – for the primary school, I am talking about – there were 12 children being taught to read. I asked, 'Why are they sitting on the floor of the foyer?' and was told there was no other area for them – hardly a conducive environment for learning for our very young.

1855 We have a large number of so-called temporary buildings on the site already, so your suggestion was to have even more porta cabins? And for how long? The point is none of this repair work will change the size of the classrooms and will not make the schools fit for purpose for the modern education curriculum that these students deserve. Would we expect students and teachers to run in the rain between the classes? Are we going to put more heaters in the winter and air conditioning in the summer? You told us to be brave and vote for another delay. I do not see any courage in keeping the staff and students in the environment they are currently in.

1860 Responding to Deputy St Pier, the question in my mind is if the La Mare de Carteret was not the right project two and a half years... you were on the project board two and a half years ago and never raised these issues. Why on earth was it included in the Treasury & Resources July 2014 SCIP portfolio if this was the case? **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Up to July 2014, you had given Education in excess of £1.3 million with your officers still on the project board, knowing full well where we were going as Education and no sign of any concerns were shown. So now a total of £1.7 million has been spent on these designs – is that value for money?

1870 I have regular monthly meetings with the Treasury Minister and he has never during the course of these meetings raised the concerns we have heard yesterday afternoon. The Treasury Minister also seems to forget that it is acknowledged in the Nicholls Report that La Mare is critical in the future of education in the States whatever the outcome. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1875 Deputy St Pier seems to be of the view that schools normally operate at close to 100% capacity. In the business world, yes, I absolutely agree with him, that is right, but in education this is a different world. Schools are designed to typically operate at about 90% capacity.

The reason education would not commit to closing the school on the basis of building the La Mare de Carteret is quite simple; there has to be a consultation with our community. We live in a democracy and one of the core principles is good corporate governance.

1880 The Cambridge Project's view was dismissed by the profession over here as unworkable and undesirable. We then went into the next T&R review about the space standard in the three secondary schools, which is what we are still working to.

1885 The Treasury Minister is incorrect about what this money is for and it is disappointing that this line is so often perpetuated. It is not a £60 million-high school; it is a high school, a primary school, a pre-school, a communications and autism base, community facilities and sports facilities. He knows that full well. I would like to thank Deputy Gollop for reminding Members of this fact.

In terms of the quotation from correspondence in November 2013, once again it is a selective quotation. If he had continued with the letter it would have read:

'Notwithstanding this observation, the Education Board is of the view that there has been a strategic refresh which has been approved by the States of Deliberation in any event.'

1890 In July 2013 the States of Deliberation approved unanimously the States' Report. My Board is perturbed therefore that the clear evidence in its Capital Prioritisation submission to demonstrate that a strategy refresh has been a continuous process over the last 10 years has been ignored. We trust that these facts address the panel's concern and satisfy your request for a strategy refresh.

In the Treasury Minister's response, for the avoidance of doubt, the recommendation was:

'... the Education Department undertake a strategy refresh in order to ensure that your Department is satisfied that the proposals remain aligned to a strategic direction and is therefore able to make a compelling case to the Assembly.'

1895 I can respond now to say that the Education Department was satisfied and remains satisfied that it aligns with its own strategic direction. If we were simply slavishly following the original EDP1 plans we would, as we have heard several people say, still be building our third 720-school. We are not and we have not.

1900 Finally, in response to Deputy St Pier's comments, we are simply following all the recommendations from the Nicholls Report which, let's remind everybody, was the result of the Chief Minister and Deputy Minister's amendment back in November 2014, instructing T&R in consultation with Education to the review of the scale, scope and specification. This is the Nicholls Report.

1905 We at Education believe we are not deviating from what the Nicholls Report has recommended – build La Mare at 600 and review the estate – so why is it now that these three senior politicians are wanting further delay and ignoring the Report that they asked for?

I welcome Treasury's recognition for the need for a review of the processes which had been undertaken to progress the La Mare de Carteret project. However, there are two problems from my perspective.

1910 The States' Internal Audit team is not a Department, as set in Treasury's question and answer sheet, but actually located within Policy Council, which comprises, amongst others, Education and Treasury & Resources. If a review is to be perceived as being independent and of value then the review should be undertaken by the Scrutiny Committee or the Public Accounts Committee.

Secondly, any review should be extended not just to the La Mare de Carteret project but also all current SCIP projects in the relevant Departments.

1915 In terms of lessons learnt, I have always said that Treasury politicians should sit on project boards, which the Chief Minister agreed with in November when he said that Treasury should not have unilaterally withdrawn from the SCIP project boards.

Turning to Deputy Adam's comments, I would like to point out that the Education Development Plan was a programme of projects that was about the reorganisation of special secondary and post-16 education. Of course, the projects were scheduled one at a time; it would have been unmanageable and unaffordable to do it in any other way. I am glad he acknowledges that we need to plan for the future, because that is exactly what we are doing.

Again, Deputy Adams has mentioned this £50 million for tertiary development. We have heard this number on a number of occasions from T&R but I am not sure where it comes from as it is not part of the SCIP process. At the start of the Capital Prioritisation programme, yes, we in Education did ask for £22 million to move from Coutanchez to Les Ozouets and this was turned down. Their consultants told us at the time to go from three to one and moved Delancey and Coutanchez on to Les Ozouets site, and it was guessed at some £70 million. We declined to pursue this recommendation as we have neither the funds nor the capacity to do this in one go. We are talking to T&R for moving to Delancey to Les Ozouets with a figure of around £6 million, which I would hope Members will agree is a pragmatic solution.

Deputy Dorey alleged that we will build a school and simply hope that it will fit with the future... is a gross misrepresentation of Education Department's position. La Mare, as recognised by the Nicholls review, will be an integral part of the future of the secondary sector. The changes we have made to EDP1 reflect that we are changing and modifying the rebuild programme and not simply slavishly following an extant Resolution.

Why do we want to proceed? Is it about equality of opportunity for all our young people on the Island? By this we mean each and every individual student has the same academic opportunities across our Island. This is exactly what federation is achieving. It is about social justice and this is a value-for-money Proposition.

I believe I heard Deputy Dorey say with incredulity that the Beaucamps could become an 840-school. We all know that that is not possible for a range of reasons. One is that the school has not been designed to grow and the second is the restrictions of the site. I would like to remind Deputy Dorey I gave an update of the vision in the July States 2014, explaining where we were on various workstreams.

It was signposted then that we indicated the introduction of federation and that secondary education would follow. Deputy Dorey says that we want to have our cake and eat it regarding the uncertainty about a possible school closure. Our Proposition 3 ensures that our professionals, our staff, our students and the wider community play a key role in shaping the future structure of Education, that they are there at the outset of the design and that their concerns and expert opinions are taken into account when coming forward with our plans. In this way we can ensure that we manage these uncertainties in an open and transparent way with meaningful public consultation.

1955 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, point –

Deputy Sillars: Our federation model is giving us, in effect, all the benefits –

Deputy Dorey: A point of correction.

1960 When I said about Beaucamps I made it very clear that, just as they had acquired greenhouses, land and houses for other developments, you could do that in order to develop Beaucamps.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you, and of course all the extra money we would need to do that!

1965 Our federation model is giving us, in effect, all the benefits of a larger school while keeping the benefits of smaller ones.

Turning to my very good friend, Deputy Trott, who describes the Board as 'smashing chaps' – I quite like that. On the basis that we keep our friends close... (*Laughter*) I would like to keep our very good friends even closer! (*Laughter*) Unfortunately, Deputy Trott, is wrong on this occasion regarding the fees and his challenge to the cost-neutrality of our option. Gardiner and Theobald are cost consultants that confirm that design fees are fixed on this occasion.

Also my very good friend, Deputy Trott, said he would come back and show me where in the Nicholls Report that the rebuild of La Mare was conditional on school closure. Unsurprisingly, he has not come back to me on this because I do not believe it says that. To help him understand the Report, I will refer to the relevant points in the Nicholls Report later in my speech.

Deputy Fallaize, I can assure you that we will be striving to come back to the Assembly before this term. We want to go to consultation with a wider community and we want to have a meaningful consultation. To do that, we want to consult differently.

Yes, we will have a consultation document but we also have to focus on groups with parents, our young people and parents; and we want to use crowd sourcing to engage with our professionals in our schools and then we turn this around as quickly as possible to come back to the States, and we are committed to doing this.

In terms of Proposition 3, why was it included? Well, this was included as it was a recommendation from the panel and this was the stumbling block for Treasury in our negotiations. The Chief Minister tried to mediate a solution with the Education Department, and the Education Department was under immense pressure to include a Resolution to close a secondary school without consultation and detailed research. We had hoped that this Proposition would appease Treasury demands and still keep the Education Board's beliefs and integrity intact. It did not.

I would like to thank Deputy Sherbourne for outlining what we have achieved so far. I would just like to expand on the list of activities provided by Deputy Sherbourne by adding two other important work streams that we have addressed during this political term.

We have successfully implemented the roll out of GILE2 to refresh the IT provision in all our schools – a huge achievement to address the legacy issues we inherited. Many of you will be unaware that GILE2 was subject to a T&R review at, in effect, two minutes before midnight, as they did not think we were doing it properly. We should have seen a pattern.

I have to say we did succeed in that; it was a great rollout and it went very well, and the education of our children has rolled forward dramatically.

We have also been subjected to an independent inspection by Education Scotland based on the European framework for quality management, and that independent report will be published this summer. This was included in our vision and we are the first Department to adopt this approach as we seek to strive for continuous improvement in all we do.

I have to confess I am worried that even if the States support our policy letter at the end of this debate will they ever actually start to rebuild? If I heard correctly – the Treasury Minister saying Treasury & Resources will never approve the final business case, which will release funds for the investment. I hope I heard that incorrectly.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, point of correction. I did not say that we would never approve but I did question how we would... that it would be a challenge to consider the final business case knowing that Education was in the middle of conducting a review of secondary education and knowing that they were in the middle of preparing a report on rationalisation due to come to the States by March next year.

It is a challenge; I did not say we would not do it but just to acknowledge the ongoing work of the Education Department.

Deputy Sillars: Thank you for correcting me on that and the challenge, but at the end of the day I hope I heard him incorrectly and actually if this Assembly says that is the way forward, well, that is what the Assembly has chosen that we should do.

I would like to thank everyone who has spoken in support of the Education ...

2020 Deputy De Lisle is wrong! We are replacing like for like in our primary and secondary schools; we are not increasing capacity; our recommendations are simply in accordance with the Nicholls Report and the La Mare primary school is essential to the primary estate.

The States agreed to revisit the primary estate when moving to two and three-form entry. We are not making any decisions about the primary estate here and we were very clear that it needed to be looked at by one or two boards in the future – five to 10 years' time, we said.

2025 I believe I remember your comments after Deputy Brouard's amendment in November was to, 'Get on and build La Mare!' I would urge you to support us now.

Deputy Kuttelwascher – (*Laughter*) that well-known BOAC pilot – is wrong! The project assurance reviews and the outlined business case were all completed prior to the publication of the States' Report in October 2014.

2030 Deputy Kuttelwascher again seems to be ignoring the conclusions and recommendations of their latest review panel. Deputy Kuttelwascher simply does not understand federation and is misleading with PCRs. The federation does not cost the figures he is talking about and the federation means that we will be able to increase the current PCR – that is goes towards the 15:1.

2035 It is a shame that he has not made any effort to engage with the Education Department and headteachers to understand how federation works. The drivers for federation are to enhance educational outcomes, improve collaboration and generate efficiencies. I refute the allegations that one Department is challenging the process. We have done everything that has been asked of us.

2040 The £2 million he mentioned is linked to the 15:1 pupil/teacher ratio in our policy, but because we were not successful in delivering educational outcomes back in 2011 we had to focus on teaching and learning, and deviate from our policy. That was the right thing to do.

2045 Federation is exactly the way back to move towards our 15:1 pupil/teacher ratios, whilst ensuring access to the breadth of curriculum. If he had dropped in to see us he would understand the federation is reducing our expenditure in secondary as opposed to, as he claimed, increasing our costs. The Education Department proposals, if approved, will give the opportunity to consider further rationalisation. So I am at a loss as to why he does not actually support our amendment.

2050 Deputy Jean has highlighted that a review took place to review the look at the scope, size and specification of the review panel, generating a recommendation of eight further reviews. Education has done the reviews, as agreed by Treasury Department. They were required and addressed in our States' Report.

2055 Just as an interest, Deputy Langlois mentioned that there was more money to spend in Alderney – airports etc. Just as an interesting fact, Deputy Jean might like to know the cost of educating every single student in Alderney is £12,000 per student, per year. Compared to Guernsey's primary of £4,300 per student and our federated secondary schools is £7,200 per student.

Deputy Domaille – the panel subject 2 comments are covered in the Department's appendices in the States' Report.

2060 Deputy Trott refers to today's students being the taxpayers of the future. Yes, he is correct but he forgets that they will also become parents in the future with their own children. They will want their children to have access to the best possible education for their futures.

In 2012 – a date mentioned by Deputy Perrot – two of your Board Members were on the La Mare de Carteret project board. None of this was ever mentioned in our meetings, as I have said before. I can totally agree with you – a huge effort by both Departments had been put into this project at both political and staff level, both T&R and Education.

2065 I also fully agree with you, Deputy Perrot, regarding social media etc. My wife and children have all been verbally attacked in this term. Is it acceptable for Members to be? I do not know. But certainly not Members' families! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The difference regarding Les Beaucamps is that it was a totally separate building and brand new. The difference that Deputy Lester Queripel was saying... that it is a totally different

2070 environment when you are having major refurbishment completed when the students are in the same building. I would say to all Members that this is what you are asking these children and young people to be subjected to, in what is already agreed in buildings agreed by T&R's panel that are not fit for educational purposes.

2075 Deputy Langlois – you *have* seen change in 15-year-old plans. They have been changed and surely you recognise that. They have been updated and modernised as the years have gone by. The lengths of delay are totally unknown at this point. When we come back with recommendations, if this amendment goes through, who knows what they are and who knows if this Assembly will agree to them? What we do know is that everyone says that whatever recommendations we come back with, La Mare will be central to those proposals.

2080 In your well-intended amendment in November you and others assured us, as did other Deputies, that there would be no delay if the panel agreed to a 600-school, which of course at that time T&R and Education were disagreeing over the size. T&R recommended 480-pupil place and Education were recommending 600.

2085 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, point of correction.

T&R at that time were not recommending a 480-school; we were merely questioning whether the school could be smaller, given the population statistics and the forecast pupil numbers. We were not recommending 480, we were merely questioning 600 and that has been vindicated by the Nicholls Report.

2090

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I do not believe it has because the Nicholls Report says 'build of 600'. I accept totally that T&R were questioning whether 480 was a better size, which it would appear it is not – which is exactly what the panel recommended. This has already caused a one-year delay so far. So how many more years are acceptable?

2095 To remind you, we have already been through the States' Capital Prioritisation process and we agreed it. La Mare is part of it. Surely, Deputy Langlois, you are not recommending we go through all that again. We have had the review that you asked T&R to bring, and we have paid for it – and now we are going to ignore it? Value for money?

2100 Deputy Robert Jones – the Nicholls Report is the final report for us to consider. If this States' Report is approved... We have considered it and we are trying to implement it. Time is very important to the La Mare de Carteret project and the Nicholls Report says, 'the building of a 600-pupil school'.

2105 To Deputy Gillson and his question of timescales, in November last year we made it very clear that a decision was needed to achieve September 2017. T&R provided funding until the end of January, but then work stopped as funding was denied. At that point we stood the external project team down.

2110 We will now have to reassemble that team. The review did cause some delay, as did the further delay to this States' debate. These delays and the standing down of the team have meant we have not been able to continue with design for at least four months. We simply cannot make up that lost time. Everything has come to a stop, so with the go-ahead today, September '18 is the earliest we can open the first phase of the rebuild and September '19, to bring the project to fruition. This is still a very tight timetable, but achievable.

2115 Further delay to an unknown date... it is not possible to open the school in 2018 and it has to be at least 2019 and beyond. That is why we are saying build now, as we have the certainty for the students going through these schools at no extra cost.

2120 We have been told by T&R that there is no extra money. I accept that. T&R just told us we have to go through their process, which I understand and agree, but how long will it take until the school can even start to be maintained with additional investments? And bear in mind this is all wasted taxpayers' money, as we will be knocking it down in due course.

With respect to selection, which has no impact on the rebuild of La Mare, the Education Board is committed to a proper and meaningful consultation with parents, students, the profession and

the community; and we are going to do this together with crowd sourcing and focus groups so we provide a public service that meets the needs of our community.

2125 I do not wish to have a sterile debate about whether or not the 11-plus should be kept. I want a variety of options that could be instead of – *better* – for all of our students. This is surely the way to go and not just a repeat of a previous debate.

Deputy Fallaize: I thank Deputy Sillars for giving way.

2130 He has repeatedly said in his speech that he and his Members on Education are committed to a consultation. This is very admirable but it is not quite the same as committed to a States' debate, which is the only way that reform is going to be achieved.

2135 Is he saying that there is a cast iron commitment from the Education Department, in the event that its proposals are approved today, to come back to the States at or before the March 2016 States' meeting with a report which will contain recommendations allowing States' Members to vote on the issue of selection at 11?

Deputy Sillars: Yes. Is that good enough?

2140 **Deputy Trott:** Sir –

Deputy Sillars: Thank you.

Deputy Trott: Will you?

2145 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

Deputy Sillars: Oh, am I giving way to you as well, sir?

2150 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you. We are –

Deputy Sillars: Deputy – my favourite friend – Trott!

Deputy Trott: You are a smashing chap! (*Laughter*)

2155 **Deputy Sillars:** Just once, sir.

2160 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, may I ask the Minister of Education how this Assembly is to believe such a statement in the absence of a Resolution, bearing in mind that this Assembly was promised that debate during calendar year 2014?

Deputy Sillars: I am sure Deputy Trott has made promises that he absolutely, genuinely believed he could deliver in the huge amount of time – he must have been terribly young when he joined the States – in all that time. I am not going to go into any that he has not delivered on in that time.

2165 Deputy Heidi Soulsby, Deputy Peter Sherbourne and others have talked about trust. We as a Board are united – *absolutely united* – on this area – as we are on most areas, in reality; it just takes me a little while to get to where some of the others are, if I am honest on this one; it does take time – and we have gone through why and reasons why we were not able to deliver. Maybe we thought we would do more but, as I say, I think some very eloquent speeches have been made
2170 of all the areas that we have had to deal with: Michael Gove's area coming in; we could not let that go because otherwise we would not have any examinations in this Island; we had to consult on all of that; FTP – there is a whole range of things.

2175 I do not want to repeat it all but I have just said to Deputy Fallaize that, 'Yes, so either you trust us or you do not.' I cannot do more than that. 'We want the public and Deputies' – yes, join us – 'to help co-design and create the new model.' We will do this as fast as we can but of course it must include the 11-plus, the funding of the Colleges and the secondary review. But La Mare is still at the centre of it as no proposal we can come up with excludes it.

2180 We will do our very best to bring this comprehensive report back to the States, but no later than March 2016 and before if it is possible. The whole Education Board will do their very best, with our officers, to do this as early as possible.

2185 Deputy Duquemin – the primary debate was all about educational outcomes and the benefit our pupils would have from a two- and three-form entry school. We have stuck to the facts. My opening speech was based on 10 facts. These covered value for money, educational outcomes and the equality of opportunity, to name just three. It is the right thing to do.

2190 In terms of your comments regarding the meeting at Les Beaucamps, we were invited to do that meeting. Deputy St Pier also attended that meeting and we ensured that he was able to reply to questions raised by the parents. We were invited by the parents but we also made sure that Deputy St Pier was able to partake in that. Deputy Conder and I certainly did not feel we were playing to an audience. I also refer you to my earlier comments why Proposition 3 was introduced in our States' Report.

2195 Finally, Deputy Jones' comments about reckless spending by this Government. I would just like to point out that Education has saved £6.5 million annually reoccurring general revenue expenditure as part of the FTP and we are working on future savings through an example of the federation, whilst at the same time improving our educational outcomes for all our students.

It would be reckless spending if this amendment is successful and we continue to incur cost simply to refurbish, superficially, the La Mare de Carteret school when we are going to demolish it. We take the use of public funds extremely seriously, as I am sure all Departments do. Our financial commitments to FTP have taken priority as this was a corporate objective.

2200 Onto my speech, I would urge Members to reject Deputy Bebb's amendment. It is, in effect, a sursis on the current project, with an indefinite delay on the proposed redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret site, which colleagues will recall have been approved in principle by this Assembly back in December last year. How much more delay is acceptable to this Assembly? Even if we accept our States' Report today it would still be May 2016 before a spade goes into the ground.

2205 Treasury's review panel has confirmed that a 600-place high school is required now and should proceed. The review panel also confirm that it is selection-neutral and La Mare de Carteret High School, at a minimum of 600 places, will have a key role to play in secondary education, whatever the future structure of secondary education.

2210 The Education Department has already committed to reviewing the current selection process for admission to secondary education. Work is ongoing in preparation for a wide range of meaningful consultation with our young people, teaching professionals, parents and the wider community, on selection, the future levels of grant aid to the colleges and the optimal use of the educational estate.

2215 This will start as soon as possible and, as I have previously stated, this Board is determined to bring this back to you as soon as we can, but no later than March, as we have said in our States' Report.

None of this, however, will affect the need for a 600-place high school at La Mare. You must trust us to deliver on this. We have committed to a wide-ranging review of our secondary structure. We have said we will deliver that to you before the end of this political term.

2220 Deputy Bebb, we would most welcome you and your involvement in the consultation and co-design of this future structure, and involvement of all other Deputies throughout that process. In fact, I would encourage you all to take part.

Please let us get on with this, but do not make the mistake of thinking that the rebuild of La Mare must wait until this has been resolved. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It does not need to!

2225 As an example, we have heard today some Deputies state that two large 11-18 schools will deliver better educational outcomes for our students. We also heard from a lot of educational experts that smaller schools are better. Surely, that is one of the points for us to gather evidence on and go out to consultation on, taking into account all the different views being expressed.

2230 The second Resolution is fundamentally flawed in a number of ways. Firstly, Deputy Bebb fails to understand the problems teachers face on a day-to-day basis at both La Mare schools. The States could spend significant sums – maybe up to £1 million per annum, who knows – on addressing the fabric and condition of the buildings; we make it a better environment for teaching and learning. However, as one teacher from the high school said at the parents' meeting last Wednesday, how many plasters can you put on a wound?

2235 None of this investment would actually transform the teaching environment to create a modern classroom similar to those in which these pupils and students' peers benefit in our other schools. Such an approach does not address the equality of opportunity which is central to the Department's vision, which was unanimously approved in this Assembly in 2013.

2240 Secondly, there is a limited amount of time during the academic year when refurbishments can be completed, as highlighted by Deputy Lester Queripel in his speech. The buildings are in operation for 38 weeks of the year, with only a reasonably long period of six weeks in the summer holidays when major disruptive work can be completed. This gives a limited window of opportunity for contractors to make the necessary superficial repairs without turning the school into a building site for the duration of a school term and working day.

2245 The amount of repair work that is necessary, as I have said, just cannot be done in a six-week window and will have to continue around the students working and studying in the building that is being repaired.

2250 How can this be done with asbestos in the building and the children and staff still working there? Can you imagine the disruption this would cause to the teaching and learning environment for all our children and young people at those schools?

2255 So I agree with Deputy Queripel – it is about the timings, it is about the quality of the repairs and, indeed, is La Mare even repairable? The roof is a good example.

2260 Thirdly, how much money are we going to waste in the next few years on refurbishing a building that is already well past its expected asset life and is scheduled for demolition and replacement in the imminent future? Let's say £1 million a year for the next, what, four, five years? We do not know. Is this really a value-for-money Proposition? As the school will be rebuilt it is certainly wasted money. We can just about keep the schools limping along within our budget if we can start the building now.

2265 The Education Board will not really be looking forward to the experience of being directed to liaise with T&R to ensure that future annual budget reports recommend sufficient funding to ensure that La Mare de Carteret schools are adequately maintained until such time as the rebuild work can commence.

2270 We all know what this means in practice. We have been told there is no new money. I am not getting at T&R, but there is no new money. So, for example, Treasury did not support the re-roofing of the Grammar School and sixth form centre back in the July 2014 SCIP pipeline. So we are having to fund this essential work through our routine capital expenditure, spread over a number of years, clouding out other essential work.

2275 A large proportion of our limited budget will be focussed on two La Mare de Carteret schools which we are going to knock down in a few years. Remember, there will be less to spend on the rest of our £500 million-estate. I fully respect that T&R are doing their job.

2280 In summary, we are already working on Resolution 1; the Resolution is not sensible for, not least, four grounds which I have just mentioned. Colleagues, this amendment simply delays this essential project which many of you were keen to progress only last year. The T&R review confirms building the 600-pupil school – *now*. As the school is designed to extend it to 960, if the States so wish, after consultation and evidence-gathering there is no incremental cost.

2275 Many of you have said you need to be assured that what we are proposing is the right decision. I would ask you to consider: is it the right decision to spend what will amount to millions of pounds patching up a building nearly 20 years beyond its design life? These will be millions of pounds that we will not be able to spend on maintaining other schools, or even go to help other Departments.

2280 Is it the right decision to stop all work on the redevelopment of the La Mare schools? Because this is what will happen if this amendment goes through today. We have already stood our design team down and any longer delay we will lose that expertise and lose the professionals we have been working with over the last two and a half years to get to where we are now.

2285 Remember, we still have a lot of work to do to finalise the plans, submit a detailed planning application, go out to tender, appoint a contractor, do further value engineering to drive the price down as far as we can and complete our final business case.

2290 Even with a fair wind and continuing with our current programme, as I have said before, work will not start until May next year. If we wait until the outcome of our proposed review of the structure of secondary education – a structure that all agree requires a 600-pupil school at La Mare – then you can be sure that we will not be able to open our new schools in 2018. We will not even be able to open them in 2019; we will be looking at 2020 and even later. Are you prepared to sanction that further delay?

2295 Most of you told us in November that further delay was not acceptable. Some of you have questioned the cost and whether we can afford these new schools in our current financial climate. I fully agree with Deputy Brehaut that what we are proposing is an investment, not just in new building but in our community – an investment that will pay dividends long into the future; an investment in our young people who will be voters and taxpayers of the future; an investment in the children currently in our primary schools who will need sufficient spaces in which to be educated in 10, 15, 20 years' time, regardless of whether the 11-plus has been consigned to history or not; (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) an investment in our vulnerable children with communication and autism difficulties; an opportunity to provide pre-school facilities in an area which really needs it; an investment in our teachers and a boost to our construction industry – and boy do they need it!

2305 If you vote for this amendment today this investment will be lost or at least kicked into the long political grass, and for what? We take our responsibilities to provide value for money in the delivery of our education services extremely seriously, but we must balance that responsibility with our drive to raise educational standards, as it is only by doing this that we set our community up to compete on a world stage, to provide skilled workers to further grow our economy.

2310 Deputies, I ask you: are you happy to avoid making another very important decision today, instead of taking an easier option of delay? I believe this States is already known for not making important decisions (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and we are in danger of leaving these to another group of Deputies who will be sitting here in a years' time.

2315 Let's start making decisions now. Let's start the Education States' Report. I urge you to reject this amendment. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

2320 I have heard it said in this debate – and I believe it was from Deputy Perrot – that we should play the ball and not the man, and I would generally fully agree but I think I should start my speech, since I have never been particularly good at cricket, by playing the man.

I believe that this debate has gone to the extent that it is on these Propositions with the full support of this Assembly because there is great faith from this Assembly in the current Education Department Members. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Of that, there is no question.

2325 A lesser Department would not have survived the criticism and still have the support of this Assembly; and for such a Department to have these proposals is testament to how they are, in general, on the right path.

But now to play the ball: they are wrong! Wrong! Wrong! Wrong! If they were right there would be no debate. If the Report was such a ringing endorsement of their proposals we would not have spent over a day debating whether it was right.

2330 Even a cursory glance at the Report brings out question after question. Members have repeatedly said this is not just a school. Even the strongest part of this proposal, which is the primary school, has questions about whether it is the right size and that is the strongest case there is.

2335 But when we look at the other parts we see recommendation:

'We recommend a review of the proposed location of the nursery... We recommend a review of the design and layout of the Autism and Communication Unit to ensure it fully meets the service users' requirements.'

Staggering that we are actually talking about the possibility of building something where there is no guarantee that it actually supplies the requirements. Yet I hear people still saying they want to build this.

'We recommend a review of the design and location of the community facilities following clarification from HSSD of their scope and purpose.'

We are talking about putting money in without even knowing what the purpose is.

2340 Deputy Brehaut made a very impassionate speech as to the needs to invest in this area because we know that it is an area of our Island that is currently suffering from economic issues. We know the issues in that area. We know that it is – I forget the term that the Education Department use; I think it is – a 'priority area'. We know this, but to imagine that we can, in Guernsey, invest in one location with the intention that the economic benefit would be confined to that area is fallacy.

2345 If we look at a country like the UK and we say that we are going to spend massive amounts of money in Bristol, it will have a benefit, economically, for the whole southwest region. But to say that if we invest in an area – a tiny area – of an Island, 25 square miles, and to imagine that that economic benefit remains in that location, is false. We cannot imagine that Keynesian economics work in that way.

2350

Deputy Sillars: Sorry, point of correction, sir. What I said was –

Deputy Bebb: No, I am sorry, I was referring to what –

2355

Deputy Sillars: It is a point of correction.

Deputy Bebb: – Deputy Brehaut was referring to. (**Deputy Sillars:** Okay.) Thank you.

2360 Even then – and I would be fully supportive of investment in that area if I knew what we were doing, but the review itself refers to questioning whether this is right. The scope and purpose... We do not even know what the purpose of it is.

The overall size of the La Mare de Carteret development and the way the areas have been calculated should be reviewed. The current design appears oversized for the high school that may be restricted elsewhere. Indeed, at one point it says:

'We understand and support the underlying principle behind the La Mare de Carteret proposals, which is that of "equality of education opportunity". We are concerned, though, that in terms of the La Mare de Carteret project "equality" has been interpreted as "same as" in terms of the buildings to be provided.'

2365 **Deputy Sillars:** Sir, a technical correction. They were corrected... that that was an error and I have said several times it is the equality of all our children across the whole Island. We have not replicated a Beaucamps at La Mare.

2370 **Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry but Deputy Sillars cannot have it both ways. He has argued in debate repeatedly that the Report in front of us is the Report in front of us. I am quoting the Report.

We cannot – as Deputy Gollop has told us before – have our bun and eat it. The Report in front of me says that, ‘... “equality” has been interpreted as “same as” in terms of the buildings to be provided’.

2375 There are questions asked in relation to whether this is the right build for the secondary education. There are questions asked – not many, but there are some questions asked – as to the primary. There are questions asked in relation to the nursery provision. There is a question asked about the sports facilities – whether they should be, indeed, referred to the Culture & Leisure Department. Though I do not see them jumping up and down in order to take this over. There are questions asked as to whether it would meet HSSD’s requirement.

2380 But the most staggering question:

‘We question the wisdom of building a secondary school for less than 600 pupils and do not recommend this option although it would reduce the number of surplus spaces in the system.’

Then one thing which I found staggering:

‘The La Mare de Carteret site probably provides the best flexibility to meet the future changes.’

But the Report itself then, at another point, questions whether this build, this model, would facilitate the Education Department’s own vision; and here we are, still with a possibility of spending this money.

2385 When it comes to the buildings no-one denies – and I think that it is fairly evident from my amendment – that there is a recognition of the need to spend money on the buildings.

2390 Deputy Queripel raises some very pertinent questions as to the quality of any maintenance. Just as we have faith in the Members of the Education Department to do most of their work, I think that we should have the appropriate faith in them to come up with the right amount of investment in order to maintain these buildings *and* – I mean I do have faith in them – to provide the appropriate level of care for the children in our schools. Of that I have no doubt. I am convinced that these people will have the right amount of care.

2395 There were some points raised in relation to the order of debating matters. Deputy Conder, in particular, asked in relation to the priorities of the vision stating that the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret would happen before rationalisation or any debate on secondary education.

That is arguably how it was put forward, although I think that the point was made in debate that of course the vision states that they will input the La Mare de Carteret into the SCIP process. It does not say it would rebuild the La Mare de Carteret. However, just as with many things in this debate, we need to look at the sequence of events.

2400 After that vision statement we had the SCIP report and at that point in time we were made aware that we are £30 million adrift in our capital investment. Since then I have been advised that this is £36 million; it is not exactly going in the right direction. £36 million is 20% larger than our FTP target.

2405 If we are honestly to deal with our financial position then we have to be serious about this investment. We need to ensure that we have the right value for money. Indeed, I would go so far as to quote:

‘The positive parts of our economy are the absence of public debts and, very significantly, the success and the potential for the future success of the Financial Transformation Programme.’

These two characteristics of our economy – lack of debt and FTP – are the shields by which this Island can attempt to protect itself when the full impact of the financial tsunami, which is waiting to impact on western economies, is felt.

2410 I do not believe we have come to terms with it. Nor have we attempted to convey these facts with sufficient urgency to our fellow Islanders. Consequently, every attempt to cut or curb spending or generate efficiencies is met with howls of public protest, special interest lobbying and resistance to even the most sensible, modest and beneficial proposals.

2415 Sir, this Government was not elected to be popular. Governments worthy of historic references take the tough decisions for the wellbeing of those who elected them to be their representatives and, equally importantly, for the wellbeing of those who come after them.

2420 I believe this vote is a moment in the sand for this Government. Either we show that we are prepared to take the tough, unpopular decisions or, as last time, we take the easy route and leave it to someone else to address the issues of the cost of Government, the continued financial deficit and the need to restructure the delivery of public services. We need to send out the message that we will stand by the mandate that the electorate so clearly delivered in 2012 – that is: we will get this Island's public finances in order. I could not agree more with my friend, Deputy Conder.

2425 It is staggering that, having made that statement and knowing where we are, we now question whether we should actually invest. We know the difficulties. We have what is apparently called a 'balanced Budget' but we all know that the financial outcomes are not going to be particularly balanced. It is not going to come in budget.

2430 We know the difficulties and we know that, of course, that will create an even more difficult position in our capital, yet here we are talking of investing in a scheme where there are very real questions asked. Even those who would propose it hold the Report as being vindication of their position, whereas all I see is question after question after question.

2435 There has been a lot of focus as to which buildings we should build and whether we should build that and whether we should build more, and there is a need for La Mare de Carteret. There are certain orthodoxies bounded about repeatedly in debate and they accept it as such, but the last time I looked we are the Government of this Island and, as the Government, we have choices.

2440 I hear repeatedly, in relation to Beaucamps, that we cannot build more on Beaucamps. The building is surrounded by fields and I know that we may not be particularly pleased with the idea of compulsory purchase or any other measure, but we have not even tested it, to my knowledge. So let's not pretend that it is possible. Of course it is possible. What is the cost, what is the probability? – is something that I am willing to have a debate on, but I am not willing to have a statement of 'We can't build more at Beaucamps.' We can. It is actually a measure of the stomach of this Assembly to make difficult decisions.

2445 We have also heard – and I believe that the point was made by Deputy Harwood – in relation to the Grammar, that by policy it does not currently receive all of the spaces available there. I understand that policy. Having heard that and being staggered and thinking, 'Well, why don't we fill it by policy?' which would have been cheaper, I have since had a conversation as to the reasons behind not filling the Grammar. They go along the lines that if you take off even more pupils – the best pupils that have passed the 11-plus – then it makes the secondary schools even more –

2450 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Sir, just a correction. I do not think the word 'best pupils' was particularly well chosen.

2455 **Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry that I might have used a word that Deputy Brouard does not agree with. It would seem that we cannot use the word 'decant' either.

The truth is that if we are to have an open debate on this we need to talk about those pupils who have passed the 11-plus that currently go to Grammar and those who did not who were within the margin of error. We are talking of taking more of those pupils through to the Grammar

2460 and, therefore, it would be more difficult within secondary education. That is how it was described
to me by other Deputies. If we do not like that language I am happy for someone else to describe
it in another way, but the truth is that of course there is one policy decision that would be
equitable for filling all of the spaces at the Grammar and that is to stop selection at 11. (**Two**
Members: Hear, hear.)

2465 Here is where we really get to the point of the amendment. Deputy Sillars promised that there
would be a report here by March. I am saying that by this amendment we have the opportunity to
hold their feet to the fire and this is what it feels like. It does not necessarily feel pleasant. If we are
to hold this Department to that promise, my firm belief is that if we choose today to put the
money and rebuild La Mare I do not believe that report would be here in time. But I do believe
2470 that those Members of the Education Department are sufficiently, emotionally invested in a
rebuild in the future of education that if we ask for this review first we will definitely have it this
term.

The questions that have been asked as to the timescales for this report to come back are fair.
Obviously it would be for the Education Department to determine exactly when they would get
back, but I know that the Policy Council would be more than content to expedite a speedy Billet in
2475 order to debate this.

I know that every effort would be made to have a debate as soon as possible, but to give a
measure of what is also being done at this point in time, on Monday a consultation will be going
out in relation to Union Civile; in Scotland when they had their consultation on gay marriage the
responses to that consultation were greater than the responses to the independence debate.

2480 We are embarking on that consultation here in Guernsey on Monday and yet, despite what we
know will be a huge response, despite what we know will be a very controversial issue, we are
committed to bringing that policy letter to this Assembly in this term. If we can undertake what
may well be the largest social policy change this term and we can do it now, then I have to ask:
what is the issue for the Education Department? It is possible. It is a question of whether there is
2485 determination to do so.

Deputy Sillars: Sir, can I have a point of correction?

I do not really understand how Deputy Bebb, in his excellent speech, can say that when we
bring this report back to the States in this term, this Assembly will agree or come up with a
2490 finance solution that will allow La Mare to be built forward. Our history is not in favour. It does not
reflect that. So it is even more delay for the students at La Mare, as we have all said. (**Several**
Members: Hear, hear.)

It is not possible to guarantee a decision from this States before March, no matter what it is we
come back with.

2495 **Deputy Bebb:** Deputy Sillars makes a good point and that is exactly the problem. Deputy
Sillars has just said himself that of course there is the very real question as to what this Assembly
would choose, and yet, still based on that, Deputy Sillars wants to invest £60 million.

2500 **Deputy Sillars:** Sorry, referring to La Mare, no matter what it is – I have said it several times; I
do not know how many more times I need to say it – it will always be at the heart of whatever it is
we come up with.

I am asking: how can you assure this Assembly that we will agree with whatever it is we bring
back and it will be passed through as policy and therefore La Mare can be rebuilt? You cannot do
2505 that, surely.

Deputy Bebb: Deputy Sillars knows that I can give no guarantee, just as Deputy Sillars can give
no guarantee. The only thing that is within the gift at the moment is for Deputy Sillars to return
with that report.

2510 All I am saying is that it is appropriate for us to decide: what do we want as a secondary
education before we go and build the infrastructure? Because I will say this now, if we build La
Mare de Carteret, I can hear the argument now, and I have great sympathy for it: we have built the
infrastructure to deliver the education system that we have got today and, therefore, we should
continue with that education system; we will have engrained this educational system (**A Member:**
2515 Hear, hear.) for the next 15 years! And I honestly believe that that will be the case.

I will give way to Deputy Conder.

The Bailiff: Deputy Conder.

2520 **Deputy Conder:** Thank you, Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb has called in aid the Nicholls Report a number of times. Would he agree that
paragraph 526 says that a 600-capacity school, as highlighted above, does create some surplus
capacity in the system, both now and in the longer term?

2525 It does, however, ensure there is a long-term flexibility to cope with changes in policies on
selection and migration, and the La Mare de Carteret site also offers opportunity in the longer
term to increase the size of the school to changes and policies, resulting in the need for additional
capacity. It should be designed, therefore, with the capacity to do this.

2530 **Deputy Bebb:** In equal measure, Deputy Conder, I am sure, would agree with the part of the
Report that says:

'Whilst recognising that it may be prudent to retain a level of flexibility in terms of overall capacity, we do not believe,
on the evidence of the current population forecasts, that there is an absolutely clear case for creating a total capacity
of 2,580 secondary places, which a rebuild of 600 places in La Mare de Carteret would create.'

So actually the Report itself calls into question that very statement.

2535 There is no getting away from the fact that the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret Secondary
School is questionable at best. The only thing that we can agree on is that we do not think that
the current one should continue anymore, but we do not have any agreement as to what the
alternative should be, and that has always been my assertion – the great uncertainty that there is
in this Assembly as to what on earth we are going to do.

Deputy Fallaize, in his speech, raised the question as to how on earth people can be undecided
on the 11-plus and I have to say – and I will try to explain how I came from being in a position of
being undecided to now being in the position that is not undecided.

2540 Both my parents taught at a secondary modern school in north Wales and when I came to
Guernsey, having never been through the education system here, obviously I assumed – naively,
now as it turns out – that the educational system here of the 11-plus was going to be delivered on
the same models that my parents taught.

2545 The basis of the 11-plus, which is a UK educational system that was adopted here, is that you
sit an exam at 11 and those pupils that are selected to go to the Grammar were taught one
curriculum – an academic curriculum – and those pupils who went to the secondary schools were
taught a vocational curriculum. I see the logic. I see the perfect logic in it.

2550 We do not in Guernsey and I had no idea of this until Deputy Fallaize told me a couple of days
ago. We put the children through an 11-plus system to separate them into different schools, to
give what many – whether it is true or not – assure me is a sense of whether they have failed or
succeeded at the age of 11, to teach them the same curriculum!

2555 That, to me, sounds like madness but at the same time Deputy Fallaize should extend the
courtesy to those Members who are not fully aware of how the system is implemented here in
Guernsey, to state clearly, 'I am undecided'. But that policy letter, which will occur – my assertion is
that will occur if this amendment is passed... those details which I personally believe to be folly
will come out and I believe that those 18 Members who are currently undecided will soon come to
a conclusion.

2560 I do not think that it is fair to have a go at those who are undecided, but I think that it is fair for us to say that a policy letter is exactly what I am asking for and at that point in time there will be very few undecided.

I have the courage to state that I cannot possibly in any way support the continuation of the current arrangements. I believe them to be wrong, but I do not think that I should bring an amendment saying on the back of this project we should abandon the 11-plus.

2565 It is only right that we have the debate. I will have the courage of my convictions in that debate to vote appropriately. I would expect others too. I have heard from Deputy Trott in this debate that he definitely has the courage of his conviction to have that debate. I will not ask: are those people who want to see the 11-plus abolished... do they also have the courage of their convictions? Because the truth is that is all I am asking for – is that debate and that debate before we commit to what is a questionable investment of £60 million.

2570 Deputy Sillars talked, in his closing speech, as to the increased cost of maintenance of La Mare de Carteret. Deputy Sillars, in the same speech, went on to confirm the excellent achievements of the Education Department in the Financial Transformation Programme and how much money they have saved this term.

2575 I therefore find it difficult to understand why he would therefore support the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, which has been stated to be an uneconomic model for the delivery of secondary education. The savings that have been made are seemingly to be created as inefficiencies on the basis of a build that we do not know the real benefits of.

2580 We could well be hampering the Education Department with an uneconomic model of the delivery of education, undoing those very difficult and hard-won benefits that Deputy Sillars himself talked of in his closing speech. I cannot see the logic.

Deputy Conder made reference to the possibility that if we do not invest in the La Mare de Carteret then it would be a bad cheque. I find that statement ironic because of course what we have is a bad cheque to the tune of £30 million and I have to ask what promise... what basis of a bad cheque when we know the finances are not fully there?

2585 We must ensure on a project that is the largest capital project in this programme, we have to ensure value for money and all I am stating is that there are real questions and as a result I am saying clearly let's discuss our secondary education.

2590 One of the things I heard is this so-called promise. I alluded to it in my opening speech and the promise was made back in 2001. I believe it was made in March 2001. Here is the strange thing: the Education Committee at the time did not support the amendment that went through and yet what I hear today is support from certain Members that we should keep to that late base amendment stating that not to rebuild the La Mare de Carteret is to kick your shoes into the long grass.

2595 I would contend that we are in the long grass. We are firmly in the long grass deciding what on earth we are going to do with our secondary education. We have long prevaricated – 14 years, since that debate – and the issue has raged tirelessly since then.

2600 If we build La Mare, if we as Members put the money into the La Mare de Carteret today I can tell you that the issue of the 11-plus is well and truly in the long grass for at least another 14 years. It is uncomfortable but one has to question what is the priority. For me, it is that debate as to the future of secondary education.

2605 Deputy Brouard and a few others have actually questioned the amendment itself. Well, I find that strange because when one looks at it plainly, the second Proposition is identical to the T&R Proposition. The first Proposition is merely asking for what was promised from the Education Department and therefore I would suggest that this amendment is simply a promise from the Education Department and a promise from the T&R Department – the two Departments involved. I ask nothing more than for them to fulfil their promises – something which I would expect all of us to be holding those two Departments, on a regular basis, to do.

2610 The first Proposition asks for nothing more than what the Education Department has promised and the second Proposition asks for nothing more than what the T&R Department has promised. It is not that inconsiderate; it is indeed very considered.

2615 The other thing in relation to the promise, having been made in March 2001, based on an amendment we seem to have had since then various Education Departments that have followed that Resolution with what I would call the zeal of a convert. They have followed it slavishly without stopping to consider whether it was right in the first place and here we are today, and I ask that question: do you want to go on a promise in 2001 – a promise that was made before the Twin Towers fell, before the dodgy dossier of Tony Blair, before we had the Harwood Report, before we had this system of Government; a promise delivered in a time before Zero-10, before the FTP?

2620 **Deputy Harwood:** A point of clarification, if I may, sir. I think the Harwood Report pre-dated the 2001 debate. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Harwood. (*Laughter*)

2625 **Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry. The implementation of the Harwood Report – given that it was still the Education Committee and the A and F.

It is before this structure of Government and it is quite possible that we are fulfilling that promise into another structure of Government (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) if you support the Education proposals and amend it. Is that sensible, good governance? Is that questioning the right decisions in the right order?

2630 The change in world events has obviously been seismic since then. I would counter that the change in education, which Deputy Inglis alluded to in his speech, that happens yearly... the change in education since then has also been seismic. Surely it is time we reviewed that decision and no better time to review it than when we are actually on the verge of spending and committing to a very large amount of money.

2635 I have great sympathy for Deputy Soulsby and her speech. I know how hard Deputy Soulsby fought in the campaign to keep St Andrew's School open and I believe that there were quite a few very well made points in her speech, but she came to a conclusion which... I would come to a different one.

2640 Part of what she requested was a review. Part of what many of you have said is required is a review. What my amendment asks for is a review. Do we actually think that it is inappropriate for those headteachers who have asked for a review before we make these decisions? Do we think that it is inappropriate for all those teachers? All those e-mails that we have had from all those parents and children have said that we should have the evidence and the information before we commit.

2645 I am asking for exactly that evidence and that is what the review of secondary education would give us. But instead of that, I see Members actually willing to invest –

Deputy Sherbourne: Another point of correction, sir.

2650 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

Deputy Sherbourne: To my knowledge, the several hundred e-mails I received, that I replied to, made no mention at all about the review. They were purely heartfelt appeals to us to make the right decision this afternoon.

2655 **Deputy Bebb:** Sorry, Deputy Sherbourne is incorrect because they say that we should not make the decisions without the evidence. How on earth does he believe that the evidence appears without the review? I fail to understand that.

2660 They have asked for us to make the decisions based on evidence. I keep reading that in every single... and, believe me, I have responded to virtually every single one of them. I am responding to the e-mails I have received. I am surprised that other Members have not and I am not giving way so if Members would –

Deputy Sillars: It is a point of correction, sir.

2665

Deputy Bebb: A point of correction!

Deputy Sillars: The point of correction is that the e-mails we got were referring to 'four to three' and 'evidence'; they were not talking about this review and not talking about La Mare!

2670

Thank you. (**Severall Members:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy Bebb: The evidence in relation to exactly what is being asked for! The Education Department themselves have agreed that there needs to be a review based on evidence. That is exactly what I am asking for. I do not understand. Any decision to go from four to three should be based on evidence. Any decisions that we make... and what I can tell you is that any decision to rebuild should be based on evidence. We should not be continuing with four without actually having evidence.

2675

The repeated calls have been for an evidence-based decision. There is no evidence here. All I see are questions.

2680

The report that I am asking for... the other thing from Deputy Sherbourne that I heard in his speech... and I thought it was well made in terms of all the data is available through the OECD and through other forms of information. We know from the Education Department – both political Members and I spoke yesterday to the Chief Officer – that the review of secondary education has started. We know this. We know that it is possible, if they are given the right impetus, that this report would be back with us in this term. All I am asking is that we ensure that that report comes back.

2685

The accusation in relation to –
I will give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

2690

The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq): Thank you.

I did not really want to interrupt you but I think it might help the Assembly just on the point with regard to evidence – and this came about particularly during the time in which I was trying to help mediate between the two Departments – and that is – and I think the Minister for Education said this several times and Deputy Bebb made this point as well – that any move from four secondary schools to three schools needs to be done with appropriate evidence; that needs to take place.

2695

The Minister for Education has alluded to the fact that when that takes place, whatever that looks like, from his point of view and presumably from his Board's point of view that will always entail a rebuild of the secondary school at La Mare. The Minister for Education has said that several times.

2700

I am actually of the same opinion, but I am doing this based on my opinion and it is largely based on my heart. We have not got evidence as to whether that school needs to be there, if there is a move from four to three, and that is what we need to have.

2705

So I would just point that out for those Members of the Assembly perhaps who are a little confused with this call of evidence. That is exactly what we need to have and why we cannot proceed as it is at the moment with the way in which the Propositions currently read.

2710

Deputy Sillars: Sir, I am not quite sure how I do this. It is a point of correction of an interruption. I am not quite sure how I do this, but the point I would like to make is that in November we brought the evidence and we brought the proof all the way to this Assembly and

this Assembly agreed it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) To start turning around now and saying, 'We have not seen the evidence, we have not got the facts,' when we have got the Nicholls Report in front of us and all the evidence elsewhere, is incorrect. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2715 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

Deputy Bebb: The evidence in relation to our future secondary education is not before us and that is why the question that is not before us is: what is the future of the secondary education in Guernsey?

2720 I have suggested time and again that what we need to do is decide on our model of secondary education which will, obviously, as stated by the Members of the Education Department, include tertiary education. We need to decide on that before we decide on the infrastructure that supports it. And I have heard nothing to refute that logic.

I want to finish with a quote from another good friend.

'Guernsey has missed constant opportunities over the last three decades to rationalise and radicalise our education provision, not just at primary level but at secondary and tertiary level.'

2725 Deputy Sherbourne is completely correct. This is the opportunity in order to ensure that that debate is had. If we do not support this amendment I fear that that debate will not happen this term and my contention is such that the amendment should be supported in order to decide what do we want before we spend money on building it?

Members, please support the amendment.

2730

The Bailiff: Members, you will now vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb, seconded by Deputy Dorey –

A Member: Could we have a recorded vote, please?

2735

The Bailiff: – and there is a request for a recorded vote. (*Laughter*)

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 21, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Green	None	Deputy Storey
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Paint		Deputy Spruce
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy James	Deputy Wilkie		
Deputy Adam	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Perrot	Deputy Inglis		
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Luxon	Deputy Sillars		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy O'Hara		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Quin		
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy Hadley		
Deputy Domaille	Deputy Harwood		
Deputy Langlois	Deputy Brehaut		
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Le Clerc		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Sherbourne		
Deputy Stewart	Deputy Conder		
Deputy Gillson	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Le Pelley	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Ogier	Deputy David Jones		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
	Deputy Lowe		

Deputy Le Lièvre
Deputy Collins

2740 **The Bailiff:** Members, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb, seconded by Deputy Dorey, was 21 votes in favour, 24 against. I declare the amendment lost. (Applause)

We will now move on to the next amendment to be proposed by Deputy St Pier.

Amendment:

The Education Department redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review

1. To delete Proposition 3, re-number Propositions 1 and 2 as Propositions 2 and 3 respectively, and introduce a new Proposition 1 as follows:

'1. Recognising the Independent Review Panel's view that "the current system does not offer best value...and it can be difficult to deliver the best educational opportunity", to agree that the educational estate should be rationalised (including a reduction from four secondary schools at or around the time of the opening of a new secondary school at the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site) in order both to improve educational outcomes and deliver an educational service which provides value for money for taxpayers; and, accepting the Independent Review Panel's advice that any rationalisation would require "very careful consideration...[and] the need for any move to be managed sensitively", to direct the Education Department:

(a) to consult with all stakeholders, and

(b) to notify the States no later than March 2016 regarding how that rationalisation is to be achieved by the Education Department including its planned timeframe and the optimal size (including whether the La Mare de Carteret secondary school should be built for 600 or 960 students) and location of secondary schools (including post-16 education) to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum.'

2. To insert:

a) In substitution for 'To approve' at the beginning of the re-numbered Proposition 2: 'Recognising the possibility that with the rationalisation of the educational estate, there may be a requirement for a larger secondary school at the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site and that it may be better value for money for this to be built from the outset, to approve';

b) at the end of the words in paragraph (a) of the re-numbered Proposition 2: '; or the replacement of the High School facilities for an eight-form entry school for up to 960 students.'; and

c) immediately after '£60.2 million (excluding inflation)' in the re-numbered Proposition 3: 'for a 600 student school or a proportionately uplifted equivalent capital vote for a 960 student school should that option be demonstrated to provide better value, in either case'.

3. To add a proposition as follows:

'4. To note the Independent Review Panel's conclusion that "the condition of the school buildings is such that they are no longer suitable"; and to direct the Treasury & Resources Department to liaise with the Education Department to ensure that future annual Budget Reports recommend sufficient funding through annual cash limits and routine capital allocations to ensure that the La Mare de Carteret Schools are adequately maintained until such time as the schools are vacated.'

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

2745 I do sense that there may be some opposition to this amendment but I should start by saying I did not want to be in a position where I needed to lay this. And notwithstanding the sense of opposition to it, having rejected the Bebb amendment, Treasury & Resources do feel that they have no choice but to continue to do so in order to give the States the ability to deal with the consequences of building La Mare and so perpetuating the excess capacity in our secondary system.

2750 **The Bailiff:** Sorry to interrupt you, Deputy St Pier, but I should have reminded you that under the Rules as they now stand, you should either read out the text of the amendment or you or any Member may ask that the text be read out by the Greffier; and after it has been read out you then have the right, formally, to propose the amendment.

So I apologise for not having reminded you of that.

2755

Deputy St Pier: I apologise, sir. I am sure we are all struggling to keep up with the changing Rules. I will perhaps ask the Greffier to do it.

Thank you.

2760

The Bailiff: Greffier.

The Greffier: Thank you, sir.

Billet d'Etat X, Article I. The amendment proposed by Deputy G A St Pier, seconded by Deputy J Kuttelwascher:

2765

The Greffier read the amendment.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Greffier.

Deputy St Pier.

2770

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Some Members... I know one of the Ministers up here on the top bench has questioned why Treasury & Resources would continue to lay this amendment and the reason, sir, is quite clear. As has been said in the previous debate, Treasury & Resources' responsibility is to advise the States of the financial consequences of its decisions. We wish to give the States every opportunity to fully understand that, the consequences, and make decisions in that knowledge on the record, and that is the reason for laying this amendment.

2775

Sir, before I go any further I do just wish to address one issue that arose in the last debate for clarification, and that was in relation to the issues around the drafting and the wording of the Nicholls Report, because I fear that if I leave my previous statement on the record without commenting further there is a risk that I may mislead the Assembly.

2780

I referred to a joint meeting of Education and Treasury & Resources with the Independent Review Panel and, in response to Deputy Fallaize's request for the wording of that original draft, I did go back to officers to seek their confirmation as to the chain of events and it is worth me, again for the record, advising the States exactly what happened so that I have not misled the Assembly in my previous statement.

2785

The response has come back and I hope that Members of the Education Board who were present will be able to agree that this is the right order of events, and I quote:

'The reviewers came across and presented a summary of the report to the Treasury & Resources and Education Boards. They made it clear that their recommendation was conditional on a rationalisation of the estate. At the meeting, and followed up with the review team after the meeting, Education asked to tone down the message because of the potential catastrophic effect on the educational system. In writing the initial report, the reviewers took this on board and toned down the report to try and be sensitive to the highly charged emotions, whilst retaining the integrity of their report, in order to help Education manage the message. This report was sent to three officers only in the first instance, at the request of Education for initial review, specifically relating to the recommendation around the 600-school and review.'

Then it went through factual accuracy checks and so on.

2790

Sir, in those sort of meetings I tend not to make extensive, contemporaneous notes and I do not normally retain them. But, again, for those that were present it was a fascinating meeting because we had nine politicians, I think, in the room who sat in rapt silence for 45 minutes

listening to the Board and all making notes, including me – far more extensive than I would normally do.

I have kept those contemporaneous notes and it is worth just quoting from those verbatim:

'Any decision to rebuild La Mare builds in over-capacity. Wrong way round to make the decision before Grammar.'

2795 That is a reference, obviously, to selection. We then ran through the various different options:

'Value for money – you don't have value for money now. Option (c) is the favoured, 600 capacity at La Mare but only justified in context of a move from four to three. Review of estate as a whole makes education and economic sense, otherwise building in over-capacity/expensive educational system.'

2800 The amendment, of course, does allow the project to proceed. The States' Assembly is *not* being asked to choose between educational outcomes and value for money by Treasury & Resources; it is being asked by Treasury & Resources to choose both, and we do have the opportunity to take a path that supports educational outcomes and gives Islanders value for money.

Decisions in the past, of course, have not helped but getting the decision right this time could, of course, mean less upheaval for pupils in the future and savings of £160 million over the lifetime of the rebuilt school, which of course is £5,000 per taxpayer.

2805 How did we get to that figure? Conservatively, £5 million on the capital rebuild, £10 million on the running costs over the life of the school, £2 million per annum by moving to the Education Department's own pupil/teacher ratio of 1:15, rather than the current ratio of around 1:12, and approximately £25 million of capital savings in the long-term needs of the College of Further Education.

2810 Of course, the irony is that it is not us that will be paying for years to come but future generations of taxpayers, those educated at the schools who will be paying for any mistakes that are made now.

In its policy letter, the Education Department *has* given some consideration to the Review Panel's recommendations and has agreed in its Proposition 3 that there is a strong case for rationalising the educational estate.

2815 It is also recommended that a report is laid before the States no later than March 2016, containing recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum, including of course, at least one and maybe more options to move from four schools to three.

2820 Treasury & Resources, however, cannot support a commitment of in excess of £60 million to construct these schools with a 60-year life before establishing whether that capital investment is appropriate for the Island's education system.

2825 As we have made clear, the Department's firm view is that the States should not be asked to make a decision on the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret site before the strategic decisions have been made, including of course selection at 11, the future organisation and delivery of post-16 education and the rationalisation of the estate.

However, if the States are minded to agree with the Education Department that a decision is required now, then it is the Department's view that such a decision must be conditional upon a rationalisation of the estate from four schools to three. That was firmly the view of the Independent Review Panel.

2830 They did, as we have said, tone down the text of their written report which, of course, has now been much quoted. But their views were crystal clear in all the briefings they gave. They made it very clear that if rationalisation was off the table then they would have put the other options back on the table, including, of course, not rebuilding the secondary school. They felt it was educationally better, as all educationalists have since 2000, and they felt it was financially better.

2835 If the schools are rationalised from four to three, whether it is now or when the States vote on the Education's policy with at least one option of four to three, that they have promised in 2016, the secondary school at La Mare de Carteret will consequentially need to be built for 960 pupils.

2840 It is the Department's view that it may be considerably better value for taxpayers for a school of this size to be designed and built from the start in a single phase, rather than building one now for 600 and then extending it later in a second phase, as is currently planned by the Education Department. Of course, that will be one of the issues that is a challenge for us in considering the final business case when we do not know the result of that rationalisation debate next March.

The Review Panel made the following observations – again, which has been quoted by Deputy Bebb in the previous debate:

'We do not believe on the evidence of the current population forecasts that there is an absolutely clear case for creating a total capacity of 2,580 secondary places which a rebuild of 600 places at the La Mare de Carteret would create.'

2845 We fully agree with the Review Panel's findings that the data does not support the need to add a 600-pupil capacity to the existing estate. It is clear that the Panel's preferred option to provide a 600-place secondary school at La Mare is conditional upon the total pupil capacity being accommodated at three sites and not four.

2850 Consolidating the existing educational estate... but because of the surplus capacity in the system which, just to remind you, is 470 places or 18% of the total available, and I remind you again that that is 9.3% or 40 spaces more than was in the last Education Report last November, and of course the surplus capacity in the future is all inextricably linked to the recommendation to build the secondary school at the La Mare site.

2855 Having three of our four secondary schools 25% underused is not good educationally and the Review Panel also states that running the spare capacity in the system comes at a significant cost. The review panel highlights the inefficiencies which this creates, including the teacher/pupil ratios currently operating below the Education Department's stated policy of 1:15 and, as I have said, that alone will cost the taxpayer over £2 million a year or over £120 million over the life of the schools being proposed.

2860 Rebuilding the La Mare schools at this stage without rationalisation of the estate, as recommended by the Review Panel, would be committing the States to supporting the system which does not offer best value with benefits of economies of scale and, most importantly, does not deliver the best educational outcomes because, as the Review Panel notes, a rich and varied curriculum is more expensive on a per pupil basis to provide in smaller schools.

2865 Sir, I of course welcome the Education Department's agreement that there is a strong case for rationalising the educational estate and, having done so, the genie is out of the bottle; Education cannot put it back. The uncertainty and anxiety which so many parents, students and teachers have experienced and expressed in the last week is not going to go away. There is going to be uncertainty until the vote is taken on the four-to-three option, or options Education have promised they will present. We believe that it would be more open and transparent to begin the consultation immediately on how to achieve this.

2870 The Education Department also has plans for significant capital expenditure for the college for further education – another project which is expected to be in the States' portfolio in due course, with, of course, an estimated value for all phases, as we have heard, of some £50 million or so.

2875 However, rationalising the educational estate will also of course bring significant reductions in the investment required for the college for further education delivering significant savings to taxpayers. This approach would also free sites up for alternative uses, including of course potentially housing.

2880 Viewing the La Mare project in isolation would simply replicate past short-sightedness and will lead to significant waste of taxpayers' money. The Department believes that the States must take a fiscally responsible approach to all capital investment just as, I said in my statement, it needs to continue to do with all revenue expenditure. Every pound comes from the same source – the taxpayer. The project must be viewed in the context of the entire educational estate, as is recommended by the Review Panel and alongside the numerous other priorities of the States. In

2885 doing so, this has the potential to save taxpayers in excess of £160 million in capped and running costs over the six-year life of the schools.

Is making this rationalisation decision by amendment the right way to do it? No, of course it is not. Of course it is not. It would be vastly preferable if such a policy was developed after consultations and options analysis and so on, and that is precisely why we have argued and we will continue to argue until the final vote is taken, that the best course of action would not be trying to make a decision on La Mare until after the decisions on secondary policy and rationalisation have been made in the right order. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2895 Sir, when Treasury & Resources ask any question about another Department it is open to accusation that it is meddling in another Department's affairs, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) it is trampling on another Department's mandate, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) it is micromanaging! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Well, we are agreed on one thing I said! (*Laughter*)

2900 Asking questions around £60 million of spending is not micromanaging – trust me. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) If we did not provide that challenge we would be failing in our duty. In the last week all sorts of terms have been applied to me and my Treasury colleagues. 'Arrogant' and 'bullying' are two of the politer terms, but I am not going to apologise to this Assembly for doing my job.

2905 It is our responsibility to give you, the Members of the States, the information about the financial and resource implications of the decisions you are being asked to make. We are telling you that, based on all the reams of information available to us, if we proceed with the Propositions in this policy letter unamended, the States will be committing to and perpetuating excess capacity in our secondary school system. We have noted also – no more than that – the advice from the educationalists on-Island and off-Island – and it is only their view – that this is not in the best educational interests of the Island either.

2910 What you do with that information is for you, but we cannot in good conscience let you make a decision in ignorance of the significant financial consequences. We cannot support the Education Department's recommendations without seeking to address those consequences in this amendment, however unattractive it is. That is what this amendment achieves and it is for that reason that we have laid it and we do urge you to support it.

2915 Thank you, sir.

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

2920 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Lowe.

2925 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, I wish to seek some advice please. I think this amendment probably goes further than the original Propositions, under Rule 13(6).

The Bailiff: Yes, I can see you have been in some debate with the Comptroller about that. (*Laughter*) Have you formed a view on that, Madam Comptroller?

2930 **The Comptroller:** Sir, yes, I do. I was just trying to read all the amending words into the Propositions to understand them fully. But particularly the fact that it is going from a five-form school to an eight-form school potentially, as you read through the words, I do agree with that, sir, yes.

2935 **The Bailiff:** It also, instead of the... The present Propositions merely ask the States to agree there is a strong case for rationalising the educational estate; this amendment asks the States to

agree that, effectively, at least one school be closed. In that sense, (**The Comptroller:** Yes. Agreed.) it seems to me also that it goes beyond the original Propositions.

2940 So Rule 13(6) is engaged and you are asking then that the States vote that the amendment be not debated and no vote be taken thereon, or that debate on the amendment be postponed?

Deputy Lowe: That a vote is taken not to be debated, please, sir.

2945 **The Bailiff:** Right. The motion then is that –

A Member: Can it be a recorded vote?

2950 **The Bailiff:** Right. The motion then is that we do not debate this amendment and that no vote be taken thereon – and a request for a recorded vote. I hope that is clear. So if you wish to debate the amendment then you vote Contre, if you do not wish to debate the amendment you vote Pour.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 21, Contre 23, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Green	Deputy Duquemin	None	Deputy Storey
Deputy Paint	Deputy Dorey		Deputy Ogier
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Le Tocq		Deputy Spruce
Deputy Wilkie	Deputy James		
Deputy De Lisle	Deputy Adam		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy Perrot		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Luxon		
Deputy O'Hara	Alderney Rep. Jean		
Deputy Quin	Alderney Rep. McKinley		
Deputy Hadley	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Domaille		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Bebb		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Conder	Deputy Stewart		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Gillson		
Deputy David Jones	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Collins	Deputy Fallaize		
	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
	Deputy Le Lièvre		

2955 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the voting on the motion not to debate the amendment was 21 in favour, 23 against. I declare the motion lost. Debate will therefore continue and under our amended Rules it is for the Minister to say whether he or any other Member of his Department wishes at this stage to exercise their right to speak next.

Deputy Sillars?

2960 **Deputy Sillars:** I would like to leave it to the end.
Thank you.

The Bailiff: You are not, so I open debate to everyone. Does anyone wish to speak?
Deputy Bebb.

2965 **Deputy Bebb:** Monsieur le Bailli, having lost the last amendment, of course I am now in a position where I am very uncertain as to where on earth we go. Is this amendment optimal? No. It is fair to say that not even the Treasury Minister would actually say that it is optimal.

I have got to the point where I cannot support the rebuild in any way, shape or form because I do not think that any right thinking Assembly should be voting £60 million based on a report that asks so many questions, shows so little has been evidenced of the need – indeed, the only case that seems vaguely to stand up to any scrutiny is the primary school – and now we are being asked whether we are going to reduce the schools.

2975 I am unsure that there is any case to reduce the schools. We have four. We will have, if we build La Mare de Carteret, four serviceable secondary schools. Why on earth would we rationalise them? Why do we have four perfectly good buildings and then seek to close one of them?

I see no evidence and I have seen no claim made that, of course, if we rationalise the estate from four to three that these buildings are appropriate for any other use. Nobody has made that case. Indeed, the Proposition in the Education Department's own Report is based on what? It is nonsense.

2980 I have got to the place now where I simply have to vote not to build the school, because if we build this school I am of the firm opinion that we have built the infrastructure and we would be foolish not to use that infrastructure. We have the system and it is madness for us to think of doing anything else.

2985 I can see why the Treasury Minister and the Deputy Treasury Minister have laid this amendment. I can see that there is a need to provide some form of financial benefit but, in all honesty, if we are to rebuild La Mare the financial benefits go out the window and I just do not see... there is no evidence here for us to go there.

2990 Realistically, what we have now is a decision that is made based on emotions rather than any evidence or logic and that is not something we should be participating in and, therefore, the only logical answer is not to rebuild; but I doubt this Assembly will go there because, of course, building is the easy option and that is where we are going.

2995 We will leave the problem as to how on earth we find the missing £36 million to the next Assembly and we will leave the problem of hampering the next Assembly with four perfectly good secondary schools and, therefore, probably maintaining the current system to the next Assembly and we will have passed on every single problem that we said that we were going to tackle to the next Assembly. It is shameful, but I think that is where we are.

3000 I regret to say that I do not think that I can support this amendment because there is no evidence for it, but I also will not be supporting the main Propositions because there is no evidence for that. So I honestly question anybody's commitment to any form of financial prudence having supported this. Also I question any of those who support the rebuild as to whether or not they are really interested in reforming the education of this Island, because I cannot see the evidence for that at all.

3005 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I read over the lunchtime an interesting column by a well-known former Minister and Member of this Assembly on the educational estate and I do not agree with everything in that column but I would endorse the view that Deputy St Pier and Treasury & Resources are, to a degree, doing their job, because of course there is a considerable capital expenditure and potential revenue expenditure with these decisions.

3015 But there is a very thin dividing line between financial management and micromanagement, and educational arguments. For example, from time to time Treasury & Resources have given credence to the consultancy report that we had which goes into a number of issues which include, of course, arguments about whether Guernsey has the right policy with educational uplift additional capital costs and the size of the schools as well. Of course the size of school is

fundamentally an issue about educational choice and educational outcomes and educational achievement.

3020 I find this amendment, in many ways, rather confusing. I mean Deputy Lowe called it to task and narrowly won – no, narrowly lost actually, because there was some strange voting perhaps in there... but the point starts with recognising the Independent Review Panel's view that the current system does not offer best value. That seems suspiciously like noting. But then the next part of a very complicated syntactical paragraph is:

'... to agree that the educational estate...'

– it sounds like something out of Downton Abbey –

'... should be rationalised, including a reduction from four secondary schools to, at around the time of the opening of a new secondary school...'

– the La Mare de Carteret School –

'... in order to both improve educational outcomes...'

3025 – there we have Treasury coming into the educational orbit again –

'... and deliver an educational service which provides value for money for taxpayers...'

– which, to a degree, is a subjective assessment.

Now, that implies that if the amendment should pass, we would go on with the La Mare de Carteret at a reasonable pace but we would have an inference – a direction even – that one of the other schools would be in the process of closing.

3030 Now, bearing in mind we know that the parents, teachers and pupils at Les Beaucamps are concerned that a new and pretty much excellent school could be in jeopardy, that is an area of uncertainty. We know too that Deputy Kuttelwascher, and possibly others, went to see Grammar School parents and teachers, who of course had the usual concerns; and we know too that St Sampson's is, after perhaps a difficult beginning, achieving greater and greater excellence in their
3035 results and do not want anything that checks their progress. Given that that is already a very large school – in fact, a two-school site, a two-school campus – it is difficult to envisage some fundamental change in the short to medium term happening there.

3040 So what does this really mean? It is not clear what we are deciding. Are we already second guessing various arguments to do with sixth forms, tertiary education, the 11-plus, the nature of schools?

I do not think we are in a position to make those decisions today, but at the same time we are not in a position to argue without any real position from the Education Department or demands from the pupils, teachers and parents of this Island... we are not in a position to say we will definitely close one school.

3045 So we have to reject this amendment on those grounds and on the grounds of the uncertainty and dismay this will create. I also suspect that the timeline of March 2016, which itself is not a good political time for rational argument, is unrealistically fast, especially given the issues Deputy Trott and others have outlined – Deputy Fallaize as well – about the extremely complicated history of the 11-plus issue.

3050 There were even arguments within the proponents of change. There are those who would argue for two schools, each with a sixth form; those who would argue for three schools, all offering a similar curriculum but perhaps with a sixth form college; there are those who would argue for a tertiary college; there are those who would argue for free schools. I think we need to have much more thought before we embark on the aspects of this amendment.

3055 As for Proposition 2(c), immediately after £60.2 million for a 600-students school or a proportion of the uplifted equivalent capital vote for a 960-student school, that is unintelligible;

and in any case the Education Department have made it clear that they will allow for the flexibility of an extension should arguments down the line indicate that.

3060 I would also like to conclude by saying that... We may come onto this in general debate or we may not, but I think it is important to point out yet again that we have not heard, with the exception of Deputy Bebb in his summing up, much comment about the autism centre or the sports centre.

3065 The reviewing panel of experts gave opinions about the management of those facilities, but Treasury & Resources have not particularly been interested in following those up and therefore the process has perhaps unravelled a little bit here.

I think that in all of the circumstances we should allow the scheme as originally envisaged by Education to move ahead at a reasonable but stately pace and not put in another potential political banana skin, having already gone through a couple of these in the last nine months.

3070 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, can I ask the assembly and yourself for a short recess so that the Treasury and Education Ministers can discuss a possible alternative solution?

3075 **The Bailiff:** Members, it seems to me sensible. You may have noticed that the two Ministers have been out of the Chamber for part of the time; there are clearly some discussions going on. Are you in favour of an adjournment? Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: Right, we will adjourn.

*The Assembly adjourned at 4.34 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 4.56 p.m.*

**I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site –
Post Review –
Debate continued**

The Bailiff: Chief Minister.

3080

Deputy Le Tocq: Mr Bailiff, it seems to me that there is a potential amendment that may well get the support of both Education and T&R Boards. It requires some work but I am fairly confident that that can be done and therefore if we adjourn now that amendment could be distributed overnight or early tomorrow morning and laid tomorrow morning so that the Assembly could consider it. I think, therefore, there is not a lot of point in us continuing our business today.

3085

The Bailiff: So, Members, I put to you the motion that we adjourn to –
Deputy Lowe.

3090

Deputy Lowe: I was just going to say, sir, we have got another Billet. Is there any reason why we cannot do something off the other Billet?

3095

The Bailiff: It would be unusual to start another debate when we are in the middle of debating an amendment in the middle of a debate on another Billet. So, as it is five o'clock, I am going to

put to you the motion that we adjourn and resume tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

3100

The Bailiff: We will rise and resume tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 4.58 p.m.