



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 27th May 2015**

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

**Volume 4, No. 14**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

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

**Law Officers**

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

**People's Deputies**

**St. Peter Port South**

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

**The Castel**

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

**The West**

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

**The South-East**

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

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

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

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

A. J. Nicolle, Esq. (H.M. Deputy Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

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

Deputy A. H. Langlois (*absent de l'Île*); Deputy M. J. Storey (*indisposé*);

Deputy A. Spruce; Deputy G. M. Collins (*relevé à 10h 19*);

Deputy S. A. James, M. B. E. (*absent de l'Île*); Deputy A. H. Adam (*relevé à 10h 41*);

## Business transacted

Evocation .....	1035
Birthday wishes to the Bailiff .....	1035
Convocation .....	1035
Quarterly update on States' financial position – Statement by the Minister for Treasury & Resources.....	1035
<i>Condor Liberation</i> – Statement by the Minister for Commerce & Employment.....	1040
<b>Questions for Oral Answer.....</b>	<b>1046</b>
St Peter Port harbour – Management matters.....	1046
Cotentin – French nuclear installations.....	1050
Aurigny – Depreciation policy .....	1052
Stroke patients – Treatment and costs .....	1053
Human rights legislation – Impact on Guernsey of potential UK changes.....	1060
<b>Billet d'État IX .....</b>	<b>1063</b>
Ordinances laid before the States .....	1063
I. Social Security (Reciprocal Agreement with the Republic of Chile) Ordinance, 2015 – Approved .....	1063
Statutory Instruments laid before the States .....	1064
The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2015; .....	1064
The Driving Tests (Fees) Regulations, 2015.....	1064
II. Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986 – Election of new Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Panel of Members – Deputy Fallaize and Douzenier Heaume M.B.E. elected .....	1064
III. The Ladies' College Board of Governors – Election of new members – Mr John Marren and Mrs Stephanie Ann Nickolls elected.....	1065
V. Treasury & Resources Department – Taxation of Real Property Appeals Panel – Appointment of new Chairman and Deputy Chairman – Mrs Caroline Latham FRICS and Mr John Weir FRICS appointed .....	1066
Appointment laid before the States .....	1067
Commerce and Employment Department – Appointment of Chairman of the Board of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman.....	1067
Procedural – Motion to debate Billet X.....	1067
<b>Billet d'État X .....</b>	<b>1068</b>
I. Education Department – Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review – Debate commenced .....	1068
Procedural – Motion to suspend Rules of Procedure.....	1074
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.36 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i> .....	1085
I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review – Debate continued .....	1085
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.31 p.m.</i> .....	1122

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m. in the presence of  
His Excellency Air Marshal Peter Walker C.B., C.B.E.  
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Deputy Greffier*

## EVOCATION

### Birthday wishes to the Bailiff

**Deputy Lowe:** Sir, before we start today's proceedings may I wish you a very happy birthday on behalf of the States of Guernsey. (*Laughter and applause*) Although there is actually an Obesity Strategy, if you wish to buy cake, I am sure we would be happy to indulge! (*Laughter*)

5

**The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Lowe. That took me by surprise, but thank you very much and thank you for your good wishes.  
Greffier.

## CONVOCATION

**The Deputy Greffier:** To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Court House on Wednesday, 27th May 2015 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the Items contained in Billets IX and X which have been submitted for debate.

10

**The Bailiff:** Members of the States, it may be a warm day outside and it may get a warm day inside as well. Those who wish to do so may remove their jackets.

15

## TREASURY & RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

### Quarterly update on States' financial position – Statement by the Minister for Treasury & Resources

**The Bailiff:** We will begin today's business with a Statement by the Treasury & Resources Minister, Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Mr Bailiff, thank you for the opportunity to make another Statement this morning to update the Assembly on the overall financial position at the end of the first quarter of 2015.

I will start by stating, of course, that a much better and more rounded picture of the overall income position can be gathered after the first half of the year when significant Income Tax receipts will have been collected and analysed, so at this point in the year the two key income streams worthy of comment are ETI and Document Duty.

ETI represents the key fiscal indicator of the Island's economic position and health and is updated every quarter. The collections for the first quarter of 2015 totalled £45.4 million, which is a 2.8% increase on the same quarter last year and represents a real-terms increase. This good news is tempered by the fact that ETI receipts remain slightly short of the budgeted position for this point in the year. The second quarter results will be critical in forming a view of the likely fiscal outturn for the remainder of the year.

Document Duty receipts offer another view of economic activity. Members will recall the headlines from the last Residential Property Prices Bulletin published by the Policy Council, which said that there were 116 local market transactions during the first quarter of 2015, which is 11.5% fewer than in the same quarter of 2014 and the lowest number recorded since figures were first reported. It therefore is not at all surprising that Document Duty receipts are down, both against our Budget estimate and the same period last year, at £2.8 million. It is disappointing that Document Duty receipts remain at such low levels and that the housing market still shows little sign of recovery. This, of course, is something of concern to me and the rest of the Treasury & Resources Department and was discussed at length at a joint meeting with the Housing Department earlier in the month. Following Deputy Soulsby's amendment in the Budget last year, as directed, the two Departments have been exploring options for supporting first-time buyers. We will be submitting a joint report on the subject to the Policy Council by the end of June, examining the options available and the consequences of each option.

Overall, in the first three months of the year, Departments' and Committees' net adjusted expenditure is in line with the overall budget. However, the overall position, as ever, conceals a number of overspends and underspends at Departmental level. In particular, the Health & Social Services Department has overspent its authorised budget in the first quarter by £700,000, or 3%, and this is forecast to be an overspend in excess of £3 million by the end of the year.

The Health & Social Services Department has, I know from the close working of the Departments to monitor the financial position, undertaken significant work to review services being delivered across the Bailiwick and to ensure that they meet quality expectations. As a result of this work significant cost pressures are emerging, as the HSSD Minister outlined in his Statement to the Assembly in March, and are the subject of a policy letter to be considered at the July meeting. I am pleased to say that this policy letter will outline very clearly the reasons for the anticipated overspend and seek authority to increase the budget for the Department in 2015.

However, Members of the States, the implications are significant for the overall budget, both in 2015 and beyond, for compliance with our fiscal policies and for all other States' Departments, particularly in relation to any new spending commitments – such as, for example, the proposed pre-school education. The painful and practical reality for Departments is that any new spending is going to need to be funded by us reprioritising existing spending commitments to enable the redirection of existing resources.

Sir, as Members have been advised in the past, I have been concerned for some time that there was insufficient evidence to truly understand the financial baseline of the Health & Social Services Department and how that fared when compared to similar service provision elsewhere. Therefore, as proposed in the 2015 Budget Report, a review is underway, which is costing all services provided by the Department, benchmarking these to appropriate services elsewhere and looking at service prioritisation. The results will give my Department, the Health & Social Services Department, and this Assembly the evidence base, for the first time, which will enable us to make informed decisions about funding Health & Social Services over the next three years,

notwithstanding the longer-term demographic-driven demand pressures, which we know, of course, are coming.

As I said in my Statement this time last year, transformation, change and improvement cannot stop at the end of the FTP. I outlined how there would be an ongoing need for departmental targets and Government's continuous improvement and efficiency to ensure that future unavoidable cost pressures could be mitigated and sustainably funded. Those cost pressures are upon us and will involve difficult decisions for this Assembly in ensuring that the taxpayers' money we have collected is targeted in the right areas and on the right services. My Department therefore remains committed to supporting the future reform of the public service and the necessary service transformation within that as a means of providing sustainable services and spending every pound of taxpayers' money wisely.

Sir, in closing I must stress the need for the States to continue to focus on expenditure restraint. The FTP delivered considerable financial benefits, but residual targets still remain for some Departments. It is vital that those remaining benefits are delivered in order to balance the books and help ensure that we have sufficient funding to invest in those areas of greatest need.

It is my intention to continue to keep Members regularly updated about our financial position and I will therefore be requesting permission from you to make a further Statement to the Assembly in September, ahead, of course, of the Budget debate in October.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Members, we may now allow a period for questions, if there are any questions Members wish to raise arising from that Statement.

Deputy Hadley, and then Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Hadley:** Does the Minister agree with me that, in fact, while it is important to restrain the expenditure of the Assembly, equally it is important to provide money where it is urgently needed? The Health & Social Services Department does urgently need additional funding and finds it extremely difficult to present business cases to the Treasury & Resources Department for vital equipment, leading to unacceptable delays in the purchase of equipment when it breaks down, a recent example being the fluoroscopy equipment. Will he therefore look again at the way the Department produces business cases and indeed the way the Treasury & Resources Department examines these business cases? I do believe this is a serious danger to the Island in not purchasing vital equipment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, yes, I do agree that we need to prioritise spending for those areas of urgent need, and that, I think, in essence was one of the points I was seeking to make in my Statement.

With regard to the question of procurement of equipment, Deputy Hadley knows, because he and I have had the conversation several times outside this Assembly, that this is a matter which is regularly discussed between myself and the Minister and Deputy Minister of his Department at our monthly meetings, such that I believe that his Department should have received the reassurances that it will receive all the assistance it needs in progressing those urgent cases. I think there has been demonstrable evidence of that where those cases have been made.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

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

The fall in Document Duty reflects a slowing housing market, as we all know, so may this Assembly look forward to measures later on this year in the Budget that are designed to stimulate that sector?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

125 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, in my Statement I referred to the joint report which will be coming to the Assembly later this year, probably ahead of the Budget, in response to Deputy Soulsby's amendment, which will set out the options which the two Departments have looked at, and that will give the opportunity for the Assembly to consider the issue then before the Budget.

130 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, and then Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy Gollop:** In view of the possible need to continue to support HSSD, the States generally, and pre-school provision for children will the Treasury & Resources Department be considering perhaps increasing the amount of income raised from, let us say, motor fuel and  
135 other indirect taxes, bearing in mind the significant price reduction over the last 12 months in some of these commodities in what has been a form of deflation?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

140 **Deputy St Pier:** Well, sir, of course the Treasury & Resources Department will look at all the fiscal options available to it as it prepares the Budget to present to the Assembly in October this year. I am, of course, aware that the Environment Department are considering the options following the decisions by this Assembly in relation to the Integrated Road Transport Strategy and the implications of that, and I would not wish to pre-empt that.

145 The fiscal policies that we have, of course, are not simply around the revenue we raise but also our level of spending, and that was the issue to which I was referring in my Statement. The biggest challenge for us is not so much the revenue that we bring in but how we stay within our fiscal restraint and therefore prioritise spending within that in and between Departments and in and between services within Departments.

150

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, we seem to get mixed messages from the Minister with regard to ETI receipts and Document Duty and it is difficult to put all that together to come out with exactly  
155 where we are with regard to the first quarter. Perhaps the Minister might place some new thoughts with regard to that to the Assembly.

What new austerity measures are to be introduced in terms of cuts in spending and perhaps even with respect to restraint on pay rises for States' staff in the future?

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

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, there are mixed messages in relation to ETI and Document Duty because there is mixed information. ETI is, in essence, a positive message in terms of real-terms increases in ETI receipts, albeit not quite to the extent budgeted, whilst Document Duty is less than  
165 budgeted as a result of the slowdown in the property market. So it is mixed messages and I cannot present it any other way.

In relation to further austerity measures, I am not suggesting that further austerity measures are necessary. What I have said in my Statement is that ongoing spending restraint by all Departments and Committees is going to be necessary and, in particular in relation to new  
170 spending commitments, we will need to think long and hard about how we fund those. Again, I reference for the third time the necessity to consider doing that by the reprioritisation of existing spending in the absence of new funding.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.



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

Once again, from a Statement like this we take away the message, the narrative, that we still have an overspend in Health & Social Services Department. In drafting a statement such as that, did the Minister not think of addressing the real issue perhaps that the budget for HSSD is set at an artificially low level and is aspirational rather than achievable in the first instance?

180 Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

185 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I think the Statement is a factual statement that the spending for HSSD this year is in excess of the authorised budget approved last October. However, I think the point that Deputy Brehaut has made and has made before in relation to the overall spending limit that there ought to be for health remains an open question; hence the joint work done between the two Departments and also hence the HSSD Minister's Statement in March and the need for a policy letter to come back to the Assembly in July seeking an increase in the cash limit for 2015, recognising the spending pressures and indeed the very point that Deputy Brehaut is making.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

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

195 So would the Minister agree that the underlying overspend for the year to date for the Health & Social Services Department is approximately 0.7%, the 3% is factually correct but of course includes the emergency costs of the NMC review, so the actual business-as-usual underlying overspend runs at about 0.7% over budget, driven largely by the higher agency costs for staffing, and of course the Budget did not include any premium costing of agency staff, which is therefore self-explanatory?

200 Also would he agree that the ETI receipts, which I think he mentioned were 2.8% up on last year but behind budget, nevertheless is a fantastic performance bearing in mind the vulnerability of our economy as we have seen over the last few years, and that the initiatives like Locate Guernsey from Commerce & Employment and indeed the housing stimulus initiative that Deputy Trott referred to are key if we are going to stimulate our economy and raise more income to be able to spend on the services?

205 Thank you.

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

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I do agree with both of Deputy Luxon's points. I think the issue of the ongoing spending needs of the Department and separating out the spending here to date between ongoing business-as-usual costs and the additional exceptional costs which have been incurred this year is a very good point which he has made in his question to me.

215 And I certainly agree in relation to the ETI receipts and the need to do all we can – given our dependence, as we know from the debate on Personal Tax, Pensions and Benefits Review, to our reliance on Income Tax – to ensure that that tax base is not only stable but grows.

220 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

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

225 Doesn't the Statement highlight the fact that the Assembly should have supported the proposals in the Budget, the amendments to the Budget, to increase HSSD's budget and not have this situation where we have such a large overspend when a lot of the overspend was predicted by the previous Board, and that is why it asked for additional budget during the Budget debate?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

230 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, that of course was a decision of the Assembly back in October and I would suggest that Deputy Dorey should defer further comment until he has had an opportunity to study the Health Department's policy letter for debate in July and the reasons behind that, and indeed all the detailed numbers in that, which will be supporting their additional request for funding in 2015.

235 **The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy Dorey again.

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

240 Different subject. The performance of Document Duty, doesn't it highlight that as a Government we should have a predicted source of income from our immovable assets and not the variable sort of Document Duty?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

245 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, I feel that question is a little bit of a continuation of the debate from the Personal Tax, Pensions and Benefit Review. I do agree, as I said in the debate, with Deputy Dorey's concerns about Document Duty as a suitable tax. It is nonetheless part of our tax base. The Assembly has chosen, I believe rightly, not to seek to unwind it and replace it entirely with tax on real property, but it does, as he notes in his question and as we are experiencing, mean that it is quite an unpredictable and lumpy tax around which to budget.

250

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

## COMMERCE & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

### *Condor Liberation –*

#### **Statement by the Minister for Commerce & Employment**

**The Bailiff:** We will move on to the next Statement, which is to be delivered by the Minister of the Commerce & Employment Department. Deputy Stewart.

255 **Deputy Stewart:** Mr Bailiff, Members of the Assembly, I would like to provide the following Statement that I hope will bring some clarity to the many issues raised over recent weeks by both fellow Members and the public in regard to the Island's roll-on roll-off ferry services provided by Condor.

260 Firstly, please let me start by saying that the frustration felt by some who have been personally affected by delay or poor experience has been listened to. Commerce & Employment has been in ongoing dialogue with Condor in regard to the issues that have been experienced.

The issue that has quite understandably generated so much adverse comment via both traditional and social media is the introduction by Condor of its new vessel *Condor Liberation* to provide both car and passenger services on the northern route, that is sailing between Poole down to Guernsey and then on to Jersey.

265 It is well known that *Liberation*, on just its second day in service, struck the jetty at St Peter Port harbour. Following repair and return to service the vessel suffered from a range of mechanical issues which whilst not individually substantial collectively led to service disruptions on several days. In addition, whilst *Liberation* has completed in excess of 90% of her permitted rotations, about half of them have been subject to delays, which has added to public dissatisfaction. Finally,

270

Members will know that there has been increased social media activity, particularly over the past week, that has questioned the appropriateness of *Condor Liberation* to operate in the Island's waters.

275 Although, as I have just said, discussion at political and senior staff level with Condor has been significant and ongoing since the introduction of *Liberation*, in light of the continuing disquiet the External Transport Group (ETG), which at political level is comprised of the Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Public Services and Commerce & Employment Departments, sought a meeting with Condor's Executive Chairman and members of the company's senior management team, which took place yesterday in a very robust and open fashion, to discuss these and other issues of concern.

280 Condor yesterday provided the ETG with objective industry standard data that should provide reassurance over the issue that has generated most concern in recent days: vessel safety. All vessels are required to meet minimum stability standards and, in the case of high-speed craft, an additional code layer applies alongside the Stockholm Convention for vessels operating in Western Europe. Condor has confirmed that *Liberation* fully meets industry standards, and that said, Condor has advised that the ride or motion on *Liberation* is different to that provided by the former Incat 86 vessels. It is understood that this different motion has contributed to passengers' safety concerns. In regard to the fundamental issue of safety, in summary Condor has provided evidence to confirm the safety of the vessel and this is supported by Guernsey's Harbourmaster in his statutory capacity. But that said, the company openly accepts that the motion of the vessel is different from that experienced on its predecessors and acknowledges the concern this has caused for some passengers. Condor staff are continuing to learn about ways in which the vessel operates in Channel Island and UK waters and, as was the case with previous vessels, this experience will aid the delivery of improvement.

295 In regard to reliability, particularly in respect of *Liberation's* engines, Condor detailed for the ETG the problems that had arisen since its introduction and the measures taken to rectify them. The company encountered early mechanical teething problems but it continues to work with the engine manufacturer and is constantly learning from and seeking to mitigate against the issues that have arisen so far. For example, replacement bow thrusters are now held as a spares stock item, a greater stock level of smaller components that have resulted in engine failure are now carried on the vessel which, due to its design and layout, facilitates repairs en route rather than taking the vessel out of service. Condor advised the ETG that its diagnostic approach to identifying possible engine faults improves with each day that it runs *Liberation*. However, the company openly advised the ETG that it could not categorically rule out engine issues that have not previously manifested themselves, which, as I have just indicated, Condor claims is typical following introduction of new technology and a new vessel on a service.

300 The issue of punctuality was also discussed in depth and Condor fully recognises the disruption and disappointment this causes to passengers. The company stated that *Liberation's* speed at sea is in line with expectations at around typically 34 knots, so speed is not a factor affecting punctuality. Condor has identified, however, that delays are arising because of unfamiliarity with the loading and unloading of the vessel. Condor is already examining the causes of these delays and it has committed to further intensive analysis of the issues over the following two weeks and reporting back to the ETG its findings and solutions put in place or proposed at the end of that period of two weeks.

315 Mr Bailiff, Members of the Assembly, I must leave you in absolutely no doubt that the ETG has expressed its disappointment to Condor Ltd regarding the circumstances that have prevailed since introduction of *Condor Liberation*. The group also aired its concerns about the company's response to certain situations and customer complaints, but we were advised that this has now caught up with the majority of complaints and compensation claims received in the aftermath of the 28th March St Peter Port harbour incident and the earlier mechanical problems that followed. Condor has also given reassurance that the company is proactively taking the feedback and learning from their customers to make continuous improvements to the service.

I am aware that Condor are engaging with the media today, as I will on behalf of the ETG. The company also proposes to provide a briefing to States' Members and key stakeholders within the next month. In the meantime I can assure the Assembly that I and my ETG colleagues will continue to work with Condor and monitor the expected improvements until an acceptable northern route service standard is achieved.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

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

Condor have advised that *Liberation* fully meets industry standards, which suggests the vessel is fit for purpose. The Minister may or may not be able to answer this question, but I ask why then is it operationally restricted in common wind conditions from operating safely in St Peter Port harbour?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Stewart:** Actually, if the Presiding Officer is happy, that is probably best taken by the Minister of PSD, who also sits on the ETG, sir.

**The Bailiff:** It would be unusual for another Minister to answer, but I am sure in the circumstances that will be the wish of the Members of the Assembly; so yes, Deputy Ogier will answer.

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

As a result of the incident early on, where the vessel struck the side of the quay, a wind limit restriction was put in place in a mutually agreed fashion between the Harbours and Condor. When they have finished their investigations they will revisit whether that wind restriction will be lifted, but it is a mutual agreement. The Harbourmaster has already indicated to them that he would be happy for them to move on and remove that wind restriction, but at the moment Condor want that to remain in place until they have finished investigating the incident fully and have learnt all the lessons they feel need to be learned from that.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize, then Deputy De Lisle.

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

Clearly there is no criticism to be directed here at the States' Departments. Condor is at fault. Condor is a private company, effectively in a monopoly position on lifeline links to Guernsey, and it is providing an abysmal service.

I understand the points that Deputy Stewart has made about the assurances provided by Condor, but there are now very serious concerns, which are not restricted to Guernsey, in respect of the safety of the vessel. Would he and his colleagues be prepared to agree to arranging for an independent evaluation to be carried out into the safety, or what he referred to as the fundamental issue of safety and sea worthiness of this vessel, without which I do not think that the reputation of the ferry service on the lifeline link is going to improve very quickly?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Stewart:** Regrettably, some of the comments that have been made on social media have been malicious in nature. I am aware of one particular posting which was allegedly made by a captain. It was the only such posting made on Trip Advisor by that person. The pictures of the vessel that were posted with that were actually of the Incat 86 and not of the *Liberation*.

375 The assurances that Condor have given us are these. First of all, compared to the stability and overall safety, they actually exceed the standards of the previous vessels, the Incat 86, in terms of their stability at sea, and we have had the full technical data on that.

Secondly, there is, as I mentioned in my Statement, a further code layer that applies to high-speed vessels over and above the Stockholm agreement. So the *Liberation* is licensed by the UK  
380 authorities, by the French authorities, by our own Harbourmaster, and also by the flag carrier. A lot of what has been said about the safety of this vessel is totally unfounded, and at this point the members of the ETG did not feel that any further independent report needs to be engaged at the moment.

385 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dave Jones, then Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy David Jones:** Sir, would the Minister agree with me that Condor's statement that the passengers are experiencing a different motion on the boat is precious little use to people who cannot get up and move around the vessel? The vessel often carries, when I have been on it, a  
390 large number of elderly people and a large number of children. You cannot expect, and Condor need to realise, these people to be permanently sat in their seats, because the motion of this vessel prevents them from getting up and moving around inside to go to use the latrines, to get food, drinks and the rest of it.

I thought that Condor's statement this morning on the radio was pretty poor, to say the least,  
395 and did not indicate to me, as a serving Member of this Parliament, that they had a grip on the seriousness of this situation.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Stewart:** I think, in terms of do Condor have a grip of the seriousness of this situation, of course they do. This has been a very expensive exercise for Condor and their shareholders and they want to get it right.

The motion is different. I have sailed on the Condor. I sailed across to Jersey and I had absolutely no problems with the motion of that vessel at all and there were a lot of other Deputies  
405 on that trip over. We have experienced some fairly heavy seas and some pretty inclement weather over the last couple of months. To improve some of the handling, the assurance that Condor have given us is... There is a similar vessel, which is operated by Fred Olsen Lines, in the Canaries, and to help get the experience of how to place the vessel with either a following, a beam sea, or a sea coming on to the bow, they are engaging a master from the Fred Olsen Lines, who has over eight  
410 years' experience on this vessel, to pass on tips and tricks of how to actually improve that ride. They are also working with the manufacturers to look at other ways they can mitigate the ride.

But I think to say that the vessel is unsuitable or unsafe is, in my view, at this time, over the top. We have had some very poor weather but in regular seas Condor is fine. I would say that she is at the moment licensed up to a wave height of three and a half metres. They are going to – when  
415 there are regular cancellations because of very high seas, which would have occurred with the Incat 86 anyway – take her out without any passengers to look at her performance in higher seas and to gain more experience, as masters and as a company, in how this vessel handles.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle, then Deputy Gollop and Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, it is not just a matter of public frustration and fear of travel but fear of business losses, if this situation goes on in the tourist market and other areas.

Can I ask the Minister what consideration is being made with Jersey and the company to replace the *Liberation* vessel, that is deemed to be inappropriate and unsuitable for Channel  
425 Islands turbulent waters, perhaps by introducing the two vessels we had serving the northern route which were popular with locals and visitors?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

430 **Deputy Stewart:** The two previous vessels – this has been work that has been undertaken by  
the External Transport Group over the past two and a half years – were pretty much at the end of  
their useful life on that route. The *Liberation* is, in my view and the view of ETG, a good  
replacement for that. What we have experienced are teething problems, inexperience in loading  
and unloading. That experience will be gained. They are basically working, as I have said, with the  
manufacturers, Austal. They are bringing over an experienced master, at some considerable cost  
435 to them, to sit on the bridge, to work with their captains to try and speed up their learning curve.  
In terms of the fleet, this is one of four vessels, there has been no interruption to freight  
whatsoever and Condor are determined to make this vessel work, as are ETG. This is a suitable  
vessel. This is about gaining experience of a brand-new piece of kit and that experience is being  
gained on a daily basis.

440

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop. (*Interjection*) No, I think... We are limited to 15 minutes for  
questioning and I will not allow second questions until everybody who wants to ask one question  
has had the opportunity to do so. Deputy Gollop.

445

**Deputy Gollop:** Deputy Fallaize said there is no blame to be attached to the States, but I  
would ask the Minister, or Ministers, how well are you coping with this situation in mediating with  
our sister island of Jersey? And linked to that, was it not a corporate risk from the start to allow a  
company to go out with a new piece of traction and have no back up? Because the issue to me,  
before the health and safety issues were raised, is what will Guernsey do if the *Liberation* is out of  
450 action for a period, because we do not have two Incats to share the load?

450

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

**Deputy Stewart:** This has been covered thoroughly by ETG. As I have mentioned, it is one of a  
455 fleet of four and they also have the availability of other vessels that they can charter as well. If that  
vessel is out of service for two days they will reschedule as best they can with the other vessels in  
the fleet. They can bring the *Rapide* up if they have to, they have the *Goodwill*; and they also have  
the *Clipper*. If there is a fundamental breakdown on that vessel or a planned outage, then, as we  
say last year, there are plenty of ships that are available for charter and they have those as a  
460 contingency plan, and that is something that we work with Condor on.

460

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

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

465

I thank Deputy Stewart for his Statement, although I am really disappointed because it comes  
across that you are almost defending Condor rather than the message that we should be sending,  
that this really is not acceptable. I hope there is going to be a more positive outcome with your  
Statement this morning.

I accept you dismissed a captain who actually put a posting, but you cannot dismiss all the  
470 video evidence of passengers who have been on this ship and have actually suffered. That is right  
across the globe that that has actually circulated on YouTube, and we have to address that. We  
cannot be dismissive, so dismissing one is not really acceptable.

Would the Minister agree that bringing over somebody from Fred Olsen – again, there is video  
evidence of how that ship operates, which is not that great – should have been done before  
passengers are being used as guinea pigs on this boat that clearly is not acceptable for the waters  
475 that we have got. Currently, they are reasonable smooth; we have not even really hit the bad  
weather yet for the winter. This ship was being sold to us... that the previous ships had gone past

their sell-by date. This ship was going to be able to manage better in the water than the other two ships have been able to, and in actual fact everything that we were sold by the –

480

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe, this question is limited to one minute. You have gone well over the minute. Are you able to wrap up quickly?

485

**Deputy Lowe:** Oh, alright then, yes. Are you happy that we have been sold a ship... or misled with all the salesmanship, because everything is opposite to what we were actually sold?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

490

**Deputy Stewart:** First of all, I am not defending Condor. The meeting yesterday between ETG and Condor was robust and it was extremely open. What I will say is Condor have been extremely open with ETG. We have even seen intercompany e-mails.

495

Passengers have not been used as guinea pigs. Some of the videos that have been shown... we have had some rough seas, and it is a *boat*. I have been on a cruise ship... I can remember being on the *Oriana* when people flew from one side of a saloon to the other, the pitch was so great in the Bay of Biscay. I have been on the Incat 86 when everyone has been ill, strapped in their seats. It is a *boat*, but they are going to do everything to try and mitigate the ride problems that some people have experienced. They can do no more than that. They are trying to accelerate the learning of the captains, how to position it in seas. In many ways the boat is performing better than before, so in a bow or a stern following sea it is managing to maintain its speeds, which the Incats could not.

500

We will continue to monitor this with Condor. They will be coming back to ETG after two weeks and I will keep States' Members fully informed. There will be a full briefing of States' Members within the next month as they learn about how they can turn around the vessel faster in ports, and if they cannot do that they will readjust their schedules to run on time. They will look at improving the ride, both by talking to the manufacturers and by how they master that vessel. They can do no more than that.

505

This vessel is suitable for the waters and at the moment I can see no other alternative for us as an Island. This is a commercial operation and they have worked openly with us –

510

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart, you have one and a half minutes to answer and you are over. Deputy Perrot – and this may well be the last question that we have time for. Deputy Perrot.

515

**Deputy Perrot:** In congratulating the Ministers for trying to resolve the problems, and indeed in congratulating the company for making efforts to resolve the problem, but being mindful that local waters tend to be nasty rather than nice, what is going to be the fall-back plan? What is the strategy if ultimately it is decided that this ship is simply not acceptable – if it is not, to use the fashionable phrase, fit for purpose? I understand, in asking this question, that there are contingency arrangements to charter in other vessels, but would that be a permanent solution? If not, what is the permanent solution?

520

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Stewart.

525

**Deputy Stewart:** At this moment in time there is no evidence, and I mean no *evidence*, to suggest that this vessel is unsuitable for the waters *at this time*. Should the problems continue, then that is the role of the ETG to work with Condor to find a solution. As I say again, this is one of a fleet of four vessels and Condor have made not just a commitment over the past few years – this is a company with ties going back many, many years with the States of Guernsey, and we have worked with them in a very open and honest fashion as a partnership, which is what it is. So I am confident that one way or another a solution will be arrived at. I am confident at the moment, with

530 the evidence that we have seen at ETG, that this vessel will work for the Channel Islands. It has been a rough eight weeks but we will continue to monitor the situation on a daily basis.

**The Bailiff:** Members, we have more than exceeded the 15 minutes allotted for questions. I do have a discretion to extend it, but we have plenty of other business in this meeting. I suggest that  
535 we move on to other business, otherwise... I am minded to exercise that, because it seems to me the Minister is largely repeating himself. Although there are many questions still to be asked the answers seem to be becoming rather repetitious, so I am minded that we move on.

## Questions for Oral Answer

### PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT

#### St Peter Port harbour – Management matters

**The Bailiff:** We move on to Question Time proper and the first Question is to be asked by  
Deputy Paint of the Minister for the Public Services Department. Deputy Paint.  
540 Deputy Collins, you wish to be *relevé*?

**Deputy Collins:** Yes, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.  
545

**Deputy Paint:** Sir, my first Question to the Public Services Department is could the Minister confirm or deny that a public relations company has been employed recently by either the Public Services Department or the senior harbour management to manage the adverse publicity that has been recently encountered on the management of St Peter Port harbour?  
550

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier will reply.

**Deputy Ogier:** Sir, I am able to deny that for Deputy Paint.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint, your second question.  
555

**Deputy Paint:** Thank you, sir. One supplementary.

**The Bailiff:** One supplementary, yes.  
560

**Deputy Paint:** Would the Minister and his Board take the view that his and other Departments determined to make the liner tender disembarkation/embarkation point at the old Albert Pier will be forced to succeed regardless of public opinion, the cost to the taxpayer and the disruption to traffic flows along the South Esplanade, to name but a few?  
565

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** That is not really a question arising out of the Answer that I have given, but it is not that the cruise liner reception facilities will be forced to be made to work – they *are* working.



570 We have just had our busiest weekend ever with our busiest day ever and it went virtually  
without a hitch to the universal acclaim of everybody involved, including the passengers, the  
master of the vessel and the people who were running the tenders. It is a great success and it has  
worked very well. *(Interjection)* Such a weekend would not have been able to occur on the White  
575 Rock, due to the issues that we had there. It is our busiest weekend ever and it went off virtually  
without a hitch. In the past, on busy days at the White Rock we have seen queues backed as far as  
the weighbridge; we have seen freight lorries in the middle of the road; we have seen passengers  
going to Herm and Sark running in the road against the direction of the freight lorries, carrying  
their bags, trying to make their journey on time because the pavement is full of cruise liner  
passengers. All of that is gone. The tenders came in, they disembarked, they moved out. We had  
580 four at a time on the pontoon, which we would never have had before. We have offloaded our  
busiest day ever and everybody involved in it down there thinks it is a great success.

So it is not going to be *made* to work at any cost to the taxpayer; it *has* worked and it *is*  
working, and it has been achieved overall with the loss of an average of half a car parking space  
per day. We will continue to try and increase the amount of parking available, but it is half a space  
585 per day averaged out over the season. We –

**The Bailiff:** You are out of time. *(Laughter)*  
Deputy Paint, your second question.

590 **Deputy Paint:** Thank you for that answer.

Would the Minister confirm or deny that liner tenders will have the choice in future whether  
they disembark and embark their passengers at the Inter Island Quay or the Albert Pier; and if so,  
why has this only come to light recently?

595 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

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

Visiting cruise liners and cruise ships have the option for tenders to berth at the Inter Island  
Quay, where passengers can be directly transferred from the pontoon to the Sark and Herm  
600 ferries, rather than allowing passengers to disembark and continue on to St Peter Port. This option  
has always been available to the shore excursion companies to assist with the transfer of Herm  
and Sark tour-bound passengers only. All other passengers are routed to the Albert Pier.

**The Bailiff:** Are there any supplementary questions? Do you have a supplementary, Deputy  
605 Paint?

**Deputy Paint:** One supplementary on this one, sir. Is it the intention to make public the risk  
assessment frequently referred to for both approaches to the Inter Island Quay and the Albert  
610 Pier?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** Well, again this is a question that is not arising from the Answer that has been  
given. However, it is not our intention to make public operational risk assessments and neither is  
615 it across the States. No Department makes public its internal risk assessments, and neither should  
they.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel, do you have a supplementary arising from the Answer?

620 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Please, sir. I congratulate the Minister and his Board for amending  
the original plans for coaches to be boarded at the bus terminus, which has now been changed to

the coaches being boarded on the Albert Pier itself, but the Minister has said previously that the arrangements will be reviewed at the end of the season. Can he give me an assurance, please, that it is still the intention of his Board to review the arrangements at the end of the season and amend them if considered necessary?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** We review our arrangements daily. We are always looking for ways that we can seek to make this experience better. A good job has been done so far. There are always improvements. This year is the first season we are operating at the Albert Pier. There will be a number of changes that we will have to make for next year and we will learn what those longer-term changes are as the season goes on. There will be a final meeting at the end of the season where we get together with all the stakeholders and discuss how it has gone and discuss opportunities for change for next year, but we are always reviewing it and we will always continue to attempt to make it better.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Would the Minister agree with me that, under the circumstances, the staff of all the Departments and sections and indeed non-Government stakeholders have worked very well in addressing some of these problems and therefore that bodes well for the future, and that overall this is a very good news story for Guernsey?

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** I would agree. The staff from many Departments have worked together in an extremely collegiate way in order to make this happen and I, as the Chief Minister does, send them my congratulations.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, is this a supplementary arising? Because there are further questions.

**Deputy Gollop:** Well, yes. Would the Minister agree with me that, despite the progress made, there might be detailed changes to information and parking signage to ensure the wider public that there are still parks available on less busy cruise days?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** We ensured over the weekend that signs went up indicating alternative parking to the Albert Pier. They were temporary on this occasion. I am sure we will have better signage for the next trip. It is essential that people who are visiting the Albert Pier and cannot find parking are moved on to where the parking is available.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, and then Deputy Inglis.

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

Would the Minister kindly confirm to States' Members the commitment his Department gave that they will seek further opportunities for parking spaces around the harbour area?

Thank you, sir.

675 **Deputy Ogier:** I do confirm that we are looking at ways to increase parking around there. We have already significantly improved parking facilities over the last six months; we will continue to do so. We are going to look at some hard-to-reach areas to see what can be done in those.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Inglis.

680 **Deputy Inglis:** Thank you, sir.

Would the Minister give reassurance that, following on from the 2013 Retail Strategy Report... he commented that parking might be adequate today but it may well be inadequate tomorrow? I think that time has come and I would seek reassurance, where you talk about dealing with stakeholders at the end of the season, that we clearly talk to retailers beyond the seafront who are not particularly encouraged by what they see and hear in terms of parking for the shoppers, whom they obviously rely on.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

690 **Deputy Ogier:** Of course parking beyond the seafront is something that is outwith the Department's mandate, but Guernsey Harbours and Public Services would be delighted to find some more parking away from the harbour piers because historically the piers are there to service the harbour. They are there to enable sea-based vehicles and passengers to come on to the land. We have used every square inch of our piers that we can for parking and this has been a clash between the original uses of the piers and the uses to which we have put them, so I would welcome parking elsewhere in order to relieve some of the pressure.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Paint, your third Question.

700 **Deputy Paint:** Sir, one more question. Could the Minister confirm or deny that there are plans to employ United Kingdom additional coastguard staff to train local staff for a six-month period in maritime safety standards?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

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

In order to manage the transition and the change from our current arrangements to the new arrangements a support team has been established to assist with the transition of the initial call handling for the coastguard services to the Joint Emergency Services Control Centre (JESCC). This support includes both local staff and UK coastguard staff during an initial period of 12 weeks for this phase of the project. After this initial period staffing arrangements will be reviewed and adjustments made as required.

**The Bailiff:** Any supplementary, Deputy Paint?

715 **Deputy Paint:** Yes, just one supplementary, sir. Could the Minister confirm that JESCC is now working efficiently on a 24-hour operation mode regarding the coastguard operations and that all maritime electronic equipment is working satisfactorily in the call centre, including DSC and DF equipment?

720 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier, I am not sure that arises from that.

**Deputy Ogier:** It does not, and I will... JESCC has been operational with the coastguards for all of the last week. There have been no issues that have been reported to the Board. As to the technicality of the equipment, I am afraid I will have to get back to Deputy Paint on it.

**HOME DEPARTMENT**

**Cotentin –  
French nuclear installations**

**The Bailiff:** I see no-one else rising with a supplementary question, so we can move on to the next series of Questions, which are to be asked by Deputy De Lisle of the Minister for the Home Department. Deputy De Lisle.

730 **Deputy De Lisle:** Yes, thank you, sir. Three Questions to the Minister of the Home Department regarding French nuclear installations in the Cotentin.

The first Question, sir: last month it was reported that French regulators have been informed of manufacturing anomalies in components particularly important for safety at Flamanville reactor after an investigation revealed potential weaknesses in the steel used to make its safety casing.  
735 There are fears that a third reactor being built at Flamanville, just 30 miles from Guernsey and even closer to Alderney, is unsafe. What action is the Home Department taking in light of these safety threats?

**The Bailiff:** The Minister, Deputy Gillson, will reply.  
740

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

The Home Department did not view this manufacturing anomaly report as a safety threat, and the majority of Members continue to be confident in the security and safety protocols surrounding the French nuclear site at Flamanville. The manufacturing anomaly relates only to the  
745 third EPR reactor, which is yet to come online at Flamanville. It was reported to the nuclear watchdog ASN by the manufacturing company Arriva. Further testing is being carried out. The report of this anomaly highlights the seriousness with which the French authorities take these responsibilities, and the Home Department will continue to liaise closely with counterparts in France.

750 **The Bailiff:** Any supplementaries?

**Deputy De Lisle:** A supplementary, sir.

755 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Joe Carnegie, the Jersey Emergency Planning Officer, said recently that he planned to meet with French officials soon to remind them that we are here. (*Laughter*) Will this  
760 Island's Emergency Planning Officer be meeting the authorities in France alongside his counterpart in Jersey to ensure the safety concerns of Guernsey people are forcefully represented; and how long do we have to wait for a meeting with the French authorities to take place?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

765 **Deputy Gillson:** The Home Department staff, together with colleagues from the States of Jersey, will be meeting with French authorities in July this year as part of an annual emergency planning liaison meeting, at which we will discuss all of these issues.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Thank you for that answer.  
770 Can I ask a further supplementary, sir?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

775 **Deputy De Lisle:** Flamanville was supposed to come on stream in 2012 for €3 billion. It will enter service in 2017 now, at the earliest, at a cost of €9 billion. Given this cost escalation and the fact that delays cost Arriva losses of €4.9 billion last year, will the company be prepared to take the faulty vessel out and replace it with a new one? Can the Minister answer that?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson. *(Laughter)*

780 **Deputy Gillson:** There is an awful lot in there which I cannot answer, but we are confident that the French nuclear watchdog will ensure that the plant is produced in line with its specification, in line with safety protocols, so that it will operate safely.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle, your second Question.

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

We expect a lot from our Ministers these days! *(Laughter and interjections)*

790 Sir, the second Question is that the Bailiwick of Guernsey is not only in sight of Flamanville, which sits under a cliff face to the south of Dielette, but it is also close to Cap de la Hague, one of the world's largest nuclear reprocessing sites. Does the Island's Environmental Health Unit and Radiation Advisory Group regularly test milk, seafood and seaweed for radioactivity; and if so, how often is this done and what levels, maximum and median, have emerged from the tests over the last five years?

795 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

800 **Deputy Gillson:** Mr Bailiff, fish, shellfish, seaweed, milk, water and edible locally grown produce are tested for radioactivity as part of an ongoing annual sampling programme. Due to the number and spectrum of samples taken over the last five years it is not readily possible to provide maximum and median levels. All of the results are, however, well below those that would lead to doses that would exceed either the statutory UK annual dose limit to members of the public of one millisievert, European Union limits or European government targets. All the results were therefore notably below any levels which would lead to unacceptable doses as a result of dietary intake.

805 **The Bailiff:** Any supplementaries from anyone? No.

**Deputy De Lisle:** My third Question, sir?

810 **The Bailiff:** Yes.

**Deputy De Lisle:** What guidance is provided locally for Islanders in the event of a nuclear incident?

815 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy Gillson:** Mr Bailiff, in the highly unlikely event of a nuclear incident the advice would be to go in, stay in and tune in until further information is available from the authorities.

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

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I thank the Minister. I am sure that the public will be reassured by that answer. *(Laughter)*

**TREASURY AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

**Aurigny –  
Depreciation policy**

825 **The Bailiff:** The next Questions are to be asked by Alderney Representative Jean of the Minister of the Treasury & Resources Department. Alderney Representative Jean.

**Alderney Representative Jean:** Question 1: could the Minister explain to the States Aurigny's depreciation policy for (a) aircraft and (b) other capital assets?

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

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, Aurigny's accounting policies are prepared in accordance with applicable UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice and companies legislation.

835 In accordance with aviation industry practice and the requirements of Financial Reporting Standard 15 for tangible fixed assets, the cost of each aircraft is split into its main components and each component is depreciated over the remaining useful economic life of that component. The remaining useful economic life of each component is expressed either as flying hours or aircraft landings and the annual depreciation charge is calculated by reference to the number of hours flown or landings made by each aircraft during the accounting period. The cost of major  
840 maintenance inputs is also capitalised and depreciated over the length of time until the input needs repeating.

Other capital assets are depreciated on either a reducing balance or a straight line basis. Aurigny's most recently available audited accounts for 2013 show that ground equipment, motor vehicles, and furniture and equipment also depreciated on a reducing balance basis at a rate of  
845 20%, 25% and 20% respectively. Radio equipment, buildings, tools and equipment, and computer equipment are depreciated on a straight line basis at a rate of 10%, 20%, 20% and 25% respectively.

850 **The Bailiff:** Do you have a supplementary question Alderney Representative Jean, or do you wish to move on to your second Question?

**Alderney Representative Jean:** Question 2: is Aurigny's accounting policy for depreciation policy consistent with the depreciation policy the States of Guernsey applies to capital assets in other wholly owned enterprises?  
855

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

860 **Deputy St Pier:** The States of Guernsey has not adopted a depreciation policy for application to its wholly owned enterprises and nor would it be appropriate for it to do so. The operations of each of these entities are diverse and entirely different. It is for the board of directors of each company to determine the most appropriate depreciation policies that are applicable, taking into account the type of assets involved, the relevant accounting policies and industry practice. Such policies will, of course, be scrutinised by the companies' respective independent auditors, and it is open to them to comment on whether or not they are appropriate for the entity concerned.  
865

**The Bailiff:** Are there any supplementary questions? Yes, Alderney Representative Jean.

870 **Alderney Representative Jean:** Yes, if I could ask if I could have a copy of that statement, it would be useful to me, and also at the same time may I thank you for your answers.

**The Bailiff:** You should have had a copy supplied to you in advance. I am sure that will be made available if it has not been.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

875

**Deputy Gollop:** I beg to ask a supplementary on that. Bearing in mind the Minister's Answers, will he consider whether it is right that perhaps the depreciation policy could lead to Aurigny, in some circumstances, being seen to make an artificially larger loss on the new Dornier-operated routes, which could therefore lead to viability and fare issues, whereas a reconsideration of accounting policy would not, in practice, lead to such negative outcomes?

880

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, as I indicated to the Assembly in a previous comment, the impact of the Dorniers will be to increase the depreciation charge because of the additional value that has been acquired, so Deputy Gollop's point is quite right, but I did assure the Assembly at that time that the impact on fare levels was something that needed to be taken into account and was the reason for having a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between all the relevant parties in relation to Alderney and its services.

885

It would not be appropriate, I would suggest, sir, to be changing the accounting policies. Those, as I said in my earlier Answer, need to be driven by applicable standards and applicable accounting policies in order that the company can produce a set of accounts which are true and fair.

890

**The Bailiff:** Any further supplementaries? No.

Before we move on to the next Questions, Deputy Adam, do you wish to be *relevé*?

895

**Deputy Adam:** Yes, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

900

## HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

### Stroke patients – Treatment and costs

**The Bailiff:** The next Questions are to be asked by Deputy Domaille of the Minister of the Health & Social Services Department. Deputy Domaille.

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

905

In the recently considered Medical Officer of Health's Annual Report heart disease and strokes were identified as causing approximately 30% of deaths in Guernsey. According to the National Audit Office, around one in four people who have a stroke die. Survivors suffer a range of problems and half of them are left dependent on others for everyday activities. About one quarter of strokes occur in people under 65, and this number is shown to be increasing.

910

First question, sir: on average how many cases of stroke, including transient ischemic attacks, occur in Guernsey every year; how many of these strokes are admitted to hospital; and how many people die every year as the result of a stroke?

Thank you, sir.

915 **The Bailiff:** The Minister, Deputy Luxon, will reply.

**Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, of deaths in 2010 to 2012 an average of 54 deaths a year were recorded from a stroke. Between 2010 and 2014 an average of 92 cases of stroke, including transient ischemic attacks, occurred per annum. These were reported cases involving admission.  
920 Of these cases, approximately 25% to 30% resulted in death of the patient. In 2014, 103 patients were recorded as admitted to the PEH for a primary diagnosis of stroke and 14 people for a transient ischemic attack.

In addition to the above patients it has been indicated that there are a significant number of stroke attack cases that are not admitted to hospital or attend as outpatients, with the data  
925 available from our partners as follows: 2010, 75 patients; 2011, approximately 90; 2012, approximately 92; 2013, approximately 75; and 2014, 93 patients.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

930 **Deputy Domaille:** Just a supplementary on that, sir, if I may.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

**Deputy Domaille:** Some of the figures that have been quoted have referred to an audit. Could  
935 I ask if the audit was carried out in house or by an independent body, and did it include not only acute stroke care but also the rehabilitation service?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

940 **Deputy Luxon:** Sir, I do not have that information available to me, but I will come back to Deputy Domaille with it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

945 **Deputy Domaille:** I thank the Minister, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille your second Question.

**Deputy Domaille:** In 2012 England alone had approximately 110,000 strokes and 20,000  
950 transient ischaemic attacks, and there were around 300,000 people living with moderate to severe disabilities as a result of a stroke. Strokes are the biggest single cause of adult disability in the UK. The National Audit Office has stated that the direct care cost of strokes is at least £3 billion annually, with a wider economic cost of about £8 billion.

Approximately how many people in Guernsey are living with moderate to severe disabilities as  
955 a result of a stroke, and what is the estimated annual direct care cost of strokes and the wider economic cost to Guernsey?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

960 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, no definitive data currently exists, but best estimates are of around 800 to 900 people currently living in Guernsey with moderate to severe disabilities as a result of a stroke. Accordingly, due to their being no definitive data, it is not possible to currently provide figures on direct care costs and the wider economic costs, although they will be significant.

965 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.



**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir. A supplementary?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

970 **Deputy Domaille:** Would the Minister agree that this basic information should be identified in any audit of the stroke care service, and that the 2010-14 audits should have contained this information?

Thank you.

975 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** I have to agree with Deputy Domaille that the information would be useful, would be important, but clearly that has not been able to be achieved.

980 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille, your third Question.

**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir, and I thank the Minister for his frank Answer there; it is very good.

985 The National Audit Office and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence stress that there are clear economic and patient benefits in having a fast emergency response with early access to professional help and diagnosis. NICE has issued extensive guidance on stroke diagnosis and treatment, including a stroke care pathway and quality statements, which health professionals are expected to meet. NICE's quality standards require for patients who have a possible diagnosis of a stroke to be transferred to a specialist stroke unit within one hour.

990 Question, sir: does Guernsey have a specialist acute stroke unit, or rapid access to one, or ready access to appropriate professionals; and if not, why not?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

995 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, Guernsey has no specialist acute stroke unit. However, there is rapid access to appropriate professionals. Stroke patients are usually admitted to Brock Ward from A&E or Critical Care Unit depending on the treatment required. The nursing staff on Brock Ward maintain the appropriate levels of skill and knowledge in relation to care and management of stroke patients. There are written guidelines for assessment and referral to other health professionals, which are required to be undertaken in the first 72 hours of admission.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

1005 **Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir. A supplementary on that?

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

1010 **Deputy Domaille:** The Minister may not be able to answer it, but is the Minister aware that under the Cochrane review it was found that a specialist stroke unit gave a 22% relative reduction in either death or dependency for stroke patients?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1015 **Deputy Luxon:** Sir, I have not read that review, but I am aware that that figure that Deputy Domaille quotes is an accepted approximation, yes.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley, you have a supplementary question?

**Deputy Hadley:** Is the Minister aware that in fact the Department did try setting up a stroke unit some years ago but, because of the number of patients and the economics on this Island, it did not prove to be a cost-effective exercise?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Yes, sir. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille, your next Question.

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

Stroke victims cannot wait. Speed may not only be the difference between life and death; it also dictates the quality of a patient's life. Standards require that patients with a suspected stroke receive brain imaging within one hour of arrival at hospital if they meet any of the indications for immediate imaging. In 2012 the UK national median time from onset of a stroke to first scan was five and a half hours. HSSD's median time was 17¾ hours, three times the national delay in being scanned and over 17 times the maximum recommended delay time.

Question 4: what are the current national median delay and HSSD's median delay between onset of symptoms and a first scan?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, HSSD does not retain this information currently in Guernsey. Guernsey does not take part in the UK Sentinel/National Audit Programme, due to a lack of resources. However, in the 2012 report the UK national median delay time from onset of symptoms to hospital arrival was 479 minutes and the time between arrival and first scan was 140 minutes, giving a total time of onset to first scan of 619 minutes, or 10 hours 19 minutes.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** Supplementary, sir, if I may.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

**Deputy Domaille:** Given this information was available in 2012 and the significant difference between the recommended delay time and our own time, does the Minister agree that this basic information should be identified before any meaningful assessment of the appropriateness of our stroke care can be made?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** I do not know that I completely agree with Deputy Domaille's point, but his point about this information and this data being collected, measured and managed would, of course, make absolute sense. The reality for HSSD is, as he and others will know, that there are many demands on the Department's resources – far more than the capability and capacity that currently exists.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir, and I thank the Minister for his answer. I do recognise the problems he faces.

1070 In 2012 the CT scanning and thrombolysis service was only available, Monday to Friday, between the hours of eight o'clock and six o'clock in the evening. At that time approximately 30% of patients were admitted outside of these times on Mondays and Fridays. This 30% does not include those admitted over weekends where the service was not available.

1075 Will the Minister advise on the hours when the scanning and thrombolysis service is available and when it is not? Will he also advise as to the number of patients who suffer strokes outside of these hours and how long it may be before they receive a first scan?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon:

1080 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, the thrombolysis service officially runs from 8.00 a.m. until 10.00 p.m. seven days per week. It was estimated that we were would potentially miss one patient episode when this service level was agreed.

1085 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille. Oh, sorry, Deputy Bebb has a supplementary question.

**Deputy Bebb:** Yes, a supplementary on that.

Would the Minister agree with me that the importance of receiving a scan is not just the availability of the scan, but also the availability of those who would be able to interpret the images?

1090

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Deputy Bebb is absolutely right, sir.

1095 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

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

1100 NICE requires that patients with an acute stroke are to have their swallowing screened by a specially trained healthcare professional within four hours of admission. What is the median time for such screening in Guernsey?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1105 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, registered nursing staff in A&E would complete a swallowing screen within four hours of the patient's admission.

**The Bailiff:** Any supplementary? No.  
Your next Question then, Deputy Domaille.

1110 **Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir.

1115 NICE also requires that patients with acute stroke are to be assessed and managed by stroke nursing staff and at least one member of a specialist rehabilitation team within 24 hours of admission and by all relevant members of a specialist rehabilitation team within 72 hours, with documented multi-discipline goals agreed within five hours. Does Guernsey meet these standards; and if not, what provisions are there and how to our standards and times compare to the UK standards?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1120 **Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, nursing staff follow the NICE guideline on assessment of care for the first 72 hours of care, making referrals to the appropriate members of the team. However, there is

no weekend service from therapy teams at this time. Therefore, on occasions, stroke patients may only be assessed by the nursing staff within the first 24 hours of an incident.

1125 **The Bailiff:** Any supplementary?

**Deputy Domaille:** Just a quick supplementary, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

1130

**Deputy Domaille:** It may be that I have had a senior moment, but if they are not available at the weekend, surely it should be 48 hours as the maximum time for assessment, not 24.

1135 **Deputy Luxon:** I do not profess to be a clinician. I will check the accuracy of that answer and come back to Deputy Domaille, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Your next Question, Deputy Domaille.

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

1140

Together with early treatment, professional after-stroke care is essential. In Guernsey, in 2012, it was estimated approximately 36 acquired brain injury patients, whose quality of life would have benefited from specialist assessment and rehabilitation, were discharged every year from the hospital. NICE has set standards for patient rehabilitation with a goal of a move towards home care and the return to as independent a life as possible. Patients benefit from an improved quality life and the taxpayer benefits from reduced costs.

1145

Does the Health & Social Services Department provide a rehabilitation service, and does it meet NICE standards? For instance, are patients offered at least 45 minutes of active therapy for five days a week?

Thank you, sir.

1150

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1155

**Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, rehabilitation takes place on Le Marchant Ward. The NICE guidelines state 'relevant therapy', which means that not every stroke patient has necessarily every type of therapy. Care provided by the HSSD stroke team is patient centred and tailored to the patient's individual needs. It is entirely possible that some stroke patients will require no physiotherapy as part of their rehabilitation but could receive daily neuropsychology.

The NICE guideline 1.2.16 states:

'offer initially at least 45 minutes of each relevant stroke therapy for a minimum of five days per week to people who have the ability to participate.'

Further, NICE guideline 1.2.18 states:

'if people with stroke are unable to participate in 45 minutes of each rehabilitation therapy ensure that therapy is still offered five days per week for a shorter time at an intensity that allows them to actively participate.'

1160 **The Bailiff:** Any supplementaries?

**Deputy Domaille:** Supplementary, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

1165

**Deputy Domaille:** With regard to the rehabilitation service, in 2012 the Department identified the need for additional resources – in particular, three rehabilitation assistants, two nursing staff and two-and-a-half occupational therapy assistants. Have these additional resources been engaged; and if not, why not?

1170

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Sir, I cannot confirm that, but again I am very happy to come back to Deputy Domaille with the specific answers.

1175

**The Bailiff:** Your next question then, Deputy Domaille.

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

1180

Does the Health & Social Services Department work with outside agencies to oversee discharged stroke patient care, and are carers provided with a main point of contact for stroke information, written information about the patient's diagnosis and management plan, and sufficient practical training to enable them to provide care?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1185

**Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, HSSD does work with outside agencies to support stroke patients' care. HSSD has a stroke co-ordinator who is the main point of contact and provides follow-up reviews to patients post discharge.

1190

**The Bailiff:** Any supplementaries? No.  
Your final question then, Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** Yes, at last! Thank you, sir.

1195

The Medical Officer of Health's report recommended the development of cardiovascular and cancer clinical strategies. HSSD's 2020 Vision Strategy's three aims include improving outcomes for people who use its services. The Vision states that people should have access to support as early as possible at a time when they are most receptive to it, and people who are at particular risk or have a particularly high level of need should be identified and offered targeted support. The 2012 Vision identified stroke care as one of the strategies requiring development support.

1200

In view of Guernsey's aging demographics, the increasing incidence of strokes in younger people and the States' strategic aims and objectives, what improvements are the Department planning for stroke care?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

1205

**Deputy Luxon:** Mr Bailiff, as new evidence comes through and with improved monitoring, the Department, along with its consulting partners, will review and improve the stroke care service where possible and as budget allows. The financial demands on HSSD will, of course, dictate some of that capability.

1210

**The Bailiff:** You have a supplementary, Deputy Domaille?

**Deputy Domaille:** Yes, sir, thank you.

1215

Is the Minister able to confirm that the stroke care service will be included in the review outlined by the Treasury Minister earlier this morning?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** No, it is not overtly, sir, although the benchmarking review that Treasury & Resources and HSSD are currently undertaking does look at the entire HSSD service; so in general terms, yes, but not in specific terms, as I think Deputy Domaille is asking.

**The Bailiff:** Do you have another supplementary?

**Deputy Domaille:** Just one more supplementary, sir  
In 2012 the need for a continuing clinical audit programme to monitor and measure clinical outcomes and the occupational therapy ongoing rehabilitation process was identified as being essential. Is this being done?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Sir, again I will come back to Deputy Domaille specifically. What I would say is that there are many strategies and many initiatives that have been either agreed or were indicated would be followed in HSSD that simply have not, due to a lack of resources within the Department.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** Does the Minister agree with me that it is important that people reduce their susceptibility to strokes, and indeed heart attacks, by adopting a healthy lifestyle, reducing the intakes of fats, increasing the consumption of fruit and vegetables, and taking regular exercise; and is he not sending a strong message to the people of Guernsey that there is unlikely to be an improved stroke care service, if it is deemed necessary, while the Department is inadequately... underfunded?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** I think there are several yesses in answer to that question, sir. This is a serious point. The point I am making is that there are resource implications within the Department. This is a very serious area, and of course the Department must take its responsibilities seriously and look to develop the service as it can.

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

### **Human rights legislation – Impact on Guernsey of potential UK changes**

**The Bailiff:** We move on to the final series of Questions, which are to be asked by Deputy Gollop of the Chief Minister. Deputy Gollop.

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

I know subsequent to asking the Questions *The Sun* has said that perhaps the UK government are not moving as quickly as they might have done, but my Question to the Chief Minister is that given that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP, is now leading a Conservative majority government potentially pledged and committed to fundamentally revising, maybe, or withdrawing from the current prescriptions of the United Kingdom Human

Rights Act linked to the European Convention, how will that affect Guernsey people's rights, duties, obligations and requirements?

1265       **The Bailiff:** Chief Minister.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Sir, as usual, Deputy Gollop has hinted in his preamble at the Answer to the Question.

1270       Sir, the UK's Human Rights Act 1998 has not been extended to the Bailiwick of Guernsey. The Human Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2000, which is similar to the UK's Human Rights Act, was brought into force on 1st September 2006. The relationship between the UK's Human Rights Act and Guernsey's Human Rights Law was further clarified by the Supreme Court in 2014 in *Barclay v Secretary of State for Justice and Lord Chancellor UKSC54*.

1275       The proposal made in the Conservative Party manifesto is to repeal the Human Rights Act and replace it with a British Bill of Rights. It is also proposed that the Bill will remain faithful to the basic principles of human rights, which are described in the European Convention on Human Rights.

1280       **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop, do you have a supplementary question?

**Deputy Gollop:** No, I think I will leave it until after the second Question.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize has.

1285       **Deputy Fallaize:** Yes, I do have a supplementary question.

1290       I am not entirely clear from the Chief Minister's Answer... In the event that the UK government is stupid enough to do what it said in the Conservative Party manifesto, is the Chief Minister saying that the domestication of the Human Rights Act to the local courts need in no way be affected by any decision that is made by the UK government *vis-à-vis* withdrawal and the replacement by a British Bill of Rights?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

1295       **The Chief Minister:** Sir, yes, generally speaking. It obviously depends on what they intend in the UK to do and how that would affect our Law and any precedents as set in the UK under the changes in that Law, and I think I will answer some of that in Deputy Gollop's second Question.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1300       **Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, Deputy Fallaize and the Chief Minister.

Will the Policy Council be consulting on considering drafting a Guernsey or Channel Island Bill of Rights, or indeed an insular code on statutory human rights?

1305       **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

**The Chief Minister:** A draft Bill has not yet been published, and as Deputy Gollop just hinted at before, overnight it has transpired that it seems that the Prime Minister of the UK is indicating that this will not be the sort of change to the legislation that the manifesto said, but rather a consultation.

1310       Nevertheless, a draft Bill has not been published so it is not clear how this Bill may or may not change how these rights are given and take effect in the UK or what the implications may or may not be for Guernsey.

1315 The Policy Council has already engaged with the Ministry of Justice on this matter, however, in particular with Lord Faulks, who is the Minister responsible for managing the relationship with the Crown Dependencies and who chaired the commission on a Bill of Rights established by the last UK government. This discussion will, of course, continue as it becomes clear how a British Bill of Rights would give effect to these rights and what the difference might be to the UK's Human Rights Act or to Guernsey's Human Rights Law. The Policy Council will then be in a position to consider the options for Guernsey.

1320 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

1325 **Deputy Gollop:** Two supplementaries. The first supplementary follows up Deputy Fallaize's point, which is would the Policy Council envisage, as perhaps a fall-back position, maintaining Guernsey's existing and long-held relationship with the European Convention on Human Rights (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) as a mainstream policy?

1330 **The Chief Minister:** I think it would be up to the Policy Council as a whole to make a decision at that time, but I can say personally that that would be my intention. I think we have got our own Law in place, we have worked hard to do that and at the moment I see no reason to change.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you.

1335 My second question is: there have been politicians in this Chamber past and present and learned lawyers who have suggested that it would be in Guernsey's interest to consider our own insular Bill of Rights and Privileges. Would you consider that an aim for the Policy Council or its successor to seriously consider as a part of external relations and constitutional reform?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

1340 **The Chief Minister:** I think the options being viewed by the Constitutional Investigation Committee do touch on this issue, and it certainly would be prudent for us in our options appraisal, if there are any changes in the UK, to investigate whether such a Bill of Rights, whether it is just for the Bailiwick of Guernsey or may involve Jersey in some way that we could work together on that, could be appropriate. However, at this juncture I think our Human Rights Law is working well and the courts here are able to make decisions based on that Law that are transparent, and I see no need personally to change.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

1350 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, Monsieur Le Bailli.

1355 Would the Chief Minister agree with me that the main concerns as laid out in the Conservative manifesto are not in relation to the Convention but in relation to the way that they are applied in the UK as a result of the current UK Act, and as such – and a review of the Act is what is being considered – is it not appropriate for us to simply wait and not to be premature, because a number of options may be possible to the UK government, and rather than jumping to a fearful position, patience is the better part of valour here?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

1360 **The Chief Minister:** That is what I was hinting at in my responses to Deputy Gollop. I am making it clear, I hope, to this Assembly, and indeed to the community as a whole, that the Policy Council is already on the case and has been in liaison with Lord Faulks. He continues to be our main point of contact with the Ministry of Justice and I will be seeing him in the next few weeks. And so those options, as they are drawn up... and bearing in mind that changes, obviously, to



1365 manifesto pledges can be made overnight, we will address them as and when it is appropriate but we will not be wasting resources on speculative positions.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb, your second supplementary.

1370 **Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, Monsieur Le Bailli, and thank you to the Chief Minister for that response, which I wholly endorse.

The other question that I would like to pose to him is: would he agree with me that the concerns that have been raised in the UK in relation to the use of the Act have not transpired here in Guernsey, and therefore it would be wholly inappropriate for us to reconsider our current Law  
1375 which we believe to be working fairly well?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Tocq.

**The Chief Minister:** Yes, again, I am aware of some of the concerns in the UK, which are  
1380 obviously dealing with situations that are quite different to here in Guernsey, and, as a result of that, that would be one of my prime reasons for not amending our legislation as it currently stands. But if there are innovations or improvements that can be made we would be foolish not to look at them in the future.

1385 **The Bailiff:** No-one else is rising and I have not had notice of any other Questions, so that concludes Question Time, and we move on to legislation.  
Greffier.

## Billet d'État IX

### ORDINANCES LAID BEFORE THE STATES

#### I. Social Security (Reciprocal Agreement with the Republic of Chile) Ordinance, 2015 – Approved

##### *Article I*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled 'The Social Security (Reciprocal Agreement with the Republic Of Chile) Ordinance, 2015', and direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.*

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet IX, Article I, Social Security (Reciprocal Agreement with the Republic of Chile) Ordinance, 2015.

1390

**The Bailiff:** This Ordinance is in the brochure. Is there any request for debate or clarification? No. We go to the vote. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1395

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

**STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS LAID BEFORE THE STATES**

**The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2015;  
The Driving Tests (Fees) Regulations, 2015**

**The Deputy Greffier:** Statutory Instruments laid before the States: The Land Planning and Development (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations, 2015; The Driving Tests (Fees) Regulations, 2015.

1400 **The Bailiff:** I have not had notice of any motion to annul either.

**II. Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986 –  
Election of new Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Panel of Members –  
Deputy Fallaize and Douzenier Heaume M.B.E. elected**

*Article II*

*To elect, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (2) of the Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986:*

- 1. a Chairman of the Panel of Members, who shall be a sitting member of the States of Deliberation and who has held a seat in the States for a period of three years or more, to fill the vacancy which will arise on 1st June, 2015, by reason of the expiry of the term of office of Deputy M. J. Fallaize, who is eligible for re-election.*
- 2. a Deputy Chairman of that Panel, who shall be one of the Deans of the Douzaines but who shall not have a seat in the States, to fill the vacancy which will arise on 1st June, 2015, by reason of the expiry of the term of office of Douzenier R L Heaume, M.B.E, who is eligible for re-election.*

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet IX, Article II, Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986, Panel of Members, election of new Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

**The Bailiff:** Chief Minister.

1405

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Sir, in rising, I am very grateful to Deputy Fallaize for his chairing of this august body, and of course he took on that chairmanship as part of the expired end of the term of its previous incumbent. I am also grateful to him because he is willing to stand again for election, as is Douzenier Heaume. That is important for continuity, because we do want to see some reform

1410

So I ask Members to support the re-election of Deputy Fallaize as Chairman and Douzenier Heaume as the Vice-Chairman.

**The Bailiff:** Do we have a seconder for, first of all, Deputy Fallaize? Yes, Deputy Le Pelley.

1415

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Yes, I would like to second both of them.

**The Bailiff:** You second both. Thank you very much.  
Do we have any other nominations? No.

1420

In that case, we go first to the vote on the Proposition to re-elect Deputy Fallaize as the Chairman of the Administrative Decisions Review Board. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1425

**The Bailiff:** I declare him elected.

Secondly, on the Proposition to re-elect Douzaine Representative Heaume as the Vice-Chairman. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1430

**The Bailiff:** I declare him elected.

**III. The Ladies' College Board of Governors –  
Election of new members –  
Mr John Marren and Mrs Stephanie Ann Nickolls elected**

*Article III*

*The States are asked to elect:*

*1. as a member of the Ladies' College Board of Governors with effect from 1st June, 2015, Mr John Marren who has been nominated in that behalf by the Education Department for election by the States.*

*2. as a member of that Board of Governors with effect from 1st June, 2015, Mrs Stephanie Ann Nickolls who has been nominated in that behalf by the States appointed Governors and the Education Department nominated Governors for election by the States.*

**The Deputy Greffier:** Article III. Ladies' College Board of Governors, Election of new members.

1435 **The Bailiff:** We will deal, first of all, with the election of a member nominated by the Education Department, and, as you will see on page 979 of the Billet, John Marren is the nominee. Deputy Sillars, you confirm that?

**Deputy Sillars:** I do, sir.

1440 **The Bailiff:** There is no ability for anyone else to nominate anybody on the floor of this Assembly because it is only the Education Department who can do so, so we go to the vote on the Proposition that John Marren be elected to the Board of the Ladies' College Board of Governors. Those in favour; those against.

1445 *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare him elected.

1450 And secondly, we have the nomination of a member of that Board to be nominated by the States appointed Governors and the Education Department nominated Governors, and it is Stephanie Ann Nickolls who is being put forward for re-election. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare her re-elected.

**TREASURY & RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

**V. Treasury & Resources Department –  
Taxation of Real Property Appeals Panel –  
Appointment of new Chairman and Deputy Chairman –  
Mrs Caroline Latham FRICS and Mr John Weir FRICS appointed**

*Article V.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 19th March, 2015, of the Treasury and Resources Department, they are of the opinion:*

- 1. To designate Mrs. Caroline Latham FRICS as Chairman of the Panel and Mr John Weir FRICS as Deputy Chairman of the Panel.*
- 2. To note the resignations of Mr Le Maître and Advocate Dunster from the Panel with immediate effect.*

1455 **The Deputy Greffier:** Article V. Treasury & Resources Department, Taxation of Real Property Appeals Panel, appointment of a new Chairman and a new Deputy Chairman.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

1460 **Deputy St Pier:** Thank you, sir.

This panel has existed since 2008, since the introduction of the TRP legislation, and we have been very fortunate with the individuals who have served on it and the continuity that that has provided in an important role. The current, or the former, Chairman of the panel Mr Stuart Le Maître has tendered his resignation because he is no longer eligible, having been elected as a Constable in the Vale; and similarly, Advocate Dunster has also tendered his resignation, as a Constable in St Peter's.

1465 I think what I would like to do first of all, sir, is express our appreciation, particularly to Mr Stuart Le Maître for his service to this Panel.

1470 The Department is proposing that the Deputy Chair, Mrs Caroline Latham, who has served in that role since the inception of the panel, be elected Chair, and that Mr John Weir, who has also served on the panel since its inception, become the Vice-Chair. Their details do appear on page 1047 of the Billet. The Department have been through a process of seeking expressions of interest and seeking to ascertain the attributes of those who had expressed interest against those which were required. So we have no hesitation in recommending both of those appointments to you, sir, and also to note the resignations as I have noted.

1475 There is one further matter that I would to draw attention to, which is paragraph 4.1 on page 1045, where we draw attention to the fact that the Department wishes to note – and this is not a Proposition, but merely to draw attention to it – that we do intend to undertake a review of the associated legislation. The panel have noted some lacunae in the associated appeals processes and we will be consulting on that during 2015.

1480 But, sir, we have no hesitation in recommending these two appointments to Members.

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

1485 Members, there are two Propositions on page 1048 of the Billet. I put first the Proposition to designate Mrs Caroline Latham FRICS as Chairman of the panel, and Mr John Weir FRICS as Deputy Chairman of the panel. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1490 **The Bailiff:** I declare that carried.

And secondly, to note the resignations of Mr Le Maître and Advocate Dunster from the Panel with immediate effect. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

1495

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

## **APPOINTMENT LAID BEFORE THE STATES**

### **Commerce and Employment Department – Appointment of Chairman of the Board of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman**

**The Deputy Greffier:** Appointment laid before the States. Commerce & Employment Department, appointment of Chairman of the Board of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman.

1500

**The Bailiff:** That is laid before the States. I have not had notice of any motion to annul the appointment, so that concludes elections and we move on to debate on policy letters.

### **Procedural – Motion to debate Billet X**

1505

**The Bailiff:** The Minister for the Education Department has advised me that it would be his wish that the debate on Billet X – that is the Education Department's Report on Redeveloping the La Mare De Carteret Schools' Site Post Review – be taken next, and I would put that to you as a procedural motion. The motion will be that we immediately move to debate on Billet X. So if you wish to do so, vote *Pour*. If you wish to take matters in their normal order, in which event we would move on to the Financial Transformation Programme End of Programme Report from the Policy Council and then Commerce & Employment Department's Report on Utilities, Laying and Maintaining Services in Private Land, before coming to the Education Department Report... If that is what you wish to do, vote *Contre*. I hope that is clear to everyone.

1510

So the motion is that we move immediately to debate Billet X. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

1515

**The Bailiff:** Well, certainly the volume of noise was louder on the second, (*Laughter*) but whether it actually is a majority of Members, I am not sure. I think we will have to go to a recorded vote to be certain of that. So we are going to a recorded vote on the procedural motion to move immediately to debate of Billet X.

1520

So if you wish to move immediately to debate the Education Department's Report on Redeveloping La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site vote *Pour*. If you want to do that debate later, and it will be after all the other business, then vote *Contre*. So if you want to move immediately to debate the Education Department Report vote *Pour*.

The motion is to move immediately to debate on Billet X.

1525

**The Deputy Greffier:** The voting begins with the Castel District.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried – Pour 24, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Dorey		Deputy James
Deputy Green	Deputy Le Tocq		Deputy Langlois
Deputy Paint	Deputy Adam		Deputy Storey
Deputy Wilkie	Deputy Perrot		Deputy Spruce
Deputy Burford	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Luxon		
Deputy Sillars	Deputy Kuttelwascher		
Deputy O'Hara	Deputy Domaille		
Deputy Quin	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Hadley	Deputy Gollop		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Bebb		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy St Pier		
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Stewart		
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Ogier		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Conder	Deputy Fallaize		
Deputy Lester Queripel	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Gillson			
Deputy David Jones			
Deputy Laurie Queripel			
Deputy Lowe			
Deputy Collins			

1530 **The Bailiff:** Members, the result of the vote on the procedural motion was 24 in favour, 19 against, so we will move on immediately to debate Billet X. Greffier, if you could just announce the Article.

## Billet d'État X

### EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

#### **I. Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review – Debate commenced**

*Article I.*

*The States are asked to decide:*

*Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 8th April, 2015, of the Education Department, they are of the opinion:*

*1. To approve the Education Department progressing to tender for the construction of the La Mare de Carteret Schools project comprising of:*

*(a) the replacement of the High School facilities for a five-form entry school for up to 600 students with scope for expansion for up to 960 students;*

*(b) the replacement of two-form entry Primary School facilities for up to 420 pupils;*

*(c) a replacement co-provisioned pre-school Nursery of up to 130m<sup>2</sup> adjacent to the Primary School for approximately 32 children aged 3-4 on a part-time attendance basis, allowing for groups of up to 16 children at any one time;*

*(d) club level competition indoor Sports Hall facilities within the schools' new sports facilities, focused on completing the federated approach to the provision of shared resources for sport within the States secondary education sector, the avoidance of unnecessary duplication and*

*optimising efficient dual-use school/community provision for netball, basketball and volleyball, as advised by the Culture and Leisure Department and the Guernsey Sports Commission;*

*(e) the relocation of a Communication and Autism Base of up to 200m<sup>2</sup> placed between the two schools to provide a designated unit for up to 18 children in the Primary School and a designated unit for up to 18 children in the High School and to be the base for the provision of outreach services for Bailiwick school age children and for advice to pre-school providers; and*

*(f) provision of community facilities for families and the older generation within the schools and sports buildings as a mix of a discrete access suite of rooms of 150m<sup>2</sup> as part of the Sports Building and through the sharing of school facilities.*

*2. To delegate authority to the Treasury and Resources Department to approve a capital vote, charged to the Capital Reserve, of a maximum amount of £60.2 million (excluding inflation) to fund the La Mare de Carteret Redevelopment project subject to satisfactory completion and review of the Full Business Case to ensure that the project represents value for money for the States.*

*3. To agree that there is a strong case for rationalising the education estate and to direct the Education Department:*

*(a) to consult with all stakeholders, and*

*(b) to submit a report to the States by no later than March 2016 containing:*

*(i) recommendations regarding the optimal size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum, and*

*(ii) at least one option for moving from four to three secondary age schools.*

**The Deputy Greffier:** Billet X, Article I. Education Department, Redeveloping the La Mare de Carteret Schools' Site – Post Review.

1535 **The Bailiff:** The Minister for the Education Department, Deputy Sillars, will open the debate.

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

1540 Today, Members, I offer the chance for you to vote – for reason, for logic and for the benefit of Guernsey – to deliver our promises today and provide equality of opportunity for our students and pupils at La Mare.

The question is simple: what justifiable reason is there to close a school today without having a consultation or proper evidence first? The answer: there is none. Logic dictates consult before changing.

1545 I am going to speak to you using my head and not my heart, I am going to deal in facts, not fiction, and I am going to provide you with evidence, not ill-informed speculation. Be in no doubt that what you decide today will have an impact on our children and young people, our teachers, our support staff, our parents and indeed the wider community. What you must decide is whether the impact is positive or catastrophic – and yes, I do mean catastrophic.

1550 So, how can you have a positive impact? Well, by supporting the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret Schools without further delay, as we have set out in our report, and you will be telling those children and young people that you care about what happens to them, that you believe their education is important, that you value them in the same way that you value other young people who have the good fortune to live in different catchment areas.

1555 You will be sending a message to our staff that you want them to have suitable working conditions; that you want them to enjoy their teaching; that you want them to have the facilities to allow them to deliver an exciting and engaging curriculum that will ensure our young people develop into successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors; that you want to give them the tools to not only help develop our children but also to develop and improve their own skills; and, most importantly, you will be saying to our staff, 'We have listened to *you*, our own on-Island education experts, and delivered what *you* have said *you* needed.'

1560

On a practical level, by rebuilding La Mare School as we have set out in our report you will have provided sufficient pupil spaces to cater for the numbers of children we have in our education system now and those coming up through the system in 10, 15, 20 years' time and well beyond. We are talking about children born this this year.

As well as a new primary and secondary school, you will have improved facilities for our children with autism and communication difficulties, you will have provided space for a new pre-school in an area which desperately needs one, you will have shown you have listened to our sporting organisations, who want to grow participation in their sports, particularly amongst young people and need facilities where they can do this.

You will have supported the need for cross-departmental and multi-agency working, which will be facilitated by having community spaces on the new school site, where our staff can engage with parents, support older members of the community, make them feel welcome and part of the wider community in which they live but can often feel isolated from.

You will also have ensured that there is flexibility within our secondary education system to cope with future changes of the structure of secondary education, whatever they are.

Nobody is arguing about whether or not we should rebuild the schools; we already agreed to that rebuild. Indeed, even T&R themselves agreed that the school needs to be rebuilt. Back in November they appeared to be suggesting that we build a high school for 480 pupils. The Review Panel report recommended rebuilding a 600-pupil school, and now they are proposing that we build it for 960 pupils and close at least one of our other secondary schools – this latest suggestion coming without any consultation, without any evidence, without a transition plan and without any thought to the potential catastrophic impact such a move is having on our staff, our parents and the Island's ability to attract the very best staff to come and teach in our schools. Why would you uproot from your home to come and teach in Guernsey when there is so much uncertainty about whether the school you teach in will be earmarked for closure following this week's debate?

**Deputy Bebb:** Point of order. The amendment concerning any closure has not been laid, and therefore, until it has there is no such thing that is actually to be debated.

**Deputy Sillars:** I am commenting on the letter of comment; I thought that was quite clear, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Right, Deputy Sillars has said that he is commenting on the letter of comment, which he is entitled to do, so he is able to continue to do so.

I would remind you that you are opening the debate, rather than at this point replying to any amendment. You will have your opportunity to make a speech in due course.

**Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir, and I will be, if they are laid.

Nobody appears to be arguing against the rebuilding of the primary school, the communication autism unit, the pre-school or the sports and community facilities. It appears that the main area of disagreement is about how big the high school should be and when we should build it, so I will concentrate on that.

I said I would deal in facts, so here we go. The school's rebuild is already delayed. The earliest we can now get a spade in the ground is May 2016, with the new school buildings opening in September 2018, a year late, and the demolition of the old buildings and completion of the external areas midway through 2019. This is still a very tight timescale, with no room for further delay, and is only achievable if you vote for the States' Report today. If you do not support our proposals today it will lead to a further delay to this programme, not just a further year but possibly two or even three.

Deciding to close a school now – without a plan, without any evidence, without saying which school will close, without having any idea of a transition plan or any proof that this will improve



educational outcomes – just because you believe it will offer better value for money flies in the face of evidence-based decision making. It ignores the principles of good corporate governance –

1615

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, a point of order. Deputy Sillars does appear to be addressing the issue which is not in the policy letter and is only the subject of a possible amendment.

1620

**Deputy Sillars:** Sir, I refer back to... There was a very long and comprehensive letter from T&R, and I am addressing their suggestions in that which relate to our policy letter.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, on a point of order, in fairness to Deputy Sillars I think he is addressing something that is in his policy letter, Proposition 3.

1625

**The Bailiff:** Yes.

**Deputy Sillars:** Thank you for your support.

**The Bailiff:** You may continue, Deputy Sillars.

1630

**Deputy Sillars:** Thank you, sir. I hope this is not going to keep on being interrupted for all of us (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1635

It ignores the principles of good corporate governance, it disregards the very real need for meaningful public engagement and consultation, it discounts the views of our many on-Island experts – and by that I mean our teachers and head teachers – and it takes no notice of what our parents, grandparents and students have been telling us over the last week or so.

1640

But we are not saying that *nothing* must change. We recognise that, however hard it is, we must be open to considering different ways of delivering education and, yes, more efficient ways. That is why we introduced the Guernsey Federation for Secondary Schools. In this current year we started with one subject: computer science. Students from across our schools studied at St Sampson's High School. At the start of this September coming we will have 14 courses with 250 students from across the Federation studying them. Why should where you live constrain your educational choices? These figures speak for themselves re the increasing success of our initiative. Do not let your decision today break the Federation by leaving one school feeling that it needs to fight for its survival rather being an integral part of this collaborative approach. Yes, Alderney has already benefited from the teachers in Guernsey flying to Alderney and helping Alderney deliver our curriculum. They are part of our Federation.

1645

You will see, if you turn to page 1081 in the Billet, that we remain open minded about the future structure of our education service and the possible rationalisation of our estate. We understand there are many good reasons for reducing the number of Education buildings. We have a strong track record of handing back education sites when they are not needed, and indeed making more painful decisions to close schools if that is in the best interest of our education system and our teachers and learners.

1650

Read our Proposition 3. That is a very strong commitment to you. We are looking at it, we are reviewing it, and we will come back to you before the end of this political term with our views on the future of selection, the optimal number of schools, the size of those schools, the best structure for delivering both 11-to-16 education and 16-to-18 education.

1655

If you turn the page, you will see that we will present to you at least one option of moving from four to three secondary-age schools. But what we will not do is take that decision now. We should not ignore the very real concerns of our teachers and parents. We should not damage an education system that is continuing on an upward trend of improving performance. What we should not do is decide to close a school and then consult on how to achieve it. We must consult, gather evidence and then come back to you. If we just commit to going from four to three, or

1660

even two as some suggest, then that will limit our options at this stage, and that makes no sense at all.

What we do know is that, whatever the future brings, we need a 600-pupil school at la Mare de Carteret. We explained that in our options appraisal. In our November States' Report, T&R's Review Panel agreed that we need to get on and build it. Let's just remind ourselves of what the Review Panel said – and I will quote from page 1097, paragraph 5.27:

'we would strongly recommend that the States consider the potential benefits, in the longer term, of moving from a four school model to a three school one, something which the flexibility offered by the La Mare de Carteret project would help to facilitate. We recognise that such a move would require very careful consideration by the States, not least of the variables around student numbers... If it were approved, there are then many factors which would influence when, and in particular how, such a move may best be implemented, not least the... move be managed sensitively and in a way which does not impact on educational outcomes during transition. Given the need for this to be properly and carefully considered, we take no view, therefore, as to how or when it could or should be achieved.'

I am just going to read that again:

'Given the need for this to be properly and carefully considered, we take no view, therefore, as to how or when it could or should be achieved.'

Our proposal is for a 600-pupil school at la Mare, also selection neutral. That means we need these pupil places whatever the future structure of secondary education looks like – whether the 11-plus stays, goes, or something else replaces it – and this is confirmed in T&R's Review Panel Report.

Our current plans for La Mare de Carteret High School are flexible. We have designed the school to be easily extended from 600 pupils to 960. Any decision to add an extra 360 places will be based upon evidence that will be gathered during our public consultation. Any decision in March 2016 to extend the school will not result in an abortive and costly redesign or reworking.

Deputy Conder will go into more detail in his speech, but in front of you you have a detailed drawing of the first floor of the high school. I apologise to listeners who will not be able to see this, but it will be going on to our website. The red arrow at the bottom shows the small area that needs to be taken out at a later stage if the decision is taken to extend the pupil numbers. We will bring our report back to you in March 2016, and if the decision is to go to a 960-pupil school, I have been assured there will be absolutely no extra transitional cost to the project. If the decision is to stay at 600 then, again, no extra cost.

There is talk about giving Education Department increased funds to keep La Mare de Carteret limping along. With what I have just said there is no need to delay, and therefore this money certainly would not represent good value for money. It would be completely wasted money, as the school will be demolished.

I said at the beginning that your decision today could have a positive impact or could have a catastrophic one. I am sure that no Member here can be left in any doubt as to the strength of feeling among parents, teachers and head teachers about what they see as the last-minute proposals to close a school, effectively on a whim, and further delay the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret Schools. These are extremely valid arguments.

I have only received four e-mails that are supportive of T&R's proposals as outlined in their letter of comment, and I have received hundreds of e-mails and letters of the last few days supporting our proposals.

I would also note that some students have also been writing to Deputies to express their worries about the possible closure of their school. This was not a planned campaign, the students were not encouraged to write; indeed, the teachers have constantly tried to reassure their pupils about their future and get them to focus on their school work at this important time of year. I would remind Members, though, that many of these students will be voting in a year's time, and certainly by the time of 2020 election. We should listen carefully to the voice of our young people. In fact, the newly published Children and Young People's Plan positively encourages our young

1705 people to have a voice and to engage with their Government. This is exactly what they have been doing.

So, in summary, let me give you some facts about what I believe will be the catastrophic impact if you make the wrong decision today. These are the facts.

1710 Fact 1: the electronic census confirms that our student numbers will increase from now on. We know that, from those children who are born and living on the Island now, we can expect a States' secondary school population some 300 pupils larger than it is now in 10 years' time.

Fact 2: no money is wasted if you decide at a later date to expand La Mare to a 960-pupil school.

Fact 3: the Review Panel Report confirms that a 600-pupil school is required now.

1715 Fact 4: the Review Panel Report does not place any condition on the rebuild of La Mare as a 600-pupil school.

**Deputy Trott:** On a point of order, sir –

1720 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** – and in specific reference to the Minister's last comment, did the Review Panel not find that the data does *not* support the need to add a 600-pupil-capacity school to the existing estate? Is that not actually what the Review concluded?

1725

**Deputy Sillars:** Sir, actually, it is not *adding* an extra 600; it is *replacing* a current one.

Fact 4: the Review Panel Report does not place any condition on the rebuild of La Mare as a 600-pupil school. It recommends that the States considers the opportunities for rationalising education provision in the future. It does not say we must close a school first.

1730 Fact 5: the much-needed new primary school, the essential facilities for children with communication and autism difficulties, the new pre-school and the community and sports facilities will all be unnecessarily delayed if you do not approve the rebuild today.

Fact 6: the Assembly has already agreed to approve in principle the La Mare de Carteret School redevelopment project.

1735 Fact 7: I reported back to you last June on the reasons why our plans to bring forward a consultation on the new structure of the secondary school had been delayed. This is what I said:

'At the start of this year'

– this is last year –

'the Education Department announced the creation of the Guernsey Federation of Secondary Schools to enhance educational outcomes for our students and encourage closer collaboration amongst staff. We will continue to drive the transition to the federated model which will enhance educational outcomes for our young people and provide greater equality of opportunity and access. As a result the Board has only just started its consideration on the structure of secondary education, and as such we will not be bringing a States' Report to this Assembly during 2014.'

This is still in line with our vision.

1740 Fact 8: we will bring that report to you by March 2016 at the latest. Our commitment to you is specifically referenced in Proposition 3. This report must consider structural issues such as admission to the secondary school – and yes, I mean going out to consultation on the 11-plus and selection – and looking at the future funding of the colleges as well as the physical number of school buildings we will need in the future.

Fact 9: La Mare de Carteret High School, built for at least 600 pupils, is acknowledged by the Review Panel as integral to the Education estate.

1745 Fact 10: we have followed every required States' process to get to this point. The project was prioritised as one of the 20 pipeline projects to be funded during this round of capital prioritisation, at the same cost as what we are now asking for. We have successfully gone through

each of the required gateways, project assurance reviews, value for money audits and even a further Independent Review Panel Report. T&R's own timelines show that they have given us nearly £1.7 million, the latest allocation in December 2014, to get to this point – only to try and claim now that it is not the right project to proceed with.

Sir, in closing I would like to advise Members that over the last couple of years we have improved enormously the way we recruit teachers. Last year, whilst still challenging, we recruited another cohort of excellent teachers. But now teachers are leaving because of the uncertainty over whether the schools will stay open or close. Not only are teachers leaving, it is becoming increasingly difficult to attract new teachers to come and work in our schools. This is always a challenge, but our head teachers are reporting that this is even more difficult this year. As an example, last year in secondary we had choices regarding newly qualified teachers wanting to come and live in Guernsey and work in our schools – more applicants than we could take; a very good position to be in, I suggest. For the 2015-16 academic year starting this September our secondary head teachers have confirmed we have not had a single application for a newly qualified teacher – not one. I have also been informed that teachers who have accepted jobs to join our schools in September are now e-mailing to ask if their jobs will still exist by the time they move to the Island.

We can only make a difference to our children's education outcomes if we have talented, inspirational teachers and school leaders to drive continual improvements. These must remain to be our goals for the future of educating our children, students, who are the future of Guernsey.

Please support our proposals for the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret Schools today unamended, and let us get on with the job. Let us deliver our promises and let's demonstrate that we have listened to our education experts. Help us to continue to build a world-class education system for 'Today's Learners Tomorrow's World'.

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

**Procedural –  
Motion to suspend Rules of Procedure**

*To suspend Rules 13(2) and 15(2) and any other provisions of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the amendment set out below to be debated and take effect.*

**The Bailiff:** In terms of amendments, I have indicated that I propose that we take the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey before taking the amendment proposed by the Minister and Deputy Minister of the Treasury & Resources Department.

In relation to the Deputy Bebb amendment, there was one that was circulated on time – and when I say 'on time', that is in accordance with Rule 13(2). Since then, Deputy Bebb has indicated he may wish to lay another amendment, but in order to do so he would need to suspend Rules 13(2) and 15(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

Deputy Bebb, do you wish to lay your original amendment, or do you wish to propose a motion to suspend the Rules to enable you to lay a second amendment, a revised amendment?

**Deputy Bebb:** I would like to propose a move to suspend the Rules. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Right, then, I think that motion has been circulated. It is proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey:

*'To suspend Rules 13(2) and 15(2) and any other provisions of the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the amendment set out below to be debated and take effect.'*

Deputy Sillars.

**Deputy Sillars:** Could I ask for a recorded vote, please?

1790

**The Bailiff:** Yes. We go to the vote on the motion to suspend the Rules to enable the revised Deputy Bebb amendment to be laid.

Is everybody clear as to what they are voting on? You should have it in front of you. We have a recorded vote on the motion to suspend the Rules.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Carried: – Pour 24, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Le Lièvre

**CONTRE**

Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Collins

**NE VOTE PAS**

**ABSENT**

Deputy James  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Storey  
Deputy Spruce

1795

**The Bailiff:** Members, the result of the vote on the motion to suspend the Rules was 24 in favour and 19 against. I declare the motion carried.

*Amendment:*

*To delete all propositions and replace therefor:*

*1. To direct the Education Department to submit to the States as soon as practicable a policy letter concerning the future of secondary education in Guernsey as detailed in Appendix 2 of the vision document 'Today's Learners Tomorrow's World':*

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

*2. 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 and 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 resolutions relating to proposition 1 above are made and carried into effect.*

1800

**The Bailiff:** So Deputy Bebb may then lay the revised amendment, and I would remind you, under the revised Rule 13(3), that you may either read out the text of the amendment or Deputy Bebb or any other Member may ask that the text be read out by the Greffier.

**Deputy Bebb:** Could the Greffier please read?

1805 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Greffier.

*The Deputy Greffier read the amendment.*

1810 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, Monsieur le Bailli.

1815 In my previous employment there was a wonderful meeting that I had with the head of IT, who was my boss, and with someone from the venture capital company that owned the company. She was a local Guernsey girl, a Brehaut, I am obviously Welsh and the venture capitalist was Canadian.

**A Member:** You wouldn't know!

**Deputy Bebb:** I know this comes as a surprise to some!

1820 During that meeting we all pondered how did we get to such a situation, such a difficult and awkward situation, and the Guernsey boss said, 'We are where we are.' Every time I hear that I cringe a little, but I had never heard the reaction that the Canadian gave: 'What is with you English that you always say that statement? It is the most appalling statement of accepting the status quo, of accepting the inevitability.' I realised that I chimed fully with that, although I did not feel inclined to challenge him as to the difference between English and a Guernsey person.  
1825 *(Interjection and laughter)* The same has been said time and time again as to our situation today: we are where we are. But my challenge for this Assembly is that we need not continue down that inevitable route. It is time to stop.

1830 In support of that, I heard Deputy Sillars state in his opening statements no view on how or when this should be achieved. He himself actually agrees that there should not be a status quo, and the feeling of 'we are where we are' does actually feel a little true today as I refer back to the October 2013 debate. At the beginning of that debate we debated the Budget and then we went on to debate primary schools. Today, which has a very strong sense of *déjà vu*, we had the Minister of Treasury & Resources give a statement very clearly on a failure in our finances. We do  
1835 not use the word deficit, because it is in our capital relation, but we all know that our capital programme is short to the tune, at the moment it is thought, of circa £36 million. That is, to all intents and purposes, a deficit in our capital programme.

Deputy Sillars said in that further debate in October 2013:

'We must not avoid taking the difficult decisions which will help us balance our books just because of a misplaced reluctance to challenge the status quo.'

and I could not agree with him more. We need to challenge the status quo, and the status quo in relation to our secondary education is something that the Education Department have long held that they need to challenge and review. It is included in their vision document as approved by this States. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Indeed, the vision document states clearly that the review will be completed and that we would expect to have it debated this year. Therefore, to the question of delay I ask: how long a delay is it between now and the end of the year to ensure good value for money?

1840 When we talk of good value for money I am rather supported by the statements in the independent report which the Education Department have said repeatedly vindicates their position in a number of places, but it does not fully. The summary statement here says:

'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.'

That is, to me, questioning quite clearly whether this is the right approach, and given that we are on the verge of debating the future of secondary education, my amendment clearly states that that debate should be first. It is not asking for any additional reports, as some people have  
 1845 alleged; it is asking for a report that is coming anyway and that we effectively delay debate on this particular item until we have resolved that question. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

To many they would ask, 'Well, why on earth would we stay, and why would we wait to resolve that question?' But, I would contend that it does not matter where you are on your preference for secondary education, the question mark as to where we, as an Assembly, will go is sufficiently  
 1850 great that we should take note of it.

The BBC recently contacted every single one of us and asked us the simple question: are you in favour of selection at 11? Fourteen said that they were in favour of retaining selection at 11. Fourteen said that they were opposed to selection at 11. Fifteen were undecided. I am pleased to say that one apparently told the reporter to sod off. *(Laughter and interjections)* Three did not  
 1855 reply. It does not matter how we paint it – 14 in favour, 14 against and 19 that we do not know where they will go. If that is not cause for us to question very seriously, to anybody either side of the 11-plus debate, whether we will retain this model is sufficient question for us to say we do not know. We need to resolve such a question before embarking upon such a large capital investment. I believe that this is the largest capital investment in the programme. If we are to  
 1860 demonstrate value for money, if we are to be truly careful with the public purse, then we need to ensure that this project, more than any, demonstrates that value for money. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** At £30 million short we cannot afford to be shy on such a question.

Deputy Sillars, in his opening speech, gave us the opportunity to do many things, but Deputy Sillars also knows that he did not include the fact that we need to bestow on the future  
 1865 generation appropriate finances, and nobody here would disagree with such a statement. Indeed, on such a statement I remember that Deputy Green, in his speech in 2013, said:

'Guernsey simply must get to grips with its structural... deficit. There can no longer be any suggestion of putting off difficult decisions. Most [good] thinking people in Guernsey have always known that very difficult, very painful decisions are crucial to achieving our Financial Transformation Programme targets. It was never going to be a walk in the park. Those who now do not have the stomach for these hard decisions really should not have sought election to the States in 2012. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** Making substantial savings to our general... budget cannot be delayed or fudged any longer. The States of Guernsey does not have the equivalent of a 'Magic Porridge Pot' that keeps on giving. Digging into our reserves as a community cannot go on and will not go on *ad infinitum*.'

That statement is as true of our capital as it is of our general revenue. It is still taxation. As Deputy Conder has stated on so many occasions, Government has no money, it can only demand money from the people, and whether that be for capital or revenue to the general public who pay  
 1870 tax makes little difference. It is still taxation that is levied against them.

In trying to think of how would I actually lay out the need for this review I was contemplating what is the best way of trying to convey the importance of making the right decisions in the right order, and I find myself supported by all four head teachers. Their recent letter to all of us stated clearly:

'The review of secondary education set out in the Education Board's vision document clearly highlights the challenge and complexity of reviewing secondary education and the many factors which will need to be considered. We cannot support the divisive amendment which forces the rationalisation of the secondary school structure from four to three schools without clear up-to-date evidence and proper consultation of all the issues. Teachers, parents, students and the Island community deserve to be a part of honest, open and transparent communications and full consultations of plans.'

That is exactly what we will be affording them. We will be affording people a full consultation on secondary education. It is what the head teachers asked for, it is what the Education Department knows is required, and the only contention that I would have with Education's proposals is that I would say that we need to resolve what that education model is before we invest the largest sum of money in a capital programme in the infrastructure that supports it.

1880 The report writer himself, unfortunately not included in the report, stated clearly that were we  
to move to a comprehensive model – and I do not state that that is my preference, but were we to  
move to a comprehensive model – then the best model may well be two secondary schools,  
teaching 11 to 18. I will not hold that to be the only orthodox opinion, of course it isn't, but it is  
one that the report's writer... As the Education Department hold so much sway by this report, we  
1885 should hold it in great sway that the report writer himself stated that that would be the best  
model, not for financial reasons alone but for educational outcomes, which has been repeatedly  
called by teachers as should be the focus of debate. It would be the best for educational  
outcomes. It is also recognised as being the better model for teacher recruitment and retention –  
the very issues Deputy Sillars raised in his opening speech. If we are serious about improving our  
1890 teacher employment retention and recruitment we really need to review our secondary education,  
but to spend £60 million before deciding what we want is folly.

Deputy Sillars pointed out that an increase, of course, from 600 to 960 would be a cost-neutral  
point, so the question is simply should we proceed on that basis. Well, given the very real  
question as to whether we move to a comprehensive model and whether the decision after that is  
that we should go, as has been asserted by an independent professional, not by myself... that we  
1895 would require two schools, 960 is not enough. Before we have people jumping up and down to  
say that they want smaller schools, this is not a question about class sizes. There seems to be a  
conflation of these two issues. Larger schools do not mean larger class sizes. Nobody here would  
attest to that. I am sure that the Education Department themselves, given their report on the  
1900 primary education... They acknowledge the need for smaller class sizes and we all support that  
endeavour, but larger schools do not equal larger classes. Larger schools are incredibly successful.  
I know that it was said with tongue in cheek, but one Member did of course point out that Eton is  
a school of 1,300 and that would still be larger than any two secondary schools that we would  
have here. Not exactly a bad model for us to be considering. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)  
1905 (*Interjection*)

So, when we actually look at the future of education, do we go down that same route of saying  
it is inevitable? Or do we stop, pause and ask to debate our secondary education first?

Deputy Sillars is quite right that the number of people who contacted us, concerned as to the  
closure of schools, concerned as to the decisions we would make today, were substantial. I have  
1910 tried to respond to each and every single one of them. I have failed because the volume has been  
so great and the need to research in advance of this debate was pressing. But the fear that is out  
there would surely be allayed by stating clearly that we are entering into a period of consultation  
regarding the whole issue. We all know that secondary education is all going to be reviewed.  
Indeed, I am advised from conversations that I have had with members of the Education  
1915 Department that some work on this issue has already started, and therefore will not extend delay  
– and more questioning, what price delay.

We really need to be as careful and to continue with the Transformation Programme, as has  
been said time and time again. How difficult was it for each and every Member to deliver those  
Financial Transformation Programme targets? We all know the difficulties, Departments are still  
1920 struggling with them; but if we are to eliminate deficits we need to consider capital in the same  
way. We cannot embark upon a process of having a States' capital investment programme  
knowing it to be £30 million short, and then be profligate. What we would need to do is have  
proper evidence-based decisions, repeatedly asked for by those very professionals. So, for us to  
make those decisions requires this report. Members, the case for it, in my view, is compelling. The  
1925 unfortunate factor that we must acknowledge is that, of course, it could cause some delay to the  
rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, and a situation within a school that we all agree is below standard.  
If evidence were needed as to how I feel about this, then it is evident from the second Proposition  
in this amendment. I acknowledge the problem, I feel that it is possibly the best course of action  
for us to be good stewards of finances that we do invest money in order to maintain the school,  
1930 but I would also question that the delay will be at the door of the Education Department. Only



they can determine how fast this review of secondary education would come back to this Assembly.

But, of course, it is perfectly possible that with the appropriate prioritisation this report could well be back with us within six months, and such a report would therefore ensure that we may not necessarily look at a further academic year delay. So when we talk of delay we should not be thinking of how late it is in us making a decision, but rather in how late is it before that first pupil walks into the rebuilt school. In that regard we may not be delaying that. It is entirely at the door of the Education Department as to what priority and time investment they would want to make. I am convinced, because I know the Education Department members are people of good standing... they are committed to the vision that they laid before the States. I know that they will endeavour to complete that review as speedily as possible, but also not with haste but with due care, because this question is a vexing question that has plagued this Assembly time and time again. Even back in 2001 the point that I keep hearing – this false phrase that unfortunately has conveyed in a popular mind-set the ‘promise’ to rebuild the La Mare de Carteret. It is unfortunate that such a statement has been used, because of course it is impossible to promise 14 years later what the States will do, just as we cannot promise today what the States will do in 14 years’ time. But even at that time there was a recognition by the Education Department themselves that a rationalisation was required. Fourteen years hence we have not done anything.

We can all complain about previous States, it is very easily made that the priorities of the time were as such. I am not going to embark upon that situation. We have been given the situation as it is today, but we are the people who decide the destiny of what will be bequeathed to the next States, and I ask you in all honesty: do we leave that question of the grammar school and selection unanswered and at the same time embark upon the largest programme of our SCIP or the States capital programme, a programme that goes well into the next States? Do we shackle the next States with our poor decisions? Do we ask for that very evidence requested to make the right decisions in the right order?

Members, to me the question is clear and I believe that the answer is clear, and I would ask you to please support this amendment. Thank you.

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

**Deputy Dorey:** Yes, sir, and I reserve my right to speak later.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy Lowe, you wish to challenge the amendment under –

**Deputy Lowe:** I wish to challenge under 13(6), sir, because I believe this amendment probably goes further than the Propositions and has financial implications for T&R.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. Subject to anything HM Comptroller may say, it is my view that it does go further than the original Propositions, if for no other reason than because of the second Proposition in the amendment that requires money to be spent on maintaining the school in the meantime. The first Proposition perhaps is not that different from Proposition 3 in the report, although the timing is different.

Madam Comptroller.

**The Comptroller:** Sir, I agree the first Proposition is arguable, and I agree on the second point.

**The Bailiff:** In that case I am ruling that the amendment goes further than the original Proposition.

Are you asking then that it be not debated, or are you asking that debate on the amendment be postponed, Deputy Lowe?

**Deputy Lowe:** I am asking that the amendment not be debated, please, sir.

1985 **The Bailiff:** Be not debated, right.

In that case I put to you then the Proposition that the amendment be not debated and no vote be taken thereon. I hope that is clear to everyone: the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey, be not debated and no vote be taken thereupon. Those in favour; those against.

1990 *Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.*

1995 **The Bailiff:** I think the *Contres* have it, but it is close, so to be certain, as it is a controversial issue I will ask for a recorded vote. So a recorded vote on the Proposition that the amendment proposed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey be not debated and no vote be taken thereon.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Not carried – Pour 19, Contre 23, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5*

**POUR**

Deputy Green  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley  
Alderney Rep. Jean  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Collins

**CONTRE**

Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Le Lièvre

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy James  
Alderney Rep. McKinley  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Storey  
Deputy Spruce

**The Bailiff:** Members, the vote on the Proposition that the amendment posed by Deputy Bebb and seconded by Deputy Dorey be not debated and no vote be taken thereon: there were 19 in favour and 23 against. I declare that Proposition lost.

2000 Debate will therefore continue and, under Rule 13(7) – the new or amended Rule 13(7) – the Minister of the Department or representative of the Minister has the right to speak on the amendment at this point, if he or a Member of the Department wishes to do so.

Do you wish to do so, or do you wish to reserve your right to speak later? Reserve the right to speak later.

2005 Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

2010 I think it is absolutely crucial for all Members of the Assembly to realise in order to be able to maintain a building, as set out in item 2 of this amendment, you have to first establish how much repair work is actually needed. Then you have to carry out those repairs to be able to get to the stage where you simply maintain the building.

Not only is it totally impractical to repair a school whilst students and teachers are trying to work in that school, but there is also a risk of impacting upon the health of those teachers and students, and also of course the administration staff and caretakers and cleaners, because a building site, which is what La Mare would become due to the amount of repair that is needed at the school, is a dusty, noisy, dirty and dangerous place. Tradesmen often wear protective masks to shield themselves from dust and harmful vapours, so are we going to ask the students and the staff the wear masks to protect themselves whilst they are trying to work on what would be, in a very real sense, a building site? I appreciate, sir, that some of my colleagues may be of the view that the simple answer to that is to cordon parts of the school off whilst work in certain areas takes place, but that does not actually work, because dust and harmful vapours permeate, as does all the noise from electric drills and saws, carpenters hammering nails etc. Not only have I witnessed dust, noise and harmful vapours permeating outside of the area that has been cordoned off whilst I worked in our schools over the years, but I once had to take two weeks off work because I became so ill after breathing in dust and harmful vapours, and I had been working outside of that area that had been cordoned off at the time. So there are major environmental health issues to consider whilst undertaking repairs on our schools. It is not just a case of replacing a few ceiling tiles or painting a classroom. The whole school needs to be repaired. The whole school needed to be repaired 10 years ago when I worked on it, and now – *(Interjection and laughter)* Sir, I think if Members look back to previous debates, some time ago I did say that when my brother and I worked on La Mare, on the third time we worked on it we were asked to carry out such shoddy, cheap workmanship that we refused to work on it, so we walked off of the job. So, all this is going to be taking place. Tradesmen are going to be working inside the school whilst students are doing their utmost to listen and learn and teachers are doing their utmost to educate the children. I suspect asbestos was used when the school was built, so that will have to be managed in the appropriate manner.

So, sir, in my opinion, after having worked in the construction industry for over 30 years, trying to repair La Mare whilst students and staff are still in the school is a recipe for disaster, and all the work that needs to be done could not be done in six or seven weeks over the summer holidays. The majority of it would have to be done in term time, and I suspect that the work would have to continue right through to the Christmas holiday and the term beyond.

I want to spend a moment focussing on the timings involved, because in approximately seven weeks' time the schools break up for summer holidays. So in those seven weeks a programme of works will have to be drawn up. Once that has been done the work will then have to go out to tender. The successful contractor will then have to be notified, preferably with as much notice as possible because we could not expect a contractor to undertake such a big project with only a week's notice; they need a lot longer than that. But then there is the whole issue of needing to consult with the head teacher, the teachers themselves and of course the students to determine when, where and how everyone would be moved around within the school. In reality, all of that will need to take place within the next month if this amendment succeeds today. Sir, my experience in the industry tells me that a month simply is not long enough. So what we are talking about here is that the students, teachers and staff at La Mare will have to endure months of noise and disruption whilst the building work is going on all around them.

I think I should explain at this point, sir, that it is a totally different dynamic trying to focus and concentrate within the confines of a building site, with all the building work going on around you, than it is if all the building work is taking place outside of the school on a totally separate site in the form of a rebuild. I know that some of my colleagues on the board of directors of schools may disagree with that, but due to the fact that repairs on our schools do take place in term time and are considered to be completed effectively and successfully... but my question to them would be did they spend every minute of every day sitting in a classroom with the teachers and students to witness the upset, the demoralisation and the frustration building work causes in term time.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, point of order.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** I am just trying to work out how what Deputy Queripel is saying relates to this amendment. I know we are talking about making sure that the Education Department has sufficient money to maintain the school, but I think he is going into the realms of supposition as to how much that work is going to be.

**The Bailiff:** I think that is the point that he is trying to make: that nobody knows how much work is involved. Is that the point you were making, Deputy Queripel?

**A Member:** Of course! *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Plus a certain amount of disruption to pupils in the meantime.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Yes, sir. *(Laughter)* Deputy Bebb mentions in his amendment 'to maintain until such time as the rebuild project commences'. Surely I am speaking on the amendment, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. I think I was saying you are speaking on the amendment, but I think –

**Deputy Bebb:** But surely that is the case regardless of whether the amendment passes or not.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry?

**Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry, sir, but surely that is the case regardless of whether the amendment passes or not, because the school will not be rebuilt tomorrow.

**The Bailiff:** There must be some reason for you having added the second Proposition to the amendment. You must be envisaging that there will be some further repair work required while the report envisaged in the first Proposition is carried out. I think that is what Deputy Queripel is addressing: the further work that will be needed, the disruption it will cause and the uncertainty as to how much work is involved. If not, if you are saying that –

**Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry, my confusion was to what Deputy Queripel was trying to refer to, not my amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, please continue, but if you have made the point then you could move on to another one.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, the cost and the time are unknown for any repair work and maintenance work to take place. That is my point.

Other speakers will focus on all the other aspects of the amendment. My experience in the building trade... I am trying to relay my concerns to the Assembly, and if they do not want to hear it then do whatever you need to do to stop me talking, but I have very real concerns and I am trying to relay those to the Assembly.

I will dispense with the next two pages, but I really want to focus on some of the other major issues, because the difference between 'repair' and 'maintain' is a very distinct difference. The costs are totally unknown and the time that it will take to complete the repairs to get to the stage of being able to maintain a building are totally unknown. I think we have to bear in mind one crucial factor here: the roof needs complete repair and that is an unknown cost. You cannot repair a flat roof in the middle of winter when it is raining without putting a scaffold with a canopy across the whole roofing area itself at great expense.

I suspect that at this stage in my somewhat forensic speech some of my colleagues may be losing the will to live, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) but I respectfully ask them, through the Chair, to bear in mind that, first and foremost, the more you interrupt me the longer the speech will take, but I think it is important to ask them to bear in mind only having to listen to my making a 15-minute speech. I would ask them to put themselves in the place of the staff and the students at La Mare who will probably all lose the will to live during months of disruption, not only because of the dirt, the dust and the noise but because at the end of all of that they still will not be in the new school they were promised. They will be in a school that has been repaired, a school that is still not fit for purpose. There is a real danger, in my opinion, that that may just make some of them feel second rate, not valued and not worthy. Is that what we really want – staff and students to feel second rate, not worthy or valued?

Whilst I am now on the issue of feeling demoralised to the point of feeling not worthy and second rate, another thing I ask my colleagues to bear in mind is what standard of repair will we be asking tradesmen to carry out. Will we be asking them to carry out as cheap a repair as possible, as my brother Deputy Laurie Queripel and I were asked many years ago, a second-rate repair? A partial repair to last for a year? Two years? Three years? Or will we be asking them to carry out a far more substantial repair to last for say six, seven or maybe even eight years? Will we be asking carpenters to attach new frames to existing framework that is only just beginning to show signs of going rotten?

I give way to Deputy Trott, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, I am very grateful to my friend for giving way, because I for one am listening very intently to his speech and I think what he is saying is that whilst he was active in the construction industry the Education Department asked him to carry out work that, in his professional opinion, was insufficiently robust for the job to be done properly. If that is that case, that is a very serious accusation and one that the Education Department should feel justifiably embarrassed by. Is that the case?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, my brother Deputy Laurie Queripel and I were asked to carry out work as a sticking-plaster approach to keep the school trundling along. We were not at all happy with that approach, so we refused to carry on doing what we considered to be substandard work. We understood the approach itself; we simply were not prepared to carry out substandard work to keep the school trundling along with a sticking-plaster type of approach.

The danger of interrupting me, sir, is I am going to have back and repeat what I said. (*Interjection*)

I will give way to... I think I might change my middle name to 'Yo-yo', sir. I give way to Deputy Lowe.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lowe.

**Deputy Lowe:** While you are finding your place, Deputy Queripel, I am very grateful to you giving way, but bearing in mind Deputy Trott's question, I think it would be relevant if you actually said how long ago it was, bearing in mind the schools were supposed to be being developed. So are we talking 15 years ago, 10 years ago or five years ago, when we were hoping to have the spade in the ground quite soon?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I could not exactly pinpoint it, sir, but I could give Deputy Lowe a very specific date if I go home and look at my records; but it is approximately 12 years. I might be totally wrong. My brother might disagree with me. Could be eight years, though, sir. I do not know. I give way to my brother to –

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I just wonder if I could help Deputy Lester Queripel out here, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** We worked on La Mare de Carteret School on a number of occasions and it probably goes back as far as 12 years ago but we worked there after that as well, so I would say the last time we worked there was perhaps five or seven years ago, I would have thought – perhaps mid-2000, something along those lines, yes. I think the last time we worked there... we worked there on several occasions and the last time we worked there was between five and seven years ago.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, as I was saying, are we going to ask the tradesmen to carry out far more substantial repairs to last a lot longer, or will we be asking carpenters to attach frames to existing framework that is only partially rotten or replace frames that are completely rotten? And who will make that decision? Who will oversee the standard of work and who will decide what standard of work is actually needed? All these are unknowns. I would like to hear Deputy Bebb's views on that, sir, when he responds, because surely we have to be absolutely clear about all of those issues. I see no reference to the standard of repair in this amendment and that does concern me, because, as I say, we are then into the realms of the unknown as regards the costs and the time all of this work would take.

Just to expand a little more on that point, sir, because it is a crucial point – I realise that I am speaking as an experienced employee in the construction industry of many years, but a lot of my colleagues perhaps will not realise this – in the case where effervescence or mould is present on a wall, perhaps only six or 12 inches, or maybe 18 inches, I can guarantee it will not be a simple case of replacing a piece of plasterboard or renewing a square metre of plaster. That is just a symptom. The real problem lies behind that damaged area. Everything behind that damaged area could be in need of not only repairing but replacing.

To finish on that particular point, sir, we all need to bear in mind that a tradesman has a conscience. They take pride in their work. That is why they have chosen their profession. They want to do a proper job. They do not want to carry out a partial repair. Would we ask a teacher to partially educate a child? Would we ask a cleaner to partially clean the wards in our hospitals? Would we ask a mechanic to partially repair our car? Of course we would not, so why would we ask a tradesman to carry out partial repairs on La Mare de Carteret School? Surely the students and the staff deserve the best that we can give them.

So I ask my colleagues to reject what I am sure is a well-intended amendment, but with the greatest respect to Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey, they just do not seem to have thought this through. *(Laughter)* The plain and simple fact of the matter is that there is a time to repair and there is a time to rebuild.

**Deputy David Jones:** And a time for lunch! *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** In response to Deputy Jones saying there is a time for lunch, sir, I did remind Members the more times I got interrupted the longer the speech would take. I got up at 12.13, sir. If I had not been constantly interrupted I would have been finished at perhaps 12.28. Keep on interrupting me and the speech takes longer.

2220 As I was saying, there is a time to repair and there is a time to rebuild, and the time to repair La  
Mare is long gone – it is now time to rebuild it. The staff and the students have been promised a  
new school for many years. They long for that to happen, they dream of it happening, and with  
that thought uppermost in my mind I would like to finish my speech with the last three lines of a  
poem written by William Yeats. The title of the poem is 'He Wishes for the Cloths of Heaven', and  
2225 these are the last three lines:

'But I, being poor, have only my dreams;  
I have spread my dreams under your feet;  
Tread softly because you tread on my dreams.'

**The Bailiff:** Well, on that note Members, I propose we rise for lunch and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.36 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

## EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

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

**The Bailiff:** Members, we continue the debate on the amendment posed by Deputy Bebb,  
2230 seconded by Deputy Dorey, and I call first the Chief Minister, then Deputy Perrot.

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, well, Deputy Lester Queripel's speech just before lunch was an education for me! At least  
we know now who will not be tendering for any works (*Laughter*) when it comes to repairs on the  
2235 La Mare de Carteret School. He had a point certainly, but I think a point that has or could be  
missed if it was not for the case that these sorts of repairs in my estimation are going to need to  
take place whatever we decide and vote on today. In fact, the Education Minister said right at the  
start that work could not start on the new development, even if we voted through all Education's  
proposals as they stand today, until May of next year.

2240 Now, I went recently around the school – both schools, in fact... and indeed I used to be on  
both the primary and secondary school committees years ago and, of course, like some less  
hirsute Members like myself in this Assembly, we remember back to the beginning of... I say the  
beginning of this debate really, which does seem to have gone on for 13 years. At the time, I was  
on Education and we were using similar arguments at that time with regard to the state of the  
2245 buildings.

Now, it is true that if such serious work and investment needs to go into the school, and I  
would argue, as I said, irrespective of when new building work starts, something dramatic needs  
to change there – the secondary school in particular. Then it could well be that the children, the  
pupils, will need to be accommodated differently. They may need to have temporary classrooms  
2250 installed on site, to mitigate against the sort of things that Deputy Lester Queripel was talking  
about. That will be normal anyway when building work is going on... and occurred at other  
schools over that time.

So, I would certainly say that that is not a reason not to support this particular amendment. It  
seems to me also, from having recently walked around those schools, that the primary school is in  
2255 actually much better condition than the secondary school. I was actually quite surprised at the  
condition of the primary school.

Now considering that both schools work to a design that is not dissimilar to Ladies' College, and I was on that Board a number of years ago, it is possible, obviously, to repair those buildings to such a degree that they are usable, and they do not affect the delivery of education. It is possible to do that. I think that has even been shown by the current staff at La Mare Primary and Secondary School who are now... both schools are now achieving much, much better results than they ever have done, and I credit them for that hard work.

With regard to the amendment itself, I have a lot of sympathy with this amendment, certainly as it stands now in its amended form. I did not previously because it was trying to deal with too much in scope, but the scope is now focussed.

Sir, I would encourage others in this Assembly like me, who are perhaps thinking, 'Should I support this or not?' to just remind themselves of what Deputy Bebb alluded to at the beginning, and that is courage. I think it does take courage to support something like this, because the arguments against are very emotional.

As the father of someone who was about to start at Les Beaucamps Secondary, it became Les Beaucamps High School afterwards, with all sorts of promises of a new school while she was there and never came about. I know how strong the heartstrings can pull and tug.

So I do think we need to be rational in this Assembly, and the danger is, of course, that the enemy of the best is often the good, and we could settle for something today that is good and certainly better than what we have at the moment, but is not the best that we could achieve for the next generation. I am not sure about others in this Assembly, but I could certainly say I want to see the best that we can achieve, and that is not just about buildings.

I do not disagree with some of the arguments about the effect, perhaps, to begin with a new building can have on the culture of a school, the climate of a school, and the ability to attract staff etc., but there is something far more fundamental to that, and so that is why – and the Education Minister knows this – I was disappointed that we have come to this stage, and as many of you in the Assembly know, I attempted to get both Treasury and Education together, to see whether there was some sort of compromise.

My main problem was that it seems to me we have been forced into this timing situation, to make decisions that are, in effect, out of time, out of sync with the decisions we should be making about the structure of secondary education, and indeed tertiary education as well. Now, I say that with some degree of caution, because I know that there are some that might agree with me for different reasons, different motivations, to me.

It is true to say the Review Panel... and I am glad that Review Panel reported, I am glad we had that experience. It is true to say that they have concluded that their recommendations are not dependent on selection. Yet it would have been better to have come to this had we had a decision of whether to continue with selection or not. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

But they are not dependent on that, they are still saying, effectively, there is enough room in the current system to accommodate the number of pupils we have, even with a little bit of adaption, to reduce one school and to not build the La Mare, in fact, and continue, and that is what they concluded. You can see that from the statistics.

The trouble is, to do that, we do have to then change our system of education post-11, because some of those places are at the Grammar School, and you could not have a Grammar School that is already selecting far more than they should, or we should, in that sort of system.

So the other alternative is, if you are going to build a school – and this is where I think the Panel can be misquoted – and La Mare is a good site to build the two schools, but the secondary school particular – then we must not build it for less than 600.

That is absolutely clear, because you would not get the best quality education, best opportunities for anything less than that, and I think that has been proven, for me anyway, beyond all date. So I say it with some degree of caution, because I know there are some that might support this requête because they have slightly other agendas and I will be listening to what they have to say in this debate, before deciding ultimately whether I will support this or not.



It is clear that there is a strong emotional argument to rebuild as soon as possible. Now, I do not want us to do that and miss the opportunity to give something better to the next generation, which I think is also there within our grasp.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot, were you wanting to rise?

**Deputy Perrot:** No, just a domestic matter, sir. I did not wish to speak on the amendment, I wanted to show that I can crawl along with the best of them and thank you for the cakes which we had at lunch time, (*Laughter*) and add to your birthday wishes. That was all, sir.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Perrot. I could not ignore the request from the Mother of the House.

Deputy Laurie Queripel, and then Deputy St Pier, Deputy Conder, Deputy Adam.

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

Sir, I think I had better start with just making a couple of comments with regard to the points that Deputy Lester Queripel made this morning. Over the years, we worked on a number of – not just La Mare de Carteret, but a number of – school maintenance projects: the old St Sampson's School, St Andrew's School – both of which are closed actually, but (*Laughter*) St Andrew's School... (*Interjections*)

It is the work at the La Mare de Carteret which sticks mainly in my mind because, of course, we were not there – I think we worked there on three separate occasions, and we were not there – all through the time that those buildings were being worked on, but what stood out to me aside from some of the points that Deputy Lester Queripel made, was that the priorities in regard to the kind of work that was being done were wrong. Most of work, from what I could tell, was internal work, was cosmetic work – so hanging new doors, painting work – whereas, in fact, what should have been taking place was work of a more structural nature.

I visited the school quite recently along with Deputy Dorey. I think it was the last time we went round the school. When I looked at the flat roofs, sir, I can only describe what I saw there as ponds with the associated moss gardens and vegetation; and really that is the kind of work that should have been taking place.

It is no good replacing ceiling tiles inside the buildings, when on the outside of the building on the flat roofs you have clearly got a need there to clear and clean those roofs, and to do some repair and replacement work where it is required.

It is a retrospective point, I appreciate that, but when I think back to those years, it seems to me that the priorities were wrong in regard to the maintenance work that was taking place. This was why we had a bit of a dispute with the main contractor we were working for at the time. I think that – although the buildings were only designed to last 25 or so years, I think that is why the buildings are now in such a dilapidated state because very, very often the wrong work was done.

It seems to me, from what I could tell, there was very little attention to structural work, and it was very much cosmetic and internal work, and that is why I think the schools – aside from the fact, as I say, that they are passed their sell by date... but that is why they are in such a poor state now.

I have to come to the conclusion anyway that... I have a great deal of regard for this Education Board. I think they have done a good job under the circumstances, but I think they are dealing with a legacy, historically of poor decisions and some poor estate management in regard to their estate. I think that is why we are in such a difficult situation today, and I think that is why there is so much uncertainty.

Even in regard to, if you think back to decisions made in the past, I cannot understand why, when the rebuild programme of the schools was commenced, La Mare de Carteret was last on the list. There might be a reason for that – I do not know what it was, but I cannot understand why it was last on the list, when clearly, clearly, it was the school that was most in need of a rebuild.

That is probably why it is in such a poor state now, because it was always considered, or believed, or agreed to, that it was going to be rebuilt; it was almost like a foregone conclusion, so it has not been given the right attention over the years. It has been given some attention, but not the right attention. I know it is no good looking back, but I think we need to understand why we are where we are now, and that is because I think some very bad decisions were made in the past and some bad choices.

Sir, I have not decided yet whether I am going to support this amendment, or not. I am tempted to, and it would be underplaying it to say that I have been in two minds over the last couple of weeks or so, I think I have been in four, five or six minds. There is so much to consider.

We are getting so many emails from members of the public, teachers, pupils, parents and families, and of course, they are all saying, 'Please, whatever happens, press on with the rebuild,' and I have some sympathy with that view. But I have also been getting emails from people saying, 'Look, we need to look at this first and get things in the right order, and decide how we are going to shape our secondary education in the future and what decision we are going to make about the Education's estate.' So we have been getting a degree of mixed messages from the public.

So, for me, I have been through the whole gambit of emotions and, as I say, I have been in three or four minds, not two minds, and I have not had to argue with anybody because I have been arguing with myself. Every pro point I have made in regard to the rebuild, I have come up with a point that is counter to that. I think many of my colleagues are in the same position, we have been in turmoil about this, sir – this situation – and it is a bad place to be.

As I say, I might yet vote for this amendment, I think it is a reasonable amendment, and I am glad that Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey realised and accepted that their first attempt, their first iteration was too prescriptive. If I may be so bold, sir, I think that is where T&R – I know the names on the amendment are Deputy St Pier and Deputy Kuttelwascher, but it is clearly a T&R amendment – have made their mistake. It is no wonder that they have been accused or suspected of trying in a very particular way to dictate Education policy.

Now, this amendment – the Deputy Bebb amendment – is directing the formulation of policy proposals for the future of secondary education to be decided by Education. It is not giving them parameters or telling them what they should think or what they should come back with. They are just being asked to come back with some policy proposals in regard to the future of secondary education.

So in that regard, sir, I think the tone of this amendment is much more appropriate, much more in keeping. But it does not, however, sir, and of course, human nature is such that we want everything – we want it both ways, but it does not alleviate my concerns about what the future might look like, and what rationalisation of the Education estate might be proposed.

More importantly, it will not assist, or ease the minds, or take away the anxiety and uncertainty being felt by staff, children and parents across the secondary sector, let alone the children, staff and parents associated with the La Mare de Carteret Schools.

What I mean by my concerns, sir, in regard to the type of rationalisation that might be proposed in regard to Education's estate in regard to secondary education. I think I could best explain it by saying I struggle to comprehend... should the La Mare de Carteret Schools be rebuilt, what I struggle to comprehend is the idea that a few months down the line the States may be asked to close one of the other schools.

It is certainly premature to say that is going to be the case and it is certainly premature to pick a school out, and it is unfortunate, sir, that we have had this scaremongering about it might be Les Beaucamps and things like that, because clearly no decision has been made on that at all.

I do struggle with the idea of building brand new schools at a price tag of £60 million and then being asked to close another school. The choice would be between a grammar school that is

clearly still serviceable and up to the task, a nearly new school in St Sampson's, or a brand new school in Les Beaucamps.

2415 So even if the school targeted for closure were to be used for other purposes – by the College of Further Education, for example – we cannot get away from the fact that the school chosen for closure, if one is chosen for closure, was designed at great cost for a particular purpose i.e. the education of teenaged children with all the associated facilities. How could we be sure that those facilities would be put to good and full use and not go to waste if used for tertiary purposes, and how much remodelling would those schools and those buildings need to accommodate that kind of education?

2420 Sir, for example – and I must state very clearly, of course, for people listening to this and for the *Press*, no school yet has been targeted in regard to whether it will close or whether any school will close but, for example, okay, Les Beaucamps has been mentioned, the idea of simply decanting the pupils and staff from Les Beaucamps seems to be missing the point. From all reports, sir, the school is off to a flying start, a community has been established, the staff and  
2425 pupils are apparently content, and very proud of their school, and the relationship between teachers and students is good. None of that, sir, should be lightly dismissed.

Sir, for me, rationalisation of the secondary schools is well and good, and of course we all want value for taxpayers' money, but the outcome of the amendments – and of course I am not only referring to Deputy Bebb's, but the other amendment – could well lead to the setting up of two  
2430 super high schools, and when I use the term 'super', I do not mean in the wonderful sense.

From what I am hearing, I am not sure that schools with a large cohort are best for meeting the needs of all pupils. I know there is a strong argument that says it will attract better teachers, and it will make for a richer and broader curriculum, but there are other things to consider.

2435 The evidence seems to suggest that bullying is more prevalent in large schools. They are impersonal. From what I am told, it is much more difficult for teachers to establish tailored and positive relationships with pupils, and the sense of community and identity seems to be diluted. So the disadvantages could outweigh the advantages.

Of course, as I said earlier, we have received a ton of e-mails from people on this issue. I think actually, although you could say some of them are motivated by emotion, we have to take notice  
2440 of some of the comments that we have received. I have got one – of course, I am not going to identify the person but I just want to read a section of it – from somebody that said:

'I spent 15 years in the UK and my children attended a school there before moving back to Guernsey. In our area we had two large comprehensive schools and my next door neighbours both taught at them. They all had the most modern facilities and a varied curriculum. The children and the teachers hated them. They were impersonal because they were larger. It was more difficult to keep track of what was going on i.e. bullying, general bad behaviour. Addressing particular issues with particular children.'

It goes on to say:

2445

'As for attracting better teachers, most were drawn to the smaller schools. Incidentally this area has now returned to the old grammar school system.'

This person... and she goes on to say:

'It is not all about a building and having every facility, it is about dedication, care, and knowing the children and knowing their problems.'

2450 This is a person who is pro a rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret Schools, but in common with a number of people that have contacted us, that are pro a rebuild, this person is saying it does not have to be built at the £60 million price tag. What they are saying is they are questioning the need for all the facilities that are being included in this project. What they say is we need two good basic schools. So even the people that are pro a rebuild are not quite sure that the price tag is  
2455 right, or the facilities are what is required.

Then another email I received – once again I am not going to identify the person, but a segment of it says this:

‘As a professional with many years of teaching experience and expertise I totally refute the notion that larger schools are better for our Island children.

I work relentlessly day in and day out to provide the best education to some of our Island’s most vulnerable children. I understand the needs of each and every one of the children whom I teach. I could tell you at any one point which child is having a bad day, which child has been let down, which child is upset, or which child is struggling to cope with their current situation.

I believe that I am providing the best possible relationship support for our Island’s children.

I have worked in larger schools, and some weeks I am ashamed to say that I simply did not have time to speak with each member of my class. I lacked time to say ‘how are you today?’

2460 I believe that we have the ability to create one of the best education systems in the world. This will only be achieved by considering all options carefully, while being fully informed as to all the pros and cons of larger schools and by ensuring that debate is focused on how we can provide the best education for our Island’s children and not simply based on how we can save money.

2465 So, sir, this is why I am in so many minds. As a States we have a responsibility to try and get the balance right between value for money for the taxpayer and good educational outcomes. So although I have concerns about what the remodelled secondary education system and estate might look like, I have to consider supporting this amendment.

2470 Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey quite reasonably, I think, remind the Education Department, of course, that it says we will bring a States’ Report to the Assembly during 2014 on a new structure for secondary education. So I think that is quite reasonable for that to be included in the amendment, because that is what was said by the Department. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2475 As I say, sir, I am in more than two minds. I appreciate that the school is in a very poor state. I think Deputy Lester Queripel – I understood what he was saying, but I think actually if repair work needs to be carried out for the school and maintenance in order just to make it last a bit longer, before we get this issue right in regard to secondary education, I think it could be done in a manageable way, but I understand what he was saying, because there is some uncertainty there. Do you work on it to last a year, or two years, or five years? That is where the uncertainty is. I think the actual work can be managed, especially if you are just trying to keep it in some sort of good order until things change.

2480 It really is difficult. As far as I can recall, I have supported everything that the Education Department have brought to the Assembly up until now, and in my heart I would like to support this rebuild, but my head and my rationale says that I should consider supporting the Bebb amendment because it seems to me it puts things in the right way, in the right order. It puts things the right way round.

2485 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

2490 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, it is reason and not passion which must guide our deliberations, guide our debate and guide our decision – so said Barbara Jordan, the African American Congresswoman, and these words have guided, and continue to guide, Treasury & Resources’ position and I am pleased it appears to be what is guiding our Chief Minister too.

2495 It is important to ensure that the correct project is delivered. Primarily, of course, to provide the best possible educational outcomes, but also to deliver best value for taxpayers. There is only one way to ensure that the correct project is delivered, and that is to ensure that what is built fits into the Island’s long-term plans for post-16 education and the structure of secondary education, including the number of schools, their sizes and locations. Those plans must surely be agreed before work starts on a new schools project. Otherwise it is impossible to make a £60 million-decision with any degree of certainty that it fits into those plans. To try to decide what we should

2500 build before those plans are in place puts two things in jeopardy: the best educational outcomes for our children and value for money for taxpayers.

We cannot ignore the inconvenient truth that we currently have 18% that is 469 places over capacity in our secondary system. Logic or Barbara Jordan's reason tells us that the right time to decide how best to respond to this is before, not after, the decision on La Mare. That overcapacity  
2505 is 9.3% or 40%, sorry 40 places, 9.3% or 40 places higher than the number set out in Education's Report only last November.

That 18% is across the system. St Sampson's is full, whilst Beaucamps has around 150 spaces or 22% spare capacity. A 600-student La Mare would have about 160 spaces or 26% spare capacity and of course the Grammar has 140 empty spaces or 23%, entirely as a result of a self-imposed  
2510 policy of only taking the top 25% each year from the 11-plus. If space at the colleges is included that 469 rises to 600.

So let's be clear, three out of four secondary schools are one-quarter empty. That makes no sense educationally and it makes no sense financially. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The Education Minister has said that in 10 years' time we know there is going to be a peak... rising to a peak, it  
2515 will be 300 students larger than we currently have. But that is still 150 that will still leave us 150 excess spaces, which is a 250-space difference between now and what was in the November Billet.

Sir, Members have been bombarded with correspondence in the last week, but three have caught my eye. One simply said:

'It would be a very, very reckless decision by this Assembly if they agree to rebuild these schools at such great cost and then find out at a later date that the buildings may not be needed as the structure of secondary education has changed again.'

2520

The second said:

'We trust that common sense will prevail when the States vote on this matter. Cease the madness of spending £60 million plus without any regard to the wider education strategy of Guernsey. Review the current post 11 education offering and take the opportunity to provide the best education to every Guernsey pupil.'

But the most striking of all was from a very experienced senior teacher who has worked across  
2525 our schools, and he said:

'I do believe that we must have a very clear plan for any such model of secondary education before we commit to any further decisions on the Education Estate. If the States agree to rebuild La Mare without a full and proper review of the secondary structure, and subsequent proposals for how we manage the transition to any new structure, we are beginning a process with no end goal in mind.

I have always believed the correct and proper way to manage the process of restructuring secondary education is to first decide what we want our new structure to look like, following a period of research, consultation and due diligence. Once we have a model for our excellent secondary provision we can then begin to plan how to achieve that goal and determine what facilities need to be built, re-developed or acquired to achieve this.

For these reasons I do not see how we can possibly commit to the rebuilding of La Mare, and their subsequent closure of a secondary school, before the necessary investigative work is done. Furthermore, I believe that any rebuild of La Mare will inevitably lead to the closure of another secondary school at some point in the future. This is a view is not one that I have formed recently and I did explain this to the Education Board in my response to their Vision document over two years ago. Unfortunately, I received no response to this, nor were any of my comments mentioned or even alluded to in the summary of feedback to the Vision that was produced. I would urge you to read my comments there because they illustrate that the situation we are now in is one which was very easily foreseeable over two years ago.

Of course, I do acknowledge that both La Mare Schools are in extremely poor condition. I have recently worked there, and I do sympathise with the children, parents and staff of these schools. However, I do believe that we must make decisions in the correct order by deciding exactly what provision is needed for secondary education in the future and then work out a strategy to ensure that these children are given access to better buildings and facilities in the shortest time scale possible. Reason, logic, common sense.'

It is right for pupils, parents and teachers to be concerned at any further delay, of course it is, Treasury & Resources understands that concern, but any further delay should be minimal. Sue Archer was on the Independent Review Panel and is from Gleeds, the worldwide construction  
2530 consultancy... has said:

'La Mare could not be delayed for 15 to 16 months given the stage it has got to. You could redesign it from scratch and still meet the programme.'

Education's vision – Today's Learners, Tomorrow's World envisaged a States' Report on a new structure for post-16 education during 2013, and a new structure for secondary education during 2014. When we do see these they will – they must inform the decision-making process.

2535 The Education Minister informed the States at the June 2014 sitting that work had started on the secondary education report. That being the case, the additional delay, if any, should be minimal. Pupils, parents and teachers should be more concerned about the prospect of greater upheaval, building a school and then possibly having to add to it later, because it is not fit for purpose for our community in the longer term.

2540 All taxpayers should be concerned that Education could be asking for £110 million to rebuild La Mare and then potentially the College of Further Education, without having first clearly articulated and obtained agreement from this Assembly as to its long-term plans for the future of secondary and tertiary education. Taxpayers should also be concerned at the Independent Review Panel's conclusion that proceeding with the project at La Mare, and I quote:

2545 '...without significant future increase in school population or rationalisation... would, in our view, perpetuate uneconomic provision.'

The States' Assembly has been asked by Education if it is prepared to sanction £60 million for the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret without a clear view from Education on what the future of the Island's education system will be, which as I have said from the Education's vision, the States was expecting to have had the opportunity to consider and debate during 2013 and 2014.

2550 Now, Education will quite reasonably, and rightly, say that the vision said that they would submit proposals to rebuild La Mare to the Capital Prioritisation process. This, of course, they have done, but none of us when we debated the vision in July 2013 can reasonably have expected that we would be asked to make the final decision to proceed without the reports promised on secondary and tertiary education.

2555 Sir, when the Independent Review Panel presented their findings to a meeting of the Education and Treasury & Resources Boards, I thought Education would be jumping up and down with joy. It provided them with an opportunity to move to a model that all educationalists, on-Island and off-Island, starting with the Education Council in 2000 onwards, through the Advisory and Finance Commission Report in 2004, through Dennis Mulkerrin and through to the Nicholls Report... They have all consistently been arguing the same thing: that a smaller number of large schools would improve educational opportunities and outcomes by enabling the provision of a richer, more varied curriculum, in fully occupied and vibrant schools. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

2565 It provided an opportunity to accelerate the implementation of the federated model, it provided an opportunity to accelerate the introduction of local management of schools and it provided an opportunity to determine the future of tertiary education. On top of that, it provided an opportunity to expedite the release of land at the Coutanchez for housing and, finally, it provided an opportunity to save several million pounds a year, on top of anything that could be saved on capital spend. Win, win, win!

2570 I did not understand, and I do not understand, why they did not seize the opportunity presented with both hands. All I can think of is that the EDP, which may have been fit for purpose in 2001 has developed a self-sustaining life and momentum of its own. So we are wedded to delivering an extant Resolution from 2001, which ironically the Education Council never wanted in the first place. How on earth did we get here? It is our intention to instigate a review by internal audit into the processes that have been followed, so that we can learn lessons for the future.

2575 In the meantime, it is worth reviewing the history. We all know that the old Education Council originally recommended three large secondary schools when it sought to end selection. But, on amendment, the Education Development Plan emerged with one grammar school for ages 11 to

18 and three rebuilt high schools of 720 pupils each, and the College of Further Education, of course.

In 2004 Advisory and Finance released a report it had commissioned from Cambridge Projects Limited, which concluded that the development of two high schools with 1,000 students rather than three of 720 would have educational benefits as well as a saving of £10 million to £20 million of capital expenditure and ongoing running costs. With the benefit of that advice and hindsight, it is now clear and painfully obvious that, from a space point of view, a strategic mistake was made at that point. We should have rebuilt La Mare, already passed its sell-by date then with 960 students, then St Sampson's with the same, and then we would not have needed to have spent £37 million rebuilding Les Beaucamps.

Now I will give way.

**Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy St Pier for giving way.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** It is important, I think, that we revisit the order in which these decisions were made, but would he agree with me, that the decision to rebuild three high schools was a conscious decision made by the States, because they considered that two high schools of roughly 1,000 students would not provide what the community needed?

The Education Council did indeed advocate three schools, which I think they were right to advocate, but when that was rejected by the States, the States made a conscious decision not to have just two relatively large high schools.

Would he agree with me that that was the order in which the decisions were made, because I think there is a risk here in the States being led to believe that it somehow happened almost by accident that we ended up in a position where we were looking at the rebuild of three high schools? From the moment the States made the decision to retain selection, it was clear that it would be necessary to have three non-selective high schools.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, yes, I do agree with Deputy Fallaize's analysis and I think that is actually the next point I was going to come on to – that I do accept that that would have provided the space, but may well have produced a whole bag of social problems and other challenges. Deputy Laurie Queripel referred to that in terms of bullying and so on, and I know some of these issues concern Deputy Le Lièvre, and no doubt others, and I will return to that point later.

But we have, I think, inherited the strategic errors and poor choices of the past, in our determination to plough on and deliver a 15-year-old extant Resolution and, in doing so, we will knowingly and willingly compound previous mistakes and build over capacity at great expense to the taxpayer.

*Stop!* Let's just stop and make the decisions in the right order. Let's decide what secondary education should look like. Are we going to have selection at 11 or not? Let's decide what tertiary education should look like. Are we going to have a tertiary college or not? Will it include all post-16 education or not? Let's decide what education infrastructure we need to support the secondary and tertiary systems, then we can decide what bricks and mortar need building and rebuilding.

Education themselves have said that there is a strong case for rationalising the estate, so why on earth would we commit to building a £60 million school – the largest project in this capital round – and only afterwards embark on a review that determines the size, number and location of the secondary schools we need?

So let me make sure that I have actually understood this correctly – only nine months after we have decided to build a school, are we actually going to decide how many schools we need and how big they are. It is madness. It is complete madness! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) At that

point we will have three brand new secondary schools – and this is Deputy Laurie Queripel’s point, and a grammar school, and if we are not going to retain a Grammar we will not have enough space in the other schools. So if we are going to rationalise the estate... Yes, so how on earth are we going to rationalise the estate if we retain a grammar, and if we are not going to retain a grammar we will not have enough space in the other schools. So we will need to extend one or more, having just completed them.

This decision-making process is insane. It would not be so bad if it was our own money, but it is not. It cannot possibly be right that only after committing to spending do we decide the number and locations we need and their uses. Even if we do reject this amendment and approve Education’s Propositions unamended, how on earth is Treasury & Resources expected to be able to sign off a full business case, knowing Education has just embarked on a review to rationalise the estate, and whilst the reviews of secondary and tertiary education promised in the vision are outstanding?

T&R has been consistent. At the very first meeting with Education in September 2012 we requested that a plan be submitted for the future of La Mare, taking into account the review of secondary education. In November 2013 a strategic assessment recommended that a strategy refresh of the Education Development Plan should be undertaken to ensure that the proposals remained aligned with current policies.

In its inimitable style, the response came back. It would appear that Treasury & Resources is acting *ultra vires* and that this would appear to be a matter for the States of Deliberation. Well, now the States of Deliberation have an opportunity, through this amendment, to insist on that strategy refresh, to ensure that the proposals remain aligned following the review of the secondary and tertiary education, which we all know from their vision and the Minister’s statement last June, Education are in the middle of undertaking.

For those such as Deputy Le Lièvre – and this is perhaps the point that Deputy Fallaize was making – who are concerned about the social problems of cramming all of those who have not been selected for the Grammar into two large schools – a concern which I completely understand – this is the opportunity to ensure that we make the decision about the future of secondary education before we embark on rationalisation – either by Treasury’s amendment or by Education’s report next March. This amendment will ensure that we make the decisions in the right order and so there will be no need to deal with the consequences of building excess capacity by rationalising the number of schools through my amendment.

Sir, to be clear for Deputy Laurie Queripel and others, if this amendment succeeds there will be no need for Treasury & Resources to lay its own amendment. For those that are concerned that this amendment does not specifically refer to selection, it is inconceivable that a review of secondary education could not include a review of selection. Indeed, the Minister, from his speech in the Assembly at the time of the debate of the vision, confirmed that a review of selection would be part of that review. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Sir, there are a number of Members who I know feel a great sense of loyalty to Education and its current Board, and that is admirable, but I say to those individuals this issue is so important it transcends personal loyalty. You know that the reality is that your vote risks locking us into a four-school model, because we will have three brand new schools and the Grammar. I am glad that the Minister of Education supports that this decision should be based on logic, because logic dictates that we make the decisions in the right order.

Sir, I urge all Members to please vote to support this amendment and ensure that we do make the decisions in the right order. *(Applause)*

**The Bailiff:** Next, Deputy Conder and then Deputy Adam and Deputy Hadley.

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

Well, gosh, that was calm and logical reasoning. I am glad the Minister of Treasury & Resources did display some emotion, because emotion is part of this context.



I am going to speak with my head but emotion is right; we are not desiccated calculating machines, as the former Labour politician Aneurin Bevan described his potential leader Hugh Gaitskell back in the 1950's. Emotion does play a part, but clearly we must be logical; but, as the Minister just displayed, when we discuss these things it is inevitable that some level of emotion will be shown.

Sir, in the context of the stage we have now reached in our deliberations regarding the rebuilding of the La Mare de Carteret Schools, this amendment, in my opinion, is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because it comes at the end of a long formal deliberative process in which this Assembly has, via the approval of the Education Department's vision, already approved the sequencing of the decision-making process regarding the rebuild of the La Mare de Carteret Schools.

That vision clearly showed the sequencing of its work streams and timetables. Those work streams included first the approval of the rebuilding of the schools, within the context of the still extant States' Resolution embodied in the Education Development Plan of 2002, which no-one and no States has, to my knowledge, rescinded or even questioned up to now.

Second, the Education's vision identified a review of the structure of secondary education that would follow and, thirdly, the creation of a new structure for post-16 education. As I have just said, that sequencing was agreed unanimously or nearly unanimously when the Education Department presented its work streams and timetables to this Assembly in 2013. There has been slippage and delays, not least because of the workload placed upon our Civil Service colleagues by the continued procrastination and changes of mind associated with getting this project underway. But those delays in no way change the sequencing approved by the Assembly in 2013.

This amendment is unfortunate because it introduces yet another delay to the rebuilding of the La Mare de Carteret Schools – delay upon delay. Notwithstanding the protestations by many colleagues who spoke in the debate on the last delaying amendment in November, who said they would only vote for the Le Tocq/Langlois amendment if they were assured that, if approved, that amendment would not result in any delay to the rebuilding of the school, and we now know what happened as a result.

This latest amendment will guarantee a further delay and thus will condemn the children currently at La Mare de Carteret School, and their successors, to yet more years in significantly substandard schools. Is that what one of the legacies of this States is to be?

Sir, since the dark days of 2011, our results across all schools have been on a marked and significant upwards trajectory. There will be annual dips – we know that – but performance is upwards; ahead of Jersey, ahead of the UK and getting better. As, indeed, we should demand of our education system.

Sir, for those colleagues who perhaps do not recall, in 2011 La Mare de Carteret had an 11.5% success rate for students leaving the school with five GCSEs at A\* to C, including English and maths – 11.5%. That meant nearly 90% of those children leaving that school did not have the basic qualifications. Last year that result was 40.6% – up from 11.5% in 2011 to 40.6% in 2014. That was achieved as a result of investing in additional teachers and the extraordinary efforts of leadership and teaching in that school.

The Minister of Education has already indicated to you what these delays are doing to the recruitment of our teachers. Do not underestimate the impact of this continued procrastination, continuing debate about whether this school will be built, and continuing uncertainty within our secondary sector as a whole. It is damaging our secondary sector. It has the potential to damage and halt that trajectory of improvement until we resolve these problems. This amendment suggests we should now halt the rebuild of our one remaining substandard school, to undertake and consider such a major and radical view and then, presumably, design an implementation strategy – and do it quickly.

What is this latest proposed delay going to say to the children of the La Mare de Carteret as they wait once again for those who represent them to make a decision on the rebuilding of their schools? What is that going to do to our educational outcomes? What implications does that have

2735 for those individuals as they leave La Mare de Carteret School and start to get on with their lives? They have one chance.

This amendment is ill-conceived because it suggests the Education Department, Treasury & Resources Department recommends sufficient funds to ensure the La Mare de Carteret Schools are adequately maintained until such time as the rebuild project commences. Well, nice prospect  
2740 though that might be, throwing additional States' funding at the schools will be a classic case of throwing good money after bad. It might – it just might – deal with some of the weather-related problems, but given that we currently have an estimate of £6 million, £6 million to reroof the Grammar School, I am not sure if this is what the signatories to this amendment had in mind; because that is what it might need, just for starters, and then we pull it all down again.

2745 Colleagues, wouldn't that be excellent stewardship of the taxpayers' funds. Even a new roof, new windows and new heating system, new air conditioning, relaying the car parks, enlarging the hall, replacing dilapidated mobile classrooms is not going to make that school fit for purpose. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

The classrooms are the wrong size for modern teaching methods and methodologies. The  
2750 corridors and throughways are the wrong size and limit the flexible use of the larger congregation spaces. There is insufficient space for students to eat their meals and congregate in a civilised manner. That is what we currently tell our young people at the La Mare de Carteret is good enough for them and – *and* – at the end of the day the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret is selection and structure neutral.

2755 By that I mean whatever the structure of secondary education in the future we need a 600-student high school and a 420-primary school on the La Mare de Carteret site. Whether we have four, three or two secondary schools and whatever the structure of secondary education looks like in the future, selective, comprehensive, free schools, academies or whatever system the latest educational expert in Guernsey can come up with on the back of a cigarette packet, there still has  
2760 to be a 600-student secondary school and a 420-primary school at La Mare de Carteret.

Sir, the point I have just made and I am about to elaborate upon is the most significant point I can make in this speech, or in this debate. I will return to it without embarrassment in any further speeches I make in relation to any other amendments, or in the main debate on the Education Department's Propositions.

2765 Sir, this amendment, and much of the preceding public debate, has been about achieving value for money. We have been urged not to commit to spending our capital funding irrevocably, pending later decisions in respect of the future structure of secondary or tertiary education. That is perhaps prudent, although it builds in delay and procrastination. As I have said, in a public service such as education it means that those going through the system at a particular time suffer  
2770 because of delays in decision making and investment, and they get no second chance.

However, sir, the reason this amendment is so unnecessary and so potentially damaging to the future of education on this Island is because it fails to recognise that if we get on now with initiating the rebuild of a 600-student secondary school there is no risk to the public purse, but if we do not there is a very significant risk to the future education of the children of one part of our  
2775 Island community.

The Education Department can demonstrate that if a decision is made now to get on with building the school as a 600-student school, all of the reviews of secondary education, the 11-plus, the structure of tertiary education and how many secondary schools we need, can be made before an irrevocable decision has to be made as to whether the La Mare de Carteret School  
2780 should be built for 600 students in a four-school model or for 960 students in a three-school model. It can be made before an irrevocable decision is made.

The Education Minister has already alluded to this fact and the floor plan diagram that was left in each States' Member's place early today – looks like this – can demonstrate that fact. I will now just turn to that plan and explain, as best I can, just why you can and should vote for the  
2785 Education Department's Propositions and reject this amendment. For clarification, the diagram is of the first floor of the proposed building.

Colleagues, the diagram you have, as I have said, shows the first floor. The large white area which incorporates the red arrow at the bottom left hand side of the diagram is that part of the site that has always been allocated for expanding the school to 960 students, if and when such a decision was made. The new school has been so designed such that at any time up to when the contractors leave the site, the site or part of the completed building could be opened up and the extension included in the final build, at any time up to when the contractors leave the site.

The ground floor which you do not have... the ground floor sections that would be adjacent to the new build are open walkways, so it would require no structural change to the ground floor if the extension were to be built later in the build process.

As far as the first floor is concerned – which you have in front of you – if in March of next year, or earlier or later – following the full consultation for all stakeholders, including of course this Assembly... if it is decided to build a 960-student school then, via the simple expedient of not building or opening up the small room marked in green and labelled with a red arrow on your diagram... simply not building that or opening it up, then the extension, the floor extent, can be included in the build programme.

The proposed office which has been highlighted would form the opening into a corridor which would give access to the first floor of the extension – simple and already designed in. Compare that with the extraordinary costs of keeping an out-of-date weather-affected building going through a major maintenance programme for an unspecified period.

Sir, as I have said, I think this is the most significant point that I can make in this debate. There is no cost risk associated with getting on with building a 600-student secondary school on the La Mare de Carteret site now. Its extension to a 960-school is cost neutral. It may even generate cash savings for the exchequer, through obviating the need to maintain the old La Mare de Carteret Schools for an extended period.

Throughout this debate – the long and tortuous months of this debate – no-one has suggested not building a 600-student school on that site. There is no other option. In every scenario we might think of, in terms of the future structure of secondary and tertiary education, a 600-student secondary school as a minimum has to be built at La Mare.

If we make the decision now to get on with building such a school then there is plenty of time to bring all the reports anyone, or any Department, might demand or seek, well before any irrevocable decision is made.

Indeed, the Education Department has committed itself to bringing the outstanding reports and a proposal on the future structure of secondary education to this Assembly by no later – *no later* – than March 2016, with at least one option for reducing the number of secondary schools from four to three. It is very unlikely that by then, even if we approve the go-ahead today or tomorrow, the first sod of earth will have even been cut onsite by March 2016, but – and this is the big but – if you make the right decision today or tomorrow you will have enabled the process of getting the school rebuilt and at last give the staff, children and parents some realistic expectation that their decrepit school will be replaced by a known date not too far in the future.

While that initial building programme gets under way, this Assembly will still have the flexibility without any additional cost risks to determine how many secondary schools it wants and the nature of secondary education on this Island in the future.

Colleagues, if you remember nothing else from this speech remember this point: the school has been designed for expansion, it can be expanded at minimal and probably no additional onsite costs, and the States save considerable additional costs of continuing to maintain a ruin of a school only to pull it down in the foreseeable future. We have all agreed and resolved that in all circumstances a 600-school, at a minimum, is required on the site. There can be no logical educational and cost reason for not going on with the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret School now.

Sir, to paraphrase some of the magnificent words of Martin Luther King, when 15 years ago the architects of our Education Development Plan secured approval for the amendment, which

determined the direction of our secondary education system, they were signing a promissory note to children yet to be born, and to their parents and their grandparents, and our society as a whole.

2840 That note was a promise to all of them having perpetuated the 11-plus system, we would commit ourselves to rebuilding our dilapidated high schools to such a standard that regardless of ability, aptitude or talent, our young people would be taught and experience their school lives in facilities of equal standard and which offered each child the opportunity to fulfil their potential in decent surroundings, which did not discriminate between various parts of our Island or different parts of our society.

2845 It is obvious today that Guernsey is in danger of defaulting on that promissory note, insofar as our young people at La Mare de Carteret catchment area are concerned. Instead of honouring that obligation, we are in danger of giving those young people a bad cheque, and a cheque which has come back marked 'insufficient funds' or 'resubmit at a later date'.

2850 But, colleagues, I refuse to believe this States will again seek to delay the rebuilding of the La Mare de Carteret Schools through this amendment. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling-off or take the tranquilising drug of procrastination and delay. Now is the time to fulfil those promises made 15 years ago. Now is the time to get on with this project that has so shamefully been delayed over these past months. Now is the time to say to the young people of this community and their families that we will honour the promises and obligations our predecessors made. Reject this ill-conceived and ill-timed amendment. Now is the time for this Assembly to demonstrate that when the need arises we will make the necessary and important and, yes, difficult decisions.

2855 Colleagues, reject this amendment. Now is the time! (*Applause*)

2860 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

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

2865 This is going to be rather difficult after two such excellent speeches and I am sure we will all remember something from both of them.

2870 What I remember from Deputy Conder's was how he explained so clearly how the educational aspects have improved in La Mare over the last few years; not because of a new building, not because it has been painted or decorated, but because they put extra resources and support for teachers there, because the children there were given more support and because the parents of the children were seeing that support.

So please remember one thing: having a new school does not necessarily improve education. There is not necessarily a link between academic achievement and improved building environment. However, sir, that is just as an aside.

2875 I wish to start off by saying that the Member of this Assembly who was the more hirsute one on Education was myself, as the Chief Minister mentioned. He and I were on Education – well, I was there from 2001 to 2012, I think it was – and I would like to start with Deputy Bebb who I thought made a very interesting speech.

2880 Deputy Bebb comes from Wales, as you all know. He has got a beautiful voice, but also having just come back from a BMIC or a CPA meeting, I was chatting to some Welsh MPs and you will be delighted to know he comes from a good background, a good political background.

2885 But in his speech he said one thing which I tend to disagree with. He said, 'Do not blame the previous States' Members for the situation we are in at the present time.' Interesting. I think that is fair enough in some ways, but I personally cannot accept it, because I do feel that I have a degree of responsibility for where we are at the present time. As you all know... and the Resolutions are there to see from the Billet 10th May 2001:

'To instruct the States' Education Council to report back to the States as soon as may be with a proposal for three new high schools, such proposals to include an outline cost for the complete fitment, and to instruct the States' Education Council to report back to the States with proposals to develop and improve the College of Further Education on its existing site, or such alternative sites as that Council considers appropriate.'

We keep talking about La Mare. I have not heard anyone mention the College of Further Education. What has happened to it? Personally, from my point of view, on reflection, I feel that the decisions that were made by the previous Boards on the advice of the Department tended to be in relation to one project at a time; in other words, the closure of St Peter Port when St Sampson's was built. They did not discuss at these debates anything else but that. Les Beaucamps School – where was it discussed? It was discussed after in a newspaper. There was a headline about windows falling out and lack of maintenance. We did not discuss La Mare at that time.

Yet in 1999, Deputy Laurie Queripel, it was recognised that La Mare should have been built first by that then Assembly. So maybe that is our Deputies' problems. Maybe we do not look at the overall subject and I accept at that time maybe I was naïve, not mature enough, as a politician, but I would like to think that my Ministers found out otherwise and I think out of the box sometimes. Thus, as far as I am concerned, this Assembly has been given that opportunity to address the omissions of the past – that is ensure the fundamental over-encompassing decisions that are made before spending £60 million on La Mare site and remember what you may not remember or not wish to remember because it is going to come up within two or three years' time – another £50 million on the College of FE.

I think that is what we should be talking about. We are not talking just about La Mare, we are talking about how much money are we going to have to spend in the next five to 10 years for our overall structure of education for this Island, and for the benefit of the young people, because that is what we have to decide today, not just La Mare.

La Mare is very important. I have been to an evening class there for the last 10 years, I know the condition. I was on the PTA of La Mare and the primary school, like Deputy Le Tocq. I know what the school is like, but I also know with proper resources and support, they can improve their results, which we have clearly been told this afternoon, in no uncertain terms.

Again, Deputy Conder said is the timing wrong? I do not necessarily disagree with that, but this is the time you have, and the problem is in the last few weeks we have wound up the expectations, we have wound up the emotions, and it is not just Members of this Assembly, it is that lovely thing called *The Guernsey Press* – the headlines come out. It is interesting to read the editorials, the opinion columns – they vary from one day, one week to the next. Then Mr Nick Mann of the *Press* tells I am mute, so I thought I had better not be mute today and... [*Inaudible*] (*Laughter*)

So, as I say, it may not be comfortable, it may not be easy, but this is the time, this is your chance to try and put to rights some of the – I will not say errors, because we have got good schools, got nice new schools etc. – but to start thinking for the next 10 years, not for the next two or three years, because money is tight.

Everyone says the money has been laid aside for this project. No, when the capital projects were put forward, it was said it was going to cost about £60 million. As you all may remember, the total budget on money there for capital projects does not meet the aspirations of this Assembly for addressing all these capital projects. We must make sure that each one is value for money, and each one can be shown to provide evidence that it achieves what it is meant to achieve, no matter what field it is.

This amendment gives you the opportunity. Obviously I advise you strongly do not consider one educational project at a time; look at it holistically, look at the future. I can assure you, if you think La Mare is in bad condition go and look at the huts and outbuildings of the College of FE. The restaurant has got some superb facilities; it has got a nice kitchen – all the modern kitchen facilities there – but wander down the steps in through that building into the metal workshop – yes, I have been there as well – into the other workshop and the other buildings, and that needs replacing in the not-too-distant future, because the skill force has changed, requirements have changed.

So consider that when you are considering this. Likewise, as you all know, the method of teaching the curriculum, qualifications required, these have all changed at the BMIC we are talking about unemployment and education, and they are saying that there should be a shift from what

2940 people think is university education into more vocational, because they are finding they need plumbers, electricians builders etc. Plumbers as well as people in finance. Plus painters, as well as people in the finance. Therefore things are changing. Therefore that is why you are going to need something like the College of FE in good condition.

2945 Therefore, sir, I would like to ask this Assembly most sincerely to consider these matters, consider where you are going and make me feel slightly more comfortable and support this amendment, because I feel, personally, that maybe we did not make the correct decisions, maybe we did not have all the information. But you have got the information, you have had the review, you have had experts from outside Guernsey, plus experts from inside Guernsey, giving advice on what should have happened or what should not have happened. I think now we have to look at the next 10 years – a holistic viewpoint. Thus I would hope you will be able to support this amendment, which is giving us that opportunity.

2950 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley, then Deputy Brouard.

2955 **Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, I would like to start, through you, by reminding Deputy Adam of an event which he no doubt thinks is not particularly significant, that happened in 2008. In 2008 he became the Minister of the Health & Social Services Department, so I cannot see that he was a Member of the Education Board until 2012.

2960 However you try to dress it up, this amendment is a quite brazen delaying tactic brought on by Treasury & Resources, which will condemn some of our children to continue to receive an education in the most inappropriate conditions.

**Deputy Bebb:** Point of correction.

2965 **Deputy Hadley:** And you have heard it, Mr Bailiff –

**Deputy Bebb:** Point of correction.

**Deputy Hadley:** – here first. You have heard Deputy –

2970 **Deputy Bebb:** Point of correction.

Deputy Hadley stated that this amendment was brought by the Treasury & Resources Department. The last time I looked I do not sit on that Department and neither does Deputy Dorey.

2975 **Deputy Hadley:** This amendment would not have happened if the Treasury & Resources Department had not caused the Report on the La Mare de Carteret School at the end of last year so, however you argue about semantics, we would not be here today but for the Treasury & Resources Department, and indeed, the Treasury & Resources Department –

2980 **The Chief Minister:** Sir, point of correction.

Deputy Hadley cannot continue like this. It was the Deputy Chief Minister and myself that brought an amendment to get the review in place, and I stand by that as a good means of dealing with the problem. We have sought also since then to work with both Departments. So I think he is alluding to things that just fit his argument.

2985 **Deputy Perrot:** Point of correction, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot.

**Deputy Perrot:** At the time when that amendment was proposed and seconded, as I recollect it, the Treasury Minister was not actually even in the Chamber, because I remember having to field it myself! *(Laughter)*

2995 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Point of correction.

The amendment was consistent with the point I made in the vision debate in July 2013. I have been entirely consistent, as I will show later.

3000

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley, please continue.

**Deputy Hadley:** Well, I think I might be interrupted a bit more, Mr Bailiff, because the Treasury & Resources Department have announced that if this amendment succeeds then they will not be laying the amendment that they were proposing.

3005

My speech was prepared for the amendment that was to be laid by the Treasury Department. I am now delivering it in the knowledge that that amendment may not be laid and therefore you might find one or two references to the Minister. Also it is true that I am following the Treasury Minister's speech and so some of the comments I could quite legitimately, I think, ascribe to the Treasury Minister, as he has spoken.

3010

Now, before I started to speak, Deputy Adam made it quite clear that, in his view, the States has not got the money to build this school, and so I come back to the point I am making, this is a delaying tactic to stop the rebuilding of La Mare School because in the view, certainly, of one eminent Member of the Assembly there is not sufficient money to do it.

3015

Unless this is a point of correction, I am not giving way, sir.

**Deputy Perrot:** That is absolutely outrageous! It is not true –

**Deputy Fallaize:** A point of order, sir.

3020

**The Bailiff:** Is this a point of correction, Deputy Perrot?

**Deputy Perrot:** Point of correction.

3025

Deputy Hadley jumps to all sorts of preposterous conclusions about what Treasury & Resources have been doing. Treasury & Resources have said that an amendment will be laid if the Bebb/Dorey amendment is not successful. The laying of that amendment has absolutely nothing to do with whether or not funds are available. What other Members have tried to explain, and Deputy Hadley, so signally, fails to understand, is that the totality of the funds required for the capital projects are not there. We have not said that money would not be available for this school.

3030

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** Mr Bailiff, it is my view that the whole point of this amendment is that it is a delaying tactic to prevent the expenditure of money.

3035

Even if, over the next few years, we spend millions of pounds of the taxpayers' money on tarring up La Mare, getting rid of the leaks, the damp and the rats, it will still not address the fundamental inadequacy of the provision.

3040

Deputy St Pier has said in this Assembly that he would not waste a penny of taxpayers' money and yet he is proposing the largest profligate waste of taxpayers' money that we have ever seen. The Treasury Department wants us to commit to a reduction in the number of secondary schools on this Island without any consultation. They want us to tear up States' Resolution of 2002 –

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, point of correction –

3045 **Deputy Hadley:** – without any –

**Deputy St Pier:** Point of correction, sir. *(Interjection)*

3050 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** We do appear to be addressing the wrong amendment. I know Deputy Hadley has explained why he is doing that – *(Laughter)* he is reading the wrong speech – but I do think he needs to edit it as he goes. *(Laughter)*

3055 **The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Can you do that, Deputy Hadley? *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Hadley:** I have given the right one, sir.

3060 **The Bailiff:** You may yet have the opportunity to deliver that speech.

**Deputy Hadley:** Right, right, right. *(Interjection and laughter)*  
Is this a point of correction? *(Interjection)* No, no, I am not giving way. No, good heavens! *(Laughter)*

3065 Now, if Deputy Bebb or Deputy St Pier could point to any alternative model which would not need a newly built La Mare School there might be a reason to vote for this, or the following amendment. But they cannot. *(Interjections)* Whatever model of secondary education you point at, it still requires a new school at La Mare of at least 600 pupils. If you reduce the number of high schools from three to two –

3070 Is this a point of correction? No then! *(Laughter)*

If you reduce the number of high schools from three to two it would need new buildings at La Mare and St Sampson's because Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's would not be big enough. If you abolish the 11-plus and move the students from the Grammar School site to the other secondary schools and use the premises as a tertiary college, you still need to rebuild La Mare. So, 3075 I say, if Deputy Bebb can show me any model which would negate the need for a new school then it might make some sense to delay the build, but he cannot.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction.

3080 I am sorry. I must intervene. Deputy Hadley is not – he is misleading the States – the States' Education Council itself proposed a three-school model to the States in 2001 which did not include La Mare de Carteret. They proposed the closure of La Mare de Carteret Secondary School and the construction of three high schools – one at the Grammar School site, one at Beaucamps at one at St Sampson's.

3085 **Deputy Hadley:** My understanding is that with the projected number of students that we have expected to be in 2023, you would not be able to build schools of sufficient capacity on a three-school model to avoid the rebuilding of La Mare School. But I am fairly new at the Education Department. I am sure somebody else will put it a better way than I can.

3090 Anyway, despite all of this, Deputy Bebb wants us to continue to repair ramshackle buildings, throwing away the hard-earned money of Guernsey people until the day that they allow it to be rebuilt, because rebuilt it must be.

Now, quite often people of this Island criticise this Assembly for stupid decisions, for reversing decisions or for spending hours of useless debate! *(Laughter and interjections)* I wonder in fact



whether this might be because there is an election coming up. (**Several Members:** Ooh!) Perhaps T&R want to look tough.

Well, Mr Bailiff, I would like to tell the Assembly that T&R Board do not look tough to me and they do not look tough to the students and parents and teachers at La Mare and Les Beaucamps Schools, because the people of this Island will not think they look tough, they will put this Assembly and Deputy Bebb into disrepute. An Assembly unable to make a decision, unable to follow through on previous commitments made to the people of this Island. Unable to have a strategy that is not destroyed by apparent benign amendments from T&R, such as with the Transport Strategy.

There is a commitment to treat all of our children equally with three fit-for-purpose high schools.

I do tend to get a bit put off by management speak: the three Es, the six Ss and I found out recently that Gavin St Pier has the four Ps – participate, pontificate, procrastinate, and postpone. But, as I say, Mr Bailiff, the people of Guernsey do not want this project postponed.

I want the Assembly to reject this amendment, and the other amendment if it comes, and support the Department's recommendation to start the rebuild of La Mare as soon as possible.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

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

I will be as quick as I can, Mr Bailiff, because I realise we have been debating this amendment for too long before we dismiss it. (**A Member:** Ha, ha!) (*Laughter*) Thank you.

The amendment itself is almost superficially attractive, because... but what it actually is, is a mask, because all it does... the main thing it does is it masks the actual Propositions by covering them over, and that is where we lose the school.

Point (1) of the amendment, basically, is what Education promised to do anyway. Then you go on to point (2) of the amendment which... this is a bit of a dilemma really because the first part of it says that the Independent Panel said that, 'the condition of the school buildings is such that they are no longer sustainable.'

It does not say that they can be repaired or that they should be maintained, it says, '...they are no longer sustainable.' But then the amendment goes on to say, 'Well, actually we have read that but we do not actually read it properly, because we are going to carry on and maintain the school.' So it is just fluff. What the actual amendment does is mask the fact that they are trying to put the idea of having a school further and further away.

Deputy St Pier's speech, I think, where he found three people to agree with him... I think most of the other people have had a lot more people who are probably more on the other side, that actually we should get on and rebuild the school. He says, 'Just stop and we will have another review.' We have had this debate quite often in the States where we have so many reviews that we end up actually doing nothing, and sometimes you just have to make a stand and say, 'Actually we just have to get on and do it now.'

If anyone is unsure of what the political long grass looks like, well, this is it. I am sure there will be SCIP mark two for it to go through, and then there will be the colour wheel review to go through, and then there will be the shade of tarmac review, and so it will go on.

Deputy Conder was very clear. This build is selective neutral. It is interesting, we had Dr Nicholls' Review which came out, I would suggest, different to that expected by its commissioners. With that, what do they do? They look to find another review that happens to match what they want it to say.

The decision was made to have three secondary schools of the same standard or two secondary schools of the same standard of the Grammar School.

Deputy Bebb said it is not possible to promise 14 years later. But I say this to Deputy Bebb: it is possible to deliver on those promises 14 years later. Throw out this amendment and deliver on those promises.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

3150 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I have been approached about this amendment and in relation to the changes that have been made from the original version, which the Assembly kindly allowed us to put this amended version.

3155 One of the questions that I have been asked is, does this amendment still include a review of selection? Because we refer to the Today's Learners, Tomorrow's World, the Education vision statement, I will refer to that. Under secondary education, it is very clear, one of the bullet points says:

'Review of the current system of selective education in Guernsey and development of firm, evidence-based proposals for the most effective structure of delivery of secondary education for all our students.'

3160 Deputy Sillars also obviously spoke in that debate and I quote directly from what he said and, taken from *Hansard* – this was in the July 2013 debate – he said:

'In 2014 a report will focus on restructuring secondary education. For clarity, I confirm that when the Education Department brings [back] its report to the States next year on a new structure for secondary education as referred to in Appendix 2, that report will include a full review of selection at 11, with recommendations arising from that review.'

3165 So I think it is absolutely clear and I think he has also reinforced it this morning, that this structure review will include selection at 11.

I have also been asked why we did not include a date for coming back to the Assembly. Well, Education put a year in their timetable in 2013 and have failed to deliver on time. We could have included a date, but dates in Propositions seem to me at least to have little meaning. I have far too often heard a statement apologising for delay. So we have not included a date but we just said 'as soon as practical'. I think the views of the Assembly today are very clear. They want that report back as soon as possible. As they said that they would bring it back in 2014, hopefully it should be quite advanced at this stage.

3170 Deputy Conder said, on rebuilding La Mare, this is the only option. And also Deputy Hadley said any model does need a new school at La Mare. Well, hopefully, by the end of my speech I will try and show you there are other models that do not need a rebuild at La Mare. We must spend our money wisely on schools to get the best educational system for our children and future generations.

3180 So the purpose of this amendment is to ensure that La Mare is adequately maintained, and that do events in the correct order, i.e. we decide on the system of education and we build a school to deliver that system, not *vice versa*.

3185 Firstly, I will speak on the maintenance situation. Before the November date I went round both the primary and secondary schools at La Mare, and I agree with the Chief Minister, there is a contrast between the two schools. It was obvious to me that the primary school had been better maintained. I was really surprised at the repairs, or rather the absence of repairs, in the secondary school which created, in my view, an unacceptable aesthetics.

3190 Let me give some examples. It is really not necessary to have a block of lockers with numerous doors either broken or missing, but that was the situation. It does not cost a lot to do that, but it would make such a difference. Also the situation was highlighted for me by the pupil who took us around – and Deputy Queripel was one who went round with me – she said that the girls got so fed up with the condition of the toilets that they asked to paint them themselves and they did. Now, does that not give you an example of the fact that even the most basic of maintenance had not been done? I know it is a minor point, but it is almost as if the school had been run down. I

really hope that is not the case. I want a commitment to maintain the school and part of this amendment is to ensure there is sufficient money for this.

3195 This secondary school was built for 600 pupils and now there are 439 pupils. That is 110 less pupils than it had three years ago. This reduction in pupils should help to reduce some of the problems caused by the lack of space. I saw at the Castel Primary School what a difference it can make to a school if it is properly maintained. When I joined the School Committee in 1997 it was in very poor condition, but when sufficient money was spent to catch up with all the maintenance and this, combined with a reduction in pupils, meant the school was turned round; and it makes such a difference to the atmosphere in the school. I hope the same can happen at La Mare even if only in the short term.

3200 Deputy Conder compared the roof at La Mare with that at the Grammar School but they are very different. The Grammar School has got a sloping roof which is slated, while the roof at La Mare is a flat roof.

3205 Now, I want to speak about what is the correct order of events. Firstly, it makes absolutely no sense whatsoever to build a school in the hope that it will meet the requirements of a future structure for secondary education. One person who e-mailed us yesterday called it madness. We must not build first and review the structure of our education after. It has been said that the Education Department are just following the Resolutions of the States made in 2002 when they came back after the 2001 report.

3210 Well, since then the programme has already been amended. Dates have changed considerably, but of course the change in situation as the original programme was to build three 720-pupil schools. Only one 720-pupil school has been built – St Sampson's. Les Beaucamps has a capacity of 660 and now La Mare is proposed with 600. So Education has obviously changed the size of schools as a result of the reduction in pupils.

3215 That highlights one of the reasons not to build La Mare. At the peak number of pupils, we would have within the States' secondary schools 210 more places than necessary since 2006-07 from the graph that we were given. We went to the presentation given to us on the report of the Independent Panel. It is not sensible to build schools which are designed to last at least 60 years for a peak of school population. So I looked at the population five years either side of the peak. The over capacity then would be 275. That is almost half the size of a new school. The number of pupils is predicted to continue to reduce after that date. It will be an expensive mistake to have such an over capacity. The independent review said that schools which have a significant overcapacity do not have the vibrancy and buzz that help to make a school an enjoyable place to be for both students and staff.

3220 I just cannot understand why Education wants to go ahead with this project at this time. Proposition 3 of the Education Department's Report states there is a strong case for rationalising the Education estate, and they want to submit a report regarding the optimum size, number and location of secondary schools to deliver a broad and balanced curriculum, and that one option is for moving from four to three secondary age schools. Why should the States build a school when such a review is being proposed? The argument is made even stronger when there is such a fundamental review of the structure of education, including a review of the selection system, outstanding.

3235 It is absolutely illogical to build this school at this time, particularly, when we have three good schools already. The Grammar School was built and completed in 1985, with a sixth form centre completed in 2005. St Sampson's was built in 2008 and Les Beaucamps completed in 2012.

3240 Deputy Conder said it can be extended, when we already have an overcapacity. Deputy Sillars referred to evidence-based decisions, but to decide to build and report on after is not evidence-based decisions; that is the complete opposite. You just cannot make that argument with the order of events that they are proposing. He and Deputy Conder also mentioned about the uncertainty effect on recruitment and the delay. But Proposition 3 gives that uncertainty by saying they are going to review the number, location and size. So they cannot have it both ways.

I want all children to be educated in buildings of a similar quality with modern facilities, so it is difficult for me to second this amendment and effectively delay La Mare. But I want to ensure that we spend our money wisely. I want to ensure that Education completes this review on the structure, including the selection system, as soon as possible, to make sure that we have the right system – the best system – for our children.

They said it would be completed in 2014, so I can only assume that they have done considerable work on it already. Surely, it will not take much time for it to be completed, then we can debate the report and then, or even as part of that report, review the estate so we build the right school consistent with Education, decided by the States, and not just hope that the new school is required for the new system.

As I write I find it hard to believe we are actually having this debate and Education are trying to carry out what should be a logical order of events in reverse order. The term I often heard over the last recent three weeks to justify why Education says we must go ahead with La Mare is that it is selection neutral. I want to try and show that there are options that do not involve rebuilding La Mare. The rebuild is not selection neutral. I am not saying that these are necessarily the only options, I am just giving you some examples to emphasise why we need to properly look at this first.

For example, we could keep the existing system selection and extend St Sampson's to make it an 840-pupil school. It was designed to be extended to 960 already. It had 774 pupils so this option will only mean an extra 66 pupils. That was in 2009-10. In addition, we could also extend Les Beaucamps to make it an 840-pupil school. It might have to be another building on site, or extend the existing buildings. In the past we have purchased land or glass houses and houses in order to build the two existing schools.

Some will say the school needs to be contained into one building, but from research I have done, many schools in the UK deliberately have more than one building so that pupils have some fresh air and space between lessons, which can help concentration in their forthcoming lessons.

This would still be 100 places short of the places needed for the peak year. This could be dealt with by flexing the existing schools. Just as they did at St Sampson's in 2009 when I said that they had an extra 54 pupils above the 720. Or we could use modern good quality temporary class rooms on a temporary basis to cope with the peak.

A better alternative, in my view, would be to have two age 11 to 18 schools with no selection at 11. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I know the reaction has always been that people do not want large schools, but the Grammar School had, at its peak, 1,067 pupils. The graph which was shown very briefly at the meeting at Les Beaucamps last Wednesday showed the size of a year group against the percentage of students achieving five or more grade A to C grades in GCSEs, including English and maths. I know for those who cannot see, and I have got the graph here, it is titled 'evidence inconclusive', but this graph was done for 3,489 schools in England. I think there is a clear trend.

Along the bottom axis here it shows the size of the year cohort, and here it shows percentage of children getting grade A to C. When you look at that central area it is clear that there is... as you increase the size of the year group you have a greater percentage getting grade A to C GCSEs, including English and maths. They do talk about a coalition co-efficient of 0.26 and say it is a weak causal relationship, but from the research that I have done, when you have such a large sample size that is a good dependency.

The other advantage of large 11 to 18 schools is the effect it has on the recruitment of good teachers, which obviously is so important and contributes to most results. The message that I heard from Dr Nicholls – and I also heard the same message from local teachers – is that larger 11 to 18 schools enable the recruitment and retention of high quality staff, because they are able to teach their subject over a wide range and it is often desirable for teachers.

Age 11 to 18 schools are rarely off putting, whereas not being able to maintain post-16 practice can be. Age 11 to 18 schools allow for more than one special teacher in most subjects to be employed. This allows collaboration and shared planning pooled expertise and contingency planning for resignations or illness of the teacher.

Dr Nicholls also emphasised that with the larger school you have better career opportunities for teachers, which will attract them. In addition, in an age 11 to 18 school, teachers have expertise to and from all key stages, and students can see the progression that students make from year 7 to year 13. Also the transition from year 11 to 12 is far more effective because the teachers of available subjects have a very clear understanding and appreciation of prior learning and evidence of the students they receive. This information comes from the teacher involved in that. Where 16-plus education is divorced from the 11 to 16 there is potentially a huge gap in understanding and transition is often more difficult.

I also wish to comment on another example of a tertiary college. I do think we should avoid any system which ends up with Guernsey having a tertiary college i.e. a combined sixth form and college of FE. I have been advised that there is a real and tangible difference between the way in which a tertiary college and a sixth form centre are organised, and the nature of support and guidance provided. Many parents want the more familiar school-like welfare support and guidance provision of a sixth form.

If we do not have a States provider of A-levels within the school setting then it could leave the independent colleges as the only provider. Any parents who want this for their children – and many really do appreciate the support and ethos this provision offers – would be forced to pay for their children to attend the colleges. (*Interjection*)

I am not going to give way. (*Laughter and Interjections*)

To conclude on this point, there are a number of options and I have only detailed a couple of them, which involve selection or not, and also the disadvantage of a tertiary college, but which do not require La Mare to be built. I think that the strength of the argument, that we should wait for the report on selection... which should at least give every possible option before making a decision.

My views on, 'the States need to decide the structure before rebuilding La Mare' have not changed. I made the point in July 2013 in the debate on Education's vision. Look in *Hansard*; there were at least three other Members who made the same point.

Education has also made the point that nobody amended the timescales in the vision report, but the vision report did say that the Department would make proposals to rebuild La Mare as a Capital Prioritisation process. This is very different to actually deciding to rebuild La Mare.

We knew in September 2013 that the SCIP process was going to return to the Assembly in 2014, so I do not think that their argument that we signed up to, of approving the rebuild before debating the report on the structure, is valid.

I have also heard the argument being made of the results of our secondary schools having improved because they were small schools, but I think you could equally say that it is our small schools that produce the poor results in the first place. So I do not think it is fair to include that small schools produce better results. I go back to my graph which I think clearly shows that across England larger schools have produced better results.

Again I have heard a lot of mention about larger schools and they then say that you get larger classrooms. Classroom size will not be affected. The teacher to pupil relationship will not be affected. It is the overall size of the school that is affected.

I cannot complete my speech without commenting on the meeting at Les Beaucamps last Wednesday, and the correspondence received from parents, grandparents, teachers and pupils. I think a lot of unnecessary anxiety was caused by what I think is a ridiculous overreaction, just as one politician made a comment on a Sunday phone-in.

Of course, there is some uncertainty in the education system when the structure, including selection, is being reviewed, when Education themselves have proposed a report on reducing the number of schools from four to three. There could have been a similar reaction in November 2014 when scenario (5) in Education's report suggested as a realistic option to phase out the Grammar School and create a tertiary college. This did not happen and it was not necessary for it to happen at this point. I think it has been particularly badly handled.

I conclude by asking Members to vote for this amendment so that there are adequate funds to maintain La Mare and to ensure the Department does things in the proper, logical order, which is: decide the structure of secondary education after carrying out a full and proper review, then deciding on the necessary estate to deliver that structure, and then deciding on how we develop the estate, including any rebuilding, remodelling or extending or new build required. We do not want to inadvertently set in motion a chain of events that was not planned, not desirable and not in the best interests of the young people in Guernsey, now and in the years to come.

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

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott and then Deputy Soulsby.

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

Sir, it is a job to know where to start. There is a fair bit to cover, so I have decided to start with some comments that my very good friend Deputy Conder made, when he showed us the first floor plan to the proposed La Mare de Carteret High School, and he told us that they had somehow or other future proofed this in such a way that the cost would be neutral.

Well, the Royal Institution of British Architects do not agree with him, sir. When one looks at their fee structure, the fee structure for new works is very considerably lower than the fee structure for works to existing. It is much more complex adding on a component to an existing building than it is designing the right thing from scratch.

That takes me on very neatly to my experience as a humble backbencher, over these last few years. I have thoroughly enjoyed the role for one particular reason. It is the impartiality and objectivity that one can bring to this Assembly, and the reason I say that (*Laughter and interjection*) is that, in my experience, Members have a habit of going native when they join a particular Board, and become so fixed, transfixed, on the delivery of that Board's mandate that occasionally – *occasionally* – they can lose sight of that objectiveness and impartiality.

Now, the Education Members, sir, are smashing chaps, all of them, but I fear that on this occasion this may have happened. When one looks objectively and impartially at the Independent Review, three things jump out at me. The first is that the independent review made building a school for 600 students conditional on rationalising the Education estate, since there are not, and are not forecast to be, sufficient numbers of students in Guernsey to warrant the current number and size of schools on the Island. Well, that is a fact –

**Deputy Sillars:** Sir, point of correction.

**Deputy Trott:** That is what he said. I do give way to my good friend, Deputy Sillars, sir.

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

Just to say the Nicholls Report does say that the rebuild of the 600-La Mare de Carteret is not dependent upon a review of four to three.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** See, that is another clever play on words, because that is not what I said and, indeed, not what I believe the Independent Report said. The Independent Report, as I understand it, said that the building of the school for 600 students, conditional on rationalising the Education estate, was conditional because there were not enough numbers of students either now or in the future. Well, that is what I believe they said. It is good to see that my good friend Deputy Gillson, who is a smart chap, is nodding in agreement, sir.

Now, the second thing that jumped out at me when I was reviewing the report objectively and impartially is that the review noted that the current model of delivering secondary education with four small schools and surplus spaces in the system is expensive in terms of both staffing and

building running costs. It is harder and more expensive to deliver a broad and dynamic curriculum in small schools. That, sir, sets the alarm bells ringing again.

Then the third thing that jumped out at me from the review is that the Independent Review Panel, whilst recognising that it may be prudent to retain a level of flexibility in terms of overall capacity, say they do not believe – they 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 La Mare de Carteret would create.

Now, that happens to be, sir, the basis that my friends at the Treasury & Resources Department have used in formulating an amendment which may or may not be placed.

Now, one of the harder things to do in this Assembly, because we are all very friendly with each other away from this place, is to be critical of the performance of a Board, particularly when one like the Education Board is populated with such smashing fellows as I referred to earlier. But on this occasion I need to be because, as the Treasury Minister said earlier, in words very similar to the ones that I wrote down when I arrived at this Assembly this morning, to try to decide what we should build before we decide on our long-term plans for post-16 education, and the structure of secondary education, puts two things in jeopardy. It poses the question who really cares when these are the two issues, because the two things that are put into jeopardy are (1) what are the best educational outcomes for our children, and (2) the value for money for taxpayers. The value for money for taxpayers – that is not a dirty word – relates to the taxpayers of today and indeed the taxpayers of tomorrow; (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and many of the children that are currently being educated will be those taxpayers of tomorrow who will have to deal with any bad decisions that we make today in terms of the impact on both cost and educational outcomes.

Now, we are in this situation today, sir, I firmly believe, because the Education Department has failed to deliver a new structure for education by way of a States' report during 2014, as promised. That is why we are in this mess. It is shame we are in this mess because it could have been avoided. In fact, Deputy Sherbourne, in particular, will recall that I implored the Education Department to bring that report back before this Assembly to deal with this issue in advance of this debate, because I could see the car crash that was emerging, and my worst fears have, in fact, materialised.

I implore the States, if they are impartial and objective, to support the Bebb amendment as I shall unreservedly.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby. Deputy Sillars.

**Deputy Sillars:** Sorry, sir, I did not want to interrupt my very good friend, Deputy Trott, but I did want to ask him where exactly it says specifically, that he read in the Mr Nicholls Report, that it was conditional, because I could not find it?

**Deputy Trott:** I appreciate advance notice of that question. I shall find it and refer to it later, sir.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby and then Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes, I declare an interest in this matter. I have got a son in year nine at the Grammar School. Saying that, I suggest based on past performance that he will be drawing his pension long before we manage to make any decision on this matter.

The fact that we had this amendment and that... from T&R, for that matter, as well as all the tsunami of concern coming from parents, teachers and children, reflects the void that exists in terms of educational strategy.

3450 The Education Department created a vision two years ago now that we fell over ourselves to support. We had a lovely fluffy vision from the Education Department about how our children are our future, just like the cornerstone. But where is the strategy behind it? Where there is nothing; concern, suspicion and distrust fill the void. Where are the ideas for selection? Yes or no? 11 or 14? High schools or technical colleges? Support for the independent sector, post-16 education?

3455 What does the Department mean when I say it quotes, the:

'... vision... to create an education system for the Bailiwick of Guernsey which will meet the challenges and demands of the future and provide our greatest asset, our people, with the knowledge, skills and tools to face a complex and challenging future with enthusiasm and confidence.'

What do they mean about equality of educational opportunity? Is this the same education for everyone or the best system for each child? I would hope the latter, but we have no understanding of what that is.

But today this amendment is nothing to do with value for money or educational outcomes. It is all to do with whether we trust the Education Department to do what it says it will do.

This amendment says delay any build until Education have come back with their strategy on secondary education, but we hear from Education that they will bring back a letter on selection, and on structure of education, before the end of this term, so then they can build as required anyway.

Everything has boiled down to a matter of trust. That is the question I have been asking myself. Who do I trust, particularly in the last few days? Now, I have been pretty critical of the Education Department, particularly over the closure of St Andrew's. The decision, to me, is increasingly like it will not reap the benefits forecast, but I supported the pre-school proposals as I believe they will make sense, although I was not happy with the way it was put through without consideration of funding and neither was I impressed with the way they approached the proposed La Mare build, hence my support of an independent review. The Education Department say, 'Trust us. We will be providing a paper on selection. We will be looking at options for the future structure. We committed to that in our vision,' but where is the new Education Law? In the vision document it made clear that this would be needed to, and I quote, '...stimulate the education system'.

Now, do we place our trust in the Education Department? Well, perhaps we have to. It seems to me that we now need closure, and I do not mean of a school building.

This has been one long, sorry mess, with two Departments acting in a more infantile manner than any of the children they are claiming to have in their uppermost thoughts. Frankly, I do not see that a delay will result in better decision-making. A decision on what? We are told this is about spending £60 million, but where is the debate on the primary school?

All the debate is about is a secondary school which, per the November Report, will cost £20 million. Indeed, I suspect a delay will lead to an even longer period of no decision-making at a time when our construction industry is not building anything significant and when we need to kick-start our economy; the time when teachers are leaving and it is harder to recruit new ones; and at a time when it is becoming increasingly clear to me that Policy Council has, despite the best intentions of its Members, become increasingly meaningless.

So, even though I have misgivings – and I really do – and this has been a very difficult decision for me, I cannot support this amendment.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Sherbourne:** Mr Bailiff, Members.

I do thank Deputy Heidi Soulsby for the accolade, which she cast upon the Education Department, and whether or not to trust them, because the main thrust of my speech is to do with just that – to do with trust.

I find myself in the somewhat strange position, as I deliver this speech – and I can categorically state with 100% assurance that there can be no-one in this Assembly who wants to bring forward



3500 the debate on rationalisation of secondary education, with its associated reviews on selection and tertiary education, more than I do. Not even T&R Members, and I suspect Deputy Bebb – albeit for what I suspect are totally different reasons – can want this more than I do.

I was immensely proud to become a Member of the Education Board after a long career in education locally and also to contribute quite significantly to our vision – Today's Learners, 3505 Tomorrow's World, which the States passed in March 2013.

As a response to Deputy Soulsby's comments about fine ideals, no direction, I would point her to the value statement that we made right at the beginning of that document that laid down to every single Member in this Assembly what the base line was for anything that we bring to this Assembly – inclusion and equity.

3510 Everything that we have put together to bring to this Assembly, work streams that we have initiated, that the Department have steadfastly applied in our schools, are always related or refer back to those touch stones, those values that we established in our document.

Our aim as a Board continues to be the implementation of that policy that ensures that Guernsey receives the very best, a first class and relevant education service for all the population 3515 for many years to come.

Ours has been a holistic approach that is generating an evolutionary process. It comes at a price, both in terms of time and money. Many of our work streams have proved difficult, now we as a Board have driven them through, and also for our civil servants to implement. The process of change can be challenging in the extreme. Our Treasury Minister will be very aware of that, with 3520 regard to the actual management of the FTP process – a process that was supposed to change, transform, a culture. It is not easy and we are trying to do that.

The closure, already mentioned, of St Andrew's Primary School and St Sampson's Infants was very unpopular with as many of you as there were people in our community. Based on the previous Board's agenda which was established some years before, it was nevertheless a difficult 3525 decision for the States to make and a challenging one for our Department to implement. I, for one, at a personal level would not have chosen that to be one of our first work streams. I would have been into secondary reorganisation right from the word go, but we understood there were certain work streams that did need closure on – things that had been started before the legacy that we inherited.

3530 I would like to just talk, sorry, (*Interjection*) just once –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

3535 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful to you, Deputy Sherbourne, I must ask, if that is the case, why did you put in your vision document the promise to return during 2014, if you believed there were problems associated with that promise?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Sherbourne.

3540 **Deputy Sherbourne:** I am sorry. I accept the point that we have failed to meet those promises in a very important area, but if you would allow me just to get on to this next bit, I hope it will become evident why this actually emerged over the last three years.

What I would like to do just for a few moments – and I will be as quick as I can – is I would like to run through the work streams, the things that we have actually been doing for the last three 3545 years, just to remind you of the breadth and the depth of the sort of challenges that we faced and the change that we have actually initiated.

I mentioned the primary rationalisation, pre-school provision – long, long overdue, but it is still on track; T&R help still required, however. An increase in performance in all phases of education – it is not just our high school results that have improved. Our primary data, which is now available 3550 for everyone to see – another thing that we have done – openness, transparency over the last three years. That data is there for all to see, and improvements have been made across the board.

We have a standard and effectiveness team that is working very hard, supporting our main workers, I suppose – the teachers in the school that meet our youngsters day in day out – supporting them with their targets, setting and moving forward, and we are getting really good results. It is in its early days, but we have only had three years of real, if you like, focus on that particular area. The key stage four and five curriculum... You will remember the national debate with regard to Michael Gove's proposals for restructuring the whole of GCSEs and A-levels and AS-levels. We have had to respond to those sort of initiatives, and they are time consuming, believe me, but we were able to enable our secondary schools to play a full part – our secondary school headteachers I should say – in determining the direction they felt would be best for their students, and they have control of that. It was not a centrally-directed decision; it was decided by the schools, and that was a break from tradition and one that I am very proud of.

Our federation of secondary schools initiative – that was the first, if you like; the parting shots of secondary reorganisation that was explained well, I think, in the public. Yes, there was a reaction to it – people jumping to conclusions, bussing children here, there and everywhere around the Island. That, of course, was over the top; it was typical Guernsey over the top, kneejerk reaction to a proposal which was sound in its concepts, and we are already seeing the benefits of that collaboration between our schools. A great contribution, I feel, that we are actually making to the culture in our education service.

That was driven through by the Board... difficult decisions, difficult discussions, but we went ahead. I think it is only right that we should applaud and recognise the senior staff, all teachers and especially the headteachers that are making it work. The Minister, in his opening speech, gave you the details, data, on next year's cohort of the federation model. It will take a few years to work through, but we have made an incredibly good start in a very short time.

Now, something that is extremely close to my heart are the initial steps towards, what I consider to be, a coherent tertiary provision in this Island; and this is where I totally disagree with the assessment that Deputy Dorey made with regard to the issue of school based post-16 and college based post-16. Let me just give you a few figures.

I do not know if you are aware but 85% of our young people already choose voluntarily to access full-time post-16 courses – 85%! I remember when I was teaching at St Peter Port School in 1974, I was a careers teacher, I kept data, that 35% of our children from a school cohort of about 120 a year, staying on to do CSEs and GCEs – 35% in 1974 – we now have 85% staying on to 18; 92% if you include apprentices.

Very soon it will be the norm for every child in this Island to consider full-time courses to the age of 18. We will not need to legislate for it, it will happen. What a wonderful example of, yes, the success of the steps that have been taken over the years. I am proud of that, and also working with my friend and colleague, Deputy Conder, with the College of FE, establishing a new governance structure, giving the college independence to move on.

Deputy Hunter Adam said he had not heard anything about our tertiary vision. Well, I do not know where you have been for the last three years. There have been enough things going on, and the recent appointment of a really first class principal, chief executive, who has been appointed by the Board – not by the Education Board, but by the board of the College of FE.

There are so many small aspects to the work that we have been doing for the last three years that have, yes, created the sort of slippage and problems we had meeting our aspirations. I put our hands up and say 'sorry' and, yes, we are in a position where I want the sort of review that Deputy Bebb is proposing.

I thank T&R for its actual amendment, to be honest, because it has brought tertiary education into the frame in a way that it should be. A holistic approach – something that the Education Board has struggled over, to be honest with you, because we are individuals; we are not clones, we have differences of opinion. Every single one of us has a perspective on whatever we discuss on the Board and, yes, there has been a difference of opinion over selection. I have to be honest, there has been a difference of opinion.

We have come together over the last two to three years. We are in a better place now to move forward on a consultation that will be meaningful. T&R have provided us with the sort of helpful direction, I think, with regard to the type of consultation we need. We will not need just to look at selection, we are not going to go through the debate of 2001 again – we do not need to do that. There is international data, evidence, available now through OECD and the UK authorities for us to make some reasonable, sound, evidence-based decisions.

Now, I am not a person to bear grudges and I am a calm sort of person most of the time, but I do feel things passionately, as you know, and I have had many, many years of experience – and my memory goes back quite a long way, in terms of the education system – but I would like to point one or two things out to my friend, Deputy Trott.

He is very quick to talk about structure, process, due process, and that is fine, I agree with him, corporate governance, all those good things. He entered the States in 2000. He, I believe, voted for the, what educationalists call, the notorious Torode/Berry amendment.

He was Treasury Minister between 2004 and 2008 during the time that the Education Development Plan was underway. I am sure he would have had some influence on which schools were actually built. If he did not, fine, but he was the man holding the purse strings at that time, and I cannot believe he was any different than our present Treasurer.

From 2008 to 2012, as you will know, he was our own Chief Minister, again a man who influenced... so I am sorry, Deputy Trott. *(Interjection)* Of course – and ability, of course. But can I just say to you, where were you in regard to the structures, the due process, in many projects that have actually been carried out in this Island, both in the last decade or so? I could point – and I am not going to, because I want the support of the Departments – the same criticism being levelled at Education and quite a few Departments that have put the cart before the horse.

Now, what I would like to leave you with is the thought that what harm is putting this cart before the horse going to do? It is going to make a lot of our community, especially the West – and I shall be very interested in the way that our West Deputies vote on this, because they are the guardians of the opportunities for the children in their area of the Island... La Mare de Carteret falls within their catchment area and I shall be very interested to see whether once again, Members of this Assembly, that actually have the nerve to turn round and tell these people that, 'No, sorry, it is not the right time. Money is a bit tight.' Yes, it is tight, but we know that it has been budgeted for. There is nothing new in that, but to say that to the people, 'Yes, it is emotional. We have been told to keep away from the emotional bit today,' Well, I am afraid I cannot.

I was Deputy Head at La Mare de Carteret – I should have declared that, shouldn't I, right from the start – for seven years. Seven years when the school buzzed, where Deputy Lowe was President of the School Association at that time... *(Interjection)* still am... *(Interjection)* I am not going to digress any further, but I go a long way with La Mare de Carteret and, yes, I feel very much support for the needs of the children that go to that school.

You know where I stand on selection, you know what I think it does to the psyche of a lot of children that are actually... I know some of you disagree but I have worked within it for a long, long time, and there are not many teachers that would not agree totally, 100%, with me.

I would remind you – sorry, I must not point at you – that back in 2001, 23 headteachers wrote an open letter to the community, supporting the changes of the time – 23! They were not actually obliged to; they all wanted to because they knew what was being proposed then was right for the children of this little Island, getting away from the divisions that had existed for years and years. Our time will come again – the sooner, the better.

I am sorry, Mr Bailiff, if I have shifted a little bit off beam on this, but I do really feel that the time has come for us to do the right thing, get on with building that school. You know, from the evidence that has been presented to you by my colleagues, that it is selection neutral and structure neutral. We need La Mare, the Review Board vindicated just about everything that Education had asked for.

So, please, please, vote this amendment out. If T&R then decide to lay their own, vote that out and vote our proposals in.

3655 Thank you. (*Applause*)

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

3660 **Deputy Harwood:** Thank you, sir.

In his inspiring speech, the Treasury & Resources Minister urged us to use reason, logic and common sense when dealing with this amendment and, sir, I would implore this Assembly to use reason, logic and common sense to dismiss the amendment wholeheartedly.

3665 Sir, Deputy Soulsby has already made the point that, of course, the whole project we are talking about is not just a matter of the secondary school. The secondary school is one part of it; it is a component of it. It also deals with the primary school, it deals with autism and community centres. It is a far bigger project than just secondary school.

3670 The focus has been purely on the secondary school issue and this has, therefore, led into questions of numbers. I was trying to follow Deputy Dorey's logic and reasoning when he said we could get by without actually having to have La Mare de Carteret, because we could increase the numbers at Les Beaucamps – I think he said 840, from memory – and certainly St Sampson's up to 790. Well, on my maths that probably accounts for about 270. I would remind Deputy Dorey that La Mare de Carteret currently has 439 pupils on its roll so there is immediately a shortfall. I would also refer Deputy Dorey and Deputy Bebb to a page in the Independent Report which is on page 3675 1096 of the Billet.

**Deputy Dorey:** Point of correction.

3680 The maths that I showed, showed that you had an 840 at Les Beaucamps, you have an 840-pupil school at St Sampson's and you have a 600 pupil school at the Grammar, which would produce 2,280 pupils.

3685 The graph that we had very clearly showed that the peak was 2,371, so I said it was 100 short. It is actually 91 short and I said the fact that you flexed the St Sampson's had an extra 54 pupils in 2009 that there was adequate flexing in the system, but if you did not want to do that for those peak years you could put temporary classrooms in. So I think my maths is very clear.

**Deputy Harwood:** I am obliged to you, because I was trying to note it down as you were originally speaking. (*Interjection*) Of course, your maths does not actually take account of what we do about the primary school at La Mare de Carteret, which is also part of the component. But, sir, in the Independent Report on page 1096 of the Billet, option 1, in which they say:

'5.16 A radical proposal would be to close La Mare de Carteret High School.'

Which is precisely what Deputy Dorey and Deputy Bebb probably would be recommending. Certainly Deputy Dorey is. The comment made there, sir, is and I quote:

'5.17 This would maximise use of the existing asset base, and educationally, would provide larger school rolls and with them the ability to deliver the Guernsey curriculum more efficiently and effectively. There is however insufficient capacity (308 places, including the Grammar School) to house current numbers... and the problem would be exacerbated by the projected increase in school population. We understand that there is room to build 240 additional places at St Sampson's which would answer current need, but probably not future demand. The extent of the places shortfall might not be unmanageable however and would only apply in the peak years.

5.18 Having said this, such an approach would severely limit any future flexibility in capacity. We are of the opinion that there is no real opportunity to expand Les Beaucamps and we consider that further expansion at St Sampson's to deal with the volatility that might be caused by future policy shifts (e.g. on selection or migration) would also be problematic. Full occupation of the Grammar school would already require such policy change.'

3695 So, sir, even in their Report they were rejecting the situation that we could do away with La Mare de Carteret altogether.

Sir, there is no argument that the States' Education Department and Deputy Condor or Deputy Sherbourne have already amplified. They accept there is a need for rationalisation. They are offering to bring a report back to this Assembly before the end of this current term. However, what they do recognise – and what I suggest the amendment put forward by Deputy Bebb and Deputy Dorey does not recognise – is that they need time. Any proposal of rationalisation is going to need time to prepare, to build and will require a further dip into capital budget, because even if Deputy Dorey's suggestion is that you could extend Les Beaucamps, by his admission you would have to build at least one other building and also acquire some additional land.

So, sir, there is a capital budget issue there. This immediately brings into issue, into play, the time line, because if this amendment is successful and you go and proceed on the basis of rationalisation then you decide what you want to do. You are going to be outside the current capital investment programme and way into 2018 before you even start.

Now, that leads on then to the next problem, because in the second part of the amendment they are urging Treasury & Resources to make money available –  
Do you want me to give way?

**Deputy Bebb:** Well, I am not sure if it is giving way or a point of correction but –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** Deputy Harwood – a point of correction probably – is suggesting that the amendment talks of rationalisation. The amendment does not; it clearly does not talk about rationalisation. It simply states that we should discuss the secondary education before deciding on anything, and to suggest that it implies rationalisation is incorrect.

**Deputy Harwood:** I would remind Deputy Bebb it includes the reference to the vision document, Today's Learners, Tomorrow's World, we will bring a States' Report to the Assembly –

**The Bailiff:** Is this a point of order or –

**Deputy Sillars:** It is a point of correction actually to both the amendment... *[Inaudible]*

**The Bailiff:** Can you switch your microphone on?

**Deputy Sillars:** Sorry. There is no way Les Beaucamps can accommodate 800-odd – 840 – which I believe Deputy Dorey just said. It was maxed out at 660 and that was all it could be built to.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Harwood.

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

Anybody else want to stand up before I start again? *(Laughter and interjections)* Thank you.

Sir, as I said, any suggestion that we could close La Mare and we could rebuild elsewhere, will involve budget, will involve further projects through the SCIP process which, heavens above, is a tortuous process in itself, but it is also... even if we accept that there is going to be, yes, a period of reflection on rationalisation, whether we go rationalising from four to three, four to two, I do not know.

You are going to have built up a whole new business case which will have to go back to the Treasury & Resources and, as I say, that will certainly be outside the current Capital Prioritisation programme, so there is a huge inbuilt delay as a result of adopting this amendment.

That leads on to... and I will pick up on Deputy Lester Queripel's very useful commentary on the actual practicalities of having to deal with the refurbishment, the maintenance – call it what you will – of La Mare de Carteret, because, with due respect to the Chief Minister, there is a huge amount of difference between patching up – if I dare use that word – the La Mare de Carteret to cope for two academic years, as opposed to possibly having to patch it up for at least a minimum of five, possibly six, possibly seven years, whilst we deal with the whole of the rationalisation, and the revised programme of secondary education.

Now, sir, if that is the case I also then refer back to the figure that I think was quoted by Deputy Conder that the actual cost, the capital cost that is going to be incurred in maintaining La Mare de Carteret for that period of time, could be a significant amount of millions, if not in double figures of millions. We just do not know.

The process of having to go through another SCIP – albeit perhaps a SCIP-like process – in order to extract that money from Treasury & Resources is going to build in further delays, so you are going to be looking at a period of at least 12 months, probably, before you are able to even start on the maintenance programme or refurbishment programme.

I would ask this Assembly to bear that in mind, because the whole thrust of this amendment will be to create a delay which – not just a matter of a year or even two... I suspect, and I suggest you urgently consider this could be a delay extending to five years plus. (*Interjections*)

So whatever scenario – and Deputy Conder has already made this – is needed for the rationalisation or the new secondary education programme going forward, La Mare de Carteret will be required as part of that process.

Against that, in support of this, I would ask you to look at page 1097 in the Billet, page 8 of the Independent Report, which says, and again I quote:

'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.'

Sir, we have been assured that the design can accommodate extension of numbers up to 920. Sir, I would therefore urge, on the basis of reason, on the basis of logic and on the basis of common sense that we completely reject this amendment.

Thank you sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize and then Deputy Gollop.

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

It is impossible not to have been influenced by some of the very good speeches there have been on both sides of this debate. I thought Deputy St Pier put it in a very, very logical, rational case for supporting the amendment. I think that other speakers have spoken very powerfully against the amendment.

When the amendment was first laid I was dubious about it. I became rather more sympathetic towards it around lunch time. I am, at the moment, probably likely to vote against it.

Deputy Sherbourne said, about selection at 11, our time will come again. Now, I think that is a complacent view. My view is that this Education Department has blown it. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think that they have failed, when they ought to have delivered, on their undertaking to review selection at 11. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

My biggest regret, I know, by the end of this term of the States will be not to have amended their vision or brought a requête between the debate on their vision and the debate last November on their original La Mare policy letter; because I could see as the months went by that they were losing more and more and more time, and that they were not going to bring to the

3795 States the review of selection at 11, the review on the structure of secondary education, which they had promised.

Now, the reason I say they have blown it is not because I in any way dispute their sincerity in wanting to come to the States with a report before the end of this term, but they are in cloud cuckoo land – and so is Deputy Bebb, incidentally – if either of them believe that is going to be possible.

On the last occasion it took two and a half years, from the beginning of the review to the first States debate in 2001. You have to formulate some initial proposals; you have to go out to consultation; you then have to write a policy letter; you have to come back to the States.

This is the single biggest political issue that you can confront in Guernsey. It is bigger than GST, it is bigger than any of the other major contentious debates there have been of over the last few years. It will not be done, I think, to get to the States and the States is not going to make a decision on selection at 11 after the end of this year. So you will have to be submitting a report around about September or October. We are now at the end of May. It is nonsensical for anybody to suggest that it is going to be possible for this Assembly to have a reasoned rational debate about the future structure of secondary education, including how you allocate places, and the rationalisation of the estate during this term.

Now, it is always seductive to vote in favour of having a review, especially where there is effectively a binary choice, and there is a binary choice – on selection at 11. I mean either there is going to be selection at 11 or there is not. I accept that there is all sort of alternative models – we could select at 13 or 14, we could use a means other than the 11-plus – but essentially at some point, if there is going to be a debate on it, the States will have to decide either to maintain selection at 11 or to abolish selection at 11.

Now, this amendment is drawing support from people on both sides of the argument. In fact, most of those – or many of those – who have most strongly supported this amendment have in the past been the most strongly supportive of the 11-plus, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I find it bizarre and somewhat concerning... and I think the States should be concerned by the number of Members who are urging the States to support this amendment, who have absolutely no intention at all of removing selection at 11. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I cannot know that this is the case. I may be wrong, but my view now at ten past five, unless I can be persuaded otherwise by other speakers or by Deputy Bebb perhaps when he sums up, is that the most likely outcome of this amendment is that there will be deferral, not for six months or nine months or 12 months, but it will go into the next States, and a new Education Department will be elected and say, 'Well, we need time to carry out our own review, because our views may not be the same as the views of the previous Department,' and I suspect that there will be a report brought back to the States on the rationalisation of the secondary estate and selection at 11, sometime in perhaps 2017.

There is a very good chance that the States will throw out any proposals to abolish selection at 11 (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) What will that have done? It will have simply caused a two or three-year delay in moving students at La Mare when the States did, whichever way we look at it, in 2002 give an undertaking to redevelop the secondary schools – secondary modern schools which became high schools.

Now, for any Member who... if someone wants to lay an amendment which proposes a report on the rationalisation of the estate and a review of selection at 11, with a presumption in favour of abolition, I will vote for the amendment. I am happy to defer the decision on redeveloping La Mare de Carteret School on that basis.

Deputy Bebb tells us – and I do not doubt the accuracy of what he says, but he says – I think, around a third of the States wrote to the *BBC* to say they were undecided about the future of the 11-plus. I find that staggering. At some point... we cannot just stand here as 47 individuals picking holes in the views and ideas of other Departments. We have an obligation as a Government to take a view on substantial matters of policy. I think it is feeble if after three years of having been in

Government, we have to say we have no more definitive view on selection at 11 than just asking for a review. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is a nonsense.

We are all to blame, in my view. Those Members who support the decisions that the States made in 2001 to retain selection at 11 – they know that it is right to move secondary school children into the redeveloped facilities, that there is general consensus that we cannot continue to educate children in the kind of substandard facilities we are providing at La Mare. We have done it in the north of the Island; we have done it in the south of the Island; we have got to do it at La Mare. All the children in the secondary sector have got to have access to better facilities than we are providing at La Mare at the moment.

Now, they are now saying – some of these Members – first of all we should determine our model of education, then we should decide what buildings we need. Well, we have done that. In 2001 the States decided what model of education they wanted and they decided then to have a building programme so that all school children had access to high quality facilities.

The Members who should be trying to change that are the Members who did not agree with that decision in 2001. But that is not the nature of this debate and I do not see any appetite in the States to undo that decision of 2001.

Like Deputy Sherbourne said, you would find no one more opposed to selection at 11 than him. I am as opposed to selection at 11 as him, I think that all of the educational evidence suggests that we should abolish selection at 11. I am also in favour of rationalising the estate beyond what most Members would consider acceptable, because I would rather have two secondary schools, but there is no appetite to do that. If I thought I could get an amendment through the States this afternoon to that effect, I would do it, but for us to be here as a Government three years after we were elected, and to say, 'Well, we have not been able to think about these things in sufficient depth, so we should just have a review, so that in perhaps 12 months' time somebody can come back with a report, and after four years of being in Government we can make up our minds' – that to me seems feeble.

So I agree with the argument that we should decide the policy first and then we should determine the buildings necessary to deliver the policy. But we have a policy. We have a policy of maintaining selection at 11 and educating children who have not reached a certain score in the 11-plus.

I must not use one particular word which is provocative. Educating them in facilities of a decent standard. That is our policy, so why are we now saying we need to review this policy? There is an argument that Education's Proposition 3 should be rejected, and the Achilles heel in Education's argument is actually having said that they will review their estate.

If they had said, 'We are not going to review our estate. Whatever some UK consultant tells us, we think the decisions made in 2001 were legitimate. We do not want to move to two high schools of around 1,000 students each, because we do not believe in a selective system. That that is appropriate, therefore we think we should continue with three high schools,' actually that would have been the most credible position for Education to take.

I have very little sympathy for Education feeling somewhat beleaguered perhaps or under pressure as a result of amendments having been laid to take the rationalisation undertaking further, because they have invited it by the inclusion of Proposition 3.

Unless I can be persuaded – and having someone say I am open minded is not good enough for me... because if we vote for this amendment we are ensuring that hundreds of students in the future will continue to be educated in substandard facilities.

Now I am prepared to put up with that, deeply unsatisfactory though it is, if I can see that there is a real appetite to change the model of secondary education. But I am not prepared to do it on a vague promise that we will keep an open mind and we will have a review. As an Assembly, we will not have control over the outcome of that review. It will be kicked into the next States.

So I think we have to be absolutely certain here of what we are voting for. It is not an issue of whether there is uncertainty – Education's Propositions provoke just as much uncertainty as anything that T&R has said – it is an issue of whether there is an appetite to change the model of



secondary education, because if there is not, then the conscious decision the States made in 2002 to maintain three rather than two high schools for educational reasons and for social reasons, still holds good.

I will give way to Deputy Dorey.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you.

Deputy Fallaize just said, 'If there is an appetite to review the system,' but Education themselves said there is an appetite to review by, in their vision report, saying that they were going to do that review. So they themselves have identified that we need to do that review, and there is the appetite to do it. The problem is their speed of progress.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** But, sir, if I used 'the review' I spoke incorrectly. I am not interested in a review; I am interested in a change of policy. We do this endlessly; we have reviews. In order to get something through the States, you bring together a coalition of people who are actually diametrically opposed – and you have people in this Assembly who are diametrically opposed to removing selection – arguing in favour of having a review of selection. That is just ludicrous.

So what I am saying is if there is an appetite to change the policy then great, I will be at the forefront of the queue in supporting an amendment which seeks to change the policy, but there is not an appetite to change the policy. When I –

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** I am grateful, sir.

Surely the question is how do we know if there is an appetite for change until that appetite for change is tested, and the mechanism for that is a debate? That is how you test it. How can my good friend Deputy Fallaize possibly suggest that a decision taken in 2002 is likely to be maintained today, without us having the opportunity to test that decision?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Because it is my judgement that we would not get a majority of the States to vote in favour of abolition of the 11-plus. Now, if I am wrong, let someone lay an amendment to have this review, and have a presumption in favour of removal of selection at 11. If there is an amendment before the States to that effect I will vote for it, but I am not going to vote – you have to look at the consequences of the review. The consequence of the review is that we cannot get on with the rebuilding of La Mare de Carteret. That means that hundreds more students will be educated in facilities which are substandard. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In order for us to do that, we have to have some indication that there is at least a reasonable prospect of the States changing their policy on selection at 11. Otherwise, all we have done is kick this into the long grass.

Now, I accept entirely... I do understand T&R's position about ensuring value for money in the estate. There is an argument in terms of providing value for money, there is an argument that you could defer this decision, not change the policy of selection at 11, and still rationalise the estate, by having two, rather than three, high schools.

I entirely accept that, and T&R are well within their rights to lay that before the States, but I am not going to vote for an amendment which may lead to that, because I am vehemently opposed to having a selective system in which we have two high schools each with 1,000 students. Those

3950 schools would be highly undesirable schools in our community. They would become highly undesirable. It would be extraordinarily difficult to recruit people into that sort of model. I do not say that because I oppose large schools; I want two secondary schools, ideally of 11 to 18, but I detect very little support in the States for that.

3955 So, for me, this comes down to voting for the amendment and having a review, out of which there is every chance the States will decide to maintain the model of selection at 11, and say at the end of that, 'Now we must get on with the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret School.' Or I vote for the proposals of the Education Department which get on, as quickly as possible, with the redevelopment. I do not favour the present model of secondary education. I do not want four secondary age schools. I do not want selection. I am wholly opposed to it, but I think it is  
3960 irresponsible not to deliver the necessary initiatives to deliver the policy decisions of 2002, which include the redevelopment of La Mare, unless I can be persuaded that there is a real appetite that 23 other Members will vote in the States in favour of the removal of selection at 11, and in reality I do think – and I know it is not Deputy Bebb's intention – that this amendment will only have the effect of deferring the start of the redevelopment of La Mare. I still think we will have to redevelop  
3965 this school, because I do not believe the States are going to remove selection at 11.

Unless the States can be persuaded – and I just want to reemphasise this point – we are three years into our term. I would have voted for this amendment in 2013. I would have voted for this amendment in 2014, but we are three years into our term. I think it is an abdication of our responsibility to say, 'We do not really know what our view is on the 11-plus, so let's have a review  
3970 and we will see, and we might give it to the next States to sort it out.' We have got to reach a conclusion about what our policy is, and at the moment the policy is that we maintain selection at 11, and we have three new redeveloped high schools. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Now, unless there is a different amendment which seeks to change the policy with a presumption against selection at 11, I think we need to just get on with it.

3975 **The Bailiff:** I said I would call Deputy Gollop next. Deputy Gollop, how long are you likely to be?

**Deputy Gollop:** About eight minutes, sir.

3980 **The Bailiff:** About eight minutes! (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Gollop:** I actually found myself – one starts to stand when one does not know who is speaking. I agree with much of what Deputy Harwood and Deputy Fallaize have said and, for that  
3985 reason, I think you can guess that I am going to say with a touch of reluctance, please do not vote for this amendment but support the Education Department.

Let me just point out, though, Deputy Fallaize says we should act as responsible Members of the Government after three years, be clear about our policies and work within that framework. Well, I would say I have been a Member for 18 years and not necessarily sure, because I actually  
3990 do not think it is a simple yes/no to selection. There are permutations of 11-plus, 12-plus, 13-plus; there are forms of examination, there are forms of specialist school, there is the free school idea that was in the draft amendment that we have not used.

There are certainly a lot of ideas. I am actually, strangely enough, on this one, relatively conservative and support choice and support the best of what I think our inarguably elitist system  
3995 delivers, but what I have wanted to see is a greater degree of equity and fairness across the board. We had a lot of soul searching and division in our community in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002. We still as an Assembly retain a useful role in supporting the best of what was sometimes called the independent or private schools.

Only this morning we re-elected two excellent directors to one of them. I would point out that  
4000 there is a school in the centre of the Island that is of a private kind and has a few special placeholders. There is an 11-16 school, not A-levels, of 173 pupils who pay a not insignificant

amount of money per year in fees. That school attracts consumers, children, parents, clientele, and actually delivers 94% GCSE passes, mostly at levels A to C. The point I am making is there are some small schools that succeed, and others that perhaps do not. And one can look at league tables across the United Kingdom, like my colleagues have, and have seen varieties.

I have to say I have heard quite a bit of emotion today, and dare I say it, if it is not unparliamentarily – especially on the Bailiff's birthday – a little bit of rubbish here and there. (*Laughter*) For example, we have heard repeated claims from Treasury & Resources that they are trying to save the taxpayers' interest, look after the taxpayer of £60 million. Well, of course, teachers and parents are taxpayers too.

It is not a £60 million-secondary school, it is a package that includes everything from a netball/volleyball centre, an autism centre, some coastal defences, some building work, a primary school, some pre-school facilities, all of which would have to be built, (*Interjections*) and we are not even including the maintenance of the Queripel brothers or some other contractor (*Laughter and applause*) to deliver – although the Queripels would be better and cheaper, I suspect, than most of their competition.

The essential thing here is to focus on what the real issue is. The real issue is £20 million. This has been come at from a perspective of saving money rather than looking at what works in our community. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We can see examples of smaller schools that work. We can see examples of schools in the middle that work. We have known that La Mare de Carteret was not working at peak capacity a few years ago, that is when the crisis occurred. It is improving significantly, exponentially almost... I think improving perhaps threefold by some charts, and we have to deliver on the promise that we made.

I think what really swayed me is there was a certain sympathy for what Treasury & Resources were trying to do, and I have a certain interest in looking at pre-schools if we were at the start of a political term and we already had excellent facilities, but from where we are now... When I went to part of Les Beaucamps School parents meeting there was real anger, there was passion and pride for the school, but there was utter frustration that there was a possibility of delay and the delays are – as the former Deputy Chief Minister and as Deputy Fallaize have referred to – of up to five years given consultation, reviews, late amendments, *sursis* – this is a kind of *sursis* we are discussing today, in a way – would lead to many years of delay.

I would remind Deputy Trott that one reason why we did not go as quickly as we might have done on the Torode/Berry amendment was, of course, because of the nature of Zero-10. I appreciate for many reasons we had to cut public spending at the time, and Zero-10 was a priority, but that was one reason it went slow. There was a second reason, which is more interesting, that Deputy Trott himself launched an economic model which was a holistic desire to look at the state of the building industry, and the economic multiplier it creates for us. Is this not the best time to actually employ the construction and building industry, rather than putting it off down the road? That is a factor in this debate, that nobody has mentioned, but is a significant part of our economy.

If we go into an election, maybe with a new type of Government system, a new type of membership, different numbers of States' Members, no longer a Minister maybe, certainly not a Policy Council or a Treasury & Resources Board, what a lot of confusion that will lead to delivering on these policies.

We really have to focus on the issue, and the issue is ensuring that all three high schools have more or less the same quality of facilities, the same capacity, and the same ability to deliver the right learning environment for teachers and pupils. We have got there at St Sampson's; we have more or less got there at Les Beaucamps; the Grammar School has a sixth form centre of similar vintage. The next stage is this.

I would just like to point out too that times change. I remember the 2001 vision had a tertiary college at its foundation, and maybe Education are not preaching so much about that, but it is not – I do not like the word 'madness' used wrongly – but I would also argue that maybe Treasury & Resources have not been entirely consistent. First of all, they broadly supported La Mare de

4055 Carteret; secondly, they put an amendment and the Member on the working party came off... the last time we were debating this, they were questioning the size of a 600-pupil school, and now they want to build a model for 859 pupils because that suits the arguments better. I think it is they, based on reports that they have had, that have changed significantly and Education Department have remained consistent.

4060 Given the delay and the promises we made – not just in 2001 and 2002 and 2012 but in 2014 when we went for the review – now is the time to make a decision and build the school. But build it in a modular flexible way so that we can expand or adapt according to changing economic and educational environments but that, of course, is in the Propositions and within the Report that the Education Department have put before us.

Thank you.

4065 **The Bailiff:** Members, that was eight minutes! We will now rise and resume tomorrow morning.

4070 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, before we depart could we just thank you for the cakes that you purchased for your birthday. For the sake of *Hansard*, sir, we want to record your generosity and thank you very much for the cakes! *(Applause)*

*The Assembly adjourned at 5.31 p.m.*