



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 25th September 2025

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

Volume 14, No. 30

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

Ms J E Roland, Deputy Bailiff and Deputy Presiding Officer

Law Officers

H. Pullum (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

C. P. A Blin	M. S. Laine
T. L. Bury	M. P. Leadbeater
A. K. Cameron	M. Malik
H. L. Camp	A. D. S. Matthews
G. M. Collins	L. J. McKenna
R. P. Curgenvin	P. S. N. Montague
H. L. de Sausmarez	G. A. Oswald
D. F. Dorrity	J. M. Ozanne
A. Gabriel	C. N. K. Parkinson
J. A. B. Gollop	S. R. Rochester
L. T. Goy	T. M. Rylatt
S. T. Hansmann Rouxel	A. S. Sloan
M. A. J. Helyar	G. A. St Pier
R. M. Humphreys	J. D. Strachan
N. R. Inder	L. C. Van Katwyk
B. R. Kay-Mouat	S. P. J. Vermeulen
A. Kazantseva-Miller	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representative E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy Y. Burford (*indisposée*) ; Deputy S. J. Falla (*relevé à 10h 16*) ; Deputy J. P. Le Tocq ;
Deputy A. J. Niles (*relevé à 10h 16*) ; Deputy C. N. K. Parkinson (*relevé à 10h 40*) ;
Deputy S. Williams (*relevé à 14h 56*) ; Alderney Representative E. Hill (*relevé à 15h 58*)

Business transacted

Evocation	6
Convocation	6
Statements.....	6
Rule 10(3) – Statement by the Vice-President of the Policy & Resources Committee	6
General update – Statement by the President of the Economic Development Committee	13
Questions for Oral Answer	23
Transport, traffic and highways – Improvement of pavement amenity and safety.....	23
Welsh Assembly Senedd policy – Reducing car speed limits in certain local and community areas.....	26
Outcomes of investigations – Reports received	27
Police Complaints Regime – Review Project Team	31
Billet d’État XIII	33
Elections and Appointments.....	33
1. Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election deferred to the afternoon.....	33
2. Election of a member of the Ladies College Board of Governors – Deputy Strachan elected as a member	34
Billet d’État XIV	36
Elections and Appointments.....	36
1. The Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986 – e-appointment of a Panel Chair and Members of The Complaints Panel – Proposition carried	36
Appointment laid before the States	38
Appointment of an ordinary member of the Guernsey Banking Deposit Compensation Board	38
Legislation Laid Before the States	38
The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025; The Parochial Elections (St Martin’s) Regulations, 2025 and The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules, 2025.....	38
Legislation	39
2. The Country Hospital Charitable Fund (Guernsey) Law, 2025 – Proposition carried	39
3. The Health and Safety at Work (General) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 – Proposition carried as amended.....	40
4. The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025 – Debate commenced.....	54
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.38 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.31 p.m.</i>	<i>58</i>
The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025 – Debate concluded – Proposition carried as amended	58

Billet d'État XIII.....	80
Elections and Appointments.....	80
Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee – Motion to vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure – Proposition carried.....	80
Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election commenced.....	88
Billet d'État XIII.....	94
5. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried	94
Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee – Deputy Burford elected as a member.....	95
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.09 p.m.....</i>	<i>95</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XXIII and Billet d'État XXIV of 2025. 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 Thursday, 25th September, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État which have been submitted for debate.

Billet d'État XXIV is convened pursuant to the provisions of Rule 2(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

Statements

Rule 10(3) –

Statement by the Vice-President of the Policy & Resources Committee

The Deputy Bailiff: Good morning, everybody. I will start with a statement by the Vice President of the Policy & Resources Committee.

Deputy St Pier: Madam Presiding Officer, the Committee sought your permission to make this Statement in relation to the financial position of the States in 2025. However, before I talk about that and what it will mean for the 2026 Budget, I would like to provide an update on the Revenue Service.

Members will be aware that I am leading on Resources for the Committee and as such, of course, have a keen interest across all aspects of that brief, including how to collect our revenues. Everybody in the community will be aware that the Revenue Service has been through significant change in recent years, partly to bring together the administration of social security contributions and Income Tax, and partly to replace, frankly, woefully outdated IT systems.

The work of the Revenue Service, of course, impacts every Member of the States of Deliberation and every member of our community in one way or another. Therefore, when things do not go well, we all notice it and feel it and we are certainly feeling it now.

The issue which is currently at the front of our minds is the processing of repayments. While over 30,000 assessments were issued between April and July 2025, these generated over 6,000 credits,

which may result in repayments, and which are currently having to be manually reviewed before cheques can be raised.

30 Despite the repayment process being the highest priority, this manual process is taking officers a great deal longer than would have been the case with the old system, as they are having to familiarise themselves with the way the new system presents the data they need in order to check and then manually create each repayment.

To date, the Revenue Service has issued 1,084 repayments. Without wishing to detract from the hard work of those Revenue Service officers, the current rate of issuing repayments is not an acceptable level of service to the public.

35 I want to assure all Members that the Policy & Resources Committee has familiarised itself with the problems and the planned solutions, and has provided a challenge to deliver more. Meaningful improvement in service levels will be one of the objectives currently being set for the next 12 months for the Chief Executive and Head of the Public Service. This is and will remain a top priority for the Chief Executive, his leadership team and the Committee.

40 With the permission of the Presiding Officer, I would like to give a further update on progress for the end of the year.

Turning now to finances, this is the first time that I have been able to update the States on the latest financial position and I commit to doing so on a regular basis. The new Policy & Resources Committee will shortly be publishing its first Budget and the first, of course, for this Assembly. Ahead of that, looking forward into 2026, I thank you, madam, for allowing me this time to reflect on performance to date in 2025, which sets the scene for the year ahead.

45 The results I am sharing are based on income and expenditure to the end of August and forecasts to the end of the year. At the summary level, I am pleased to report that the forecast to the year-end is an improved position compared to the budget. However, although the expected outturn would be an improvement against budgets of about £24 million, it would still result in a general revenue operating deficit of some £2 million.

I will now talk through the drivers of that overall position, starting with income. As Members will know, ETI is our largest single revenue source. It is the best indicator of real-time economic performance. Against a budget of £293 million, we are forecasting revenues of £291 million which, although slightly below, is largely in line with budget. The same trend is recorded in contribution income. Despite this small shortfall, total tax revenues are estimated to end the year ahead of budget by approximately £9 million, or just under 2%. This is entirely due to the reforecasting of likely revenues from Pillar Two, based on the latest information available to the Revenue Service.

55 However, I should stress that not a penny of this tax has been banked to date and will not be until 2027. Until that time, we can only estimate, based on the historical data available and information from impacted entities in Guernsey. There is therefore much more uncertainty around these estimates than around many others, including ETI.

60 The other good news in terms of revenue in the year to date is document duty. By the end of August, receipts were £5 million ahead of the budget. Local market transactions in 2025 are up 31% on the same period last year and 5% ahead of 2023. If current trends continue, we should end the year some £8 million ahead of the Budget estimate. But of its nature, document duty is inherently unpredictable and quite lumpy. All other revenues are largely in line with the Budget estimates.

65 Turning to expenditure. Although the current forecast is that we will end the year broadly in line with the Budget, there are a few risks to which I must draw Members' attention. Firstly, the Committee for Health & Social Care is once again facing financial challenges stemming from staffing difficulties and the need to cover vacancies through overtime and agency staff. This has been particularly evident across both adult services and acute hospital services.

70 The other pressure is coming from the cost and volume of off Island acute treatments. In totality, the forecast overspend in this area is currently £2.8 million, or just over 1%. The Policy & Resources Committee has been working hard with HSC to ensure that the budget for 2026 is both realistic and deliverable.

The other area forecasting an overspend at year end is Corporate Services with an estimate of £1.6 million being driven from two areas. The first is insurance, where the States' policies have suffered above inflation increases to the cost of insuring States' assets and risks. We have initiated a fresh look at our insurance provision and whether there are better solutions available. We are grateful that Deputy Helyar, with his considerable experience in this area, has agreed to assist in this work.

The second is centred on digital and technology services, which have seen substantial change during the year, initiated by our predecessors, with the States' transition to a new multi-vendor IT and digital model on 1st August.

For what I hope Members will regard as understandable commercial reasons, while we are currently limited in what we can share publicly, we are committed to providing greater transparency at the appropriate time. This will include details on the rationale behind the decision made by the former Policy & Resources Committee, as well as the approach to transition and its associated costs. This transition was not changed for the sake of change, but a necessary operational response to performance issues with the previous contract.

It is hoped that the multi-vendor model will be more flexible than one with a sole provider and will help to better ensure the security and resilience of the States' IT estate. A transformation of this scale represents a significant undertaking for any organisation. However, thus far, we are encouraged by the new model's initial performance, including in our more complex service areas such as schools and healthcare settings.

An important factor in its success to date has been the diligence and hard work both of the States' Digital and Technology Team and our new vendor partners, and whom I would like to take this opportunity to thank.

It is, however, necessary to stress that there remain underlying challenges. Addressing these will require yet more investment and we will continue to review service performance to ensure our IT services are resilient, cost-effective and fit for purpose.

Last week, the President of the Committee advised Members that we have appointed Deputy Marc Laine as our Digital Transformation Adviser. The role will provide the Committee with strategic oversight, expert guidance and informed challenge on issues relating to digital transformation, technology policy, risk appetite and IT service governance.

Now this advisory role is intended to strengthen political visibility in the IT sphere and to support the Committee in maintaining alignment between the States' digital initiatives and our broader Government priorities. It is an important role and we are grateful to Deputy Laine for taking it on.

As any role should be thinking about succession, the terms of reference include making recommendations to the Committee for the establishment of an IT advisory board, first recommended by the Scrutiny Management Committee in the last term. I know that Deputy Laine has started to think about this too. It will be populated with both IT insurance and business expertise primarily to assist political decision-making and also provide to the Chief Digital and Information Officer in setting the correct IT strategy moving into the future.

The level of IT change has resulted in an overspend in the year to date. However, the current forecast is that the expenditure by the end of the year will be in line with budget. The improvements needed as part of the transition have resulted in more or new cost in some areas, which are mitigated by savings elsewhere. However, there will be a net increase in cost for the 2026 Budget.

As a counterbalance to the 2025 cost pressures within the Health & Care and Corporate Services, other Committees, Authorities and Departments have collectively underspent by approximately £5 million in the year to date. Although some cost pressures are foreseen in the final months of the year, the outturn on expenditure is currently anticipated to be managed within the overall and original 2025 Budget envelope.

The other elements contributing to our operating deficit are the general revenue subsidy to support trading entity losses and the revenue of non-capitalised projects. The value of the subsidy to the trading entities is forecast to be an improvement on that budgeted due to small improvements in both income and expenditure across all those entities.

The impact of expensing project costs is now forecast to be almost £12 million less than budgeted, but this is largely due to the timing of project delivery rather than being real savings.

Once these are taken into account, as I said, we are currently estimating an operating deficit of roughly £2 million. While this is certainly an improvement on the budgeted position, it still confirms that we are spending more than we generate on a day-to-day basis before allowing for investments in assets and infrastructure. This is, of course, a challenging starting point to put together the Budget for 2026.

We are now most of the way through that process. We have examined all routes prior to the outcome next year of the tax review, to additional revenue raising, and confirmed to Committees the cash limits we will be recommending for next year.

It is probably no surprise that no one is getting everything they asked for. We are now finalising the Budget report, which will be published on 7th October. Before I go any further, having made a family commitment prior to the election, I should apologise to all Members for my absence on the 2026 Budget's publication, but I must particularly apologise to the President of the Committee, who is taking up the slack in my absence, for which I am most grateful.

I have no doubt that nobody will be happy with everything that is included. We must raise revenues where we can find scope, and frankly the scope is extremely limited. We have no choice but to fund essential public services, and some of the pressures I have spoken about today are already being spent so cannot be avoided, meaning we have no option but to budget for them next year.

However, Members and the public should be assured that there will be initiatives to deliver savings in 2026, as well as a fresh but much needed look at our whole expenditure budget and how we budget. While I do not expect Members to be overjoyed by what they read in the Budget, I hope they will appreciate the need to balance the books and the difficult decisions that entails for everybody in the States of Deliberation.

Looking further out than 2026, this Policy & Resources Committee is committed to addressing the lack of resilience in public finances. This simply must be the political term that ensures long-term fiscal sustainability for the future of our economy, our infrastructure, our public services and our community.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy St Pier.

Now, 15 minutes of questions.

Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you; and thank you for the updater, Deputy St Pier.

In the Future Guernsey manifesto, there are four instances of the following manifesto pledge: introducing reduction in baseline spending for each year from 2026, saving Guernsey more than £25 million a year by 2029. As Deputy St Pier is currently the VP of Policy & Resources, has the leader of the Future Guernsey party already broken a manifesto pledge?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam; and thank you, Deputy Inder, for the question.

I can do no better than repeat what was said in my statement which is – I will find the exact wording if I may. I cannot find the exact wording, but it is to provide the reassurance that there will be cost-saving provisions made in the Budget report. I can obviously say no more about that before the publication of the report led by the President, and Deputy Inder will have to reserve his excitement until he has the opportunity to see that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you; I thank the Vice-President for his update.

My question is regarding Income Tax. Over the campaign trail, loads of people came forward saying they just had not had their bills in. Deputy St Pier alluded to 6,000 credits, which the States' Income Tax was still working on. Can he give me an indication of how much those credits, what the estimated value is, please?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I thank Deputy Vermeulen for the question.

I regret I am not in a position, I do not have that information to hand. I will seek to ascertain it and circulate it in accordance with the rules within seven days.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, ma'am; and I thank Deputy St Pier for his update.

I just wanted to focus in on ETI because 70% of the Government's income in real time comes from ETI, and it is the best measure that we have of the performance of the economy, as you mentioned.

Our inflation is currently running at about 3.9%, so you would expect ETI receipts, if wages are going up by the same rate, to have increased by 3.9%. I just ask, is Deputy St Pier concerned about that gap and will he keep us updated if it continues to widen because it has serious consequences?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Deputy Helyar is quite correct to draw attention to our reliance, indeed our over-reliance on ETI as a source of income. I think the 70% figure actually includes the taxation of all direct income, including social security contributions. But the point nonetheless is well made. Of course, the Budget for 2025 would have included an inflation allowance. So broadly, the expected outcome of £291 million against a budget of £293 million means that we have at least kept in line with our inflation expectations for 2025.

However, that would seem to indicate no significant or no real-terms increase in revenue, so certainly it is an issue that we do need to continue to monitor closely, as he has suggested in his question. As I indicated at the beginning of my statement, Madam, I do undertake to continue to keep this Assembly regularly updated on our performance during this term.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Millar: Madam, if I was listening correctly, Deputy St Pier has not made any reference or comment to the level and progress of our capital expenditure to date, and no mention how it might affect or not affect the budget-setting process. Of course, the reason for that is that capital expenditure does not form part of the budget-setting process, which in itself actually potentially presents an issue.

Would the Vice-President consider it important that as part of the review of the budget-setting process for next year, we should consider amalgamating all of those critical decisions, including on capital expenditure, into the budget-setting process, which should be our annual key fiscal event?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller raises a valid challenge in relation to budget setting, which clearly needs to be more focused on cash coming in and cash going out, and obviously our budgets now are more aligned to the International Public Sector Accounting

Standards (IPSAS) reporting, which of course is reflective of accounting treatment and making provisions and so on.

235 I think in relation to capital, we obviously will have the opportunity for a Funding & Investment Plan debate shortly. But aligning to the closing comments I made at the end of the Statement, madam, it is quite clear that our operating revenue each year is insufficient to meet all our capital needs. That is one of the challenges which does need to be met through our review of fiscal sustainability and our consideration of how we should be funding our capital programme, because
240 not all of it necessarily needs to come from taxation and that is why the Funding & Investment Plan is there, to consider the alternative mechanisms for funding capital as well.

But I think the point is well made, but I am not going to seek to predict the outcome of the exercise I referred to in relation to the review of the budgeting process.

245 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Madam, thank you.

Just in relation to that, I thank Deputy St Pier for his update and I support his efforts to reduce expenditure year-on-year for the next four years, and I am hoping that he has a Budget that does
250 that.

My question is supplementary to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, insofar as can he give an estimate of the underlying structural deficit of the States at this time? He will appreciate it is a hobby horse of mine, but I see no reference to that number anywhere today.

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

Deputy St Pier: There are lots of things which one can throw into that, as Deputy Sloan will know, in terms of that estimate of what the underlying deficit may be. I am not going to seek to do it on my feet here and now. It is clearly an issue that will have to form part of this Assembly's
260 considerations of our fiscal policy framework, which will be within the next few months, as well as ultimately the fiscal strategy, which will need to come to the States, as we have indicated, before the middle of next year.

That will have to clearly be underpinned by expectations of what our future fiscal position is likely to be and therefore a better estimate of what the deficit is as well.

265 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, Madam; I thank Deputy St Pier for the update.

In the update I was surprised to hear about document duty, which forms a very small part of our
270 income, but it was worthy of note because I think I heard that it was up forecasted by £8 million. Is that just a blip? Is it high-value sales, i.e. the value of the property, be it commercial or residential, or is it in actual fact more high volume or churn of residential housing, which could be a concern because people do not necessarily want to be moving house all the time?

Thank you.

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

Deputy St Pier: I thank Deputy Gabriel for the question.

It has been driven by increased volume and actually increased volume is probably reflective of a
280 more dynamic market, which is probably a good thing. However, the challenge of course with document duty is it is very difficult to predict and manage because it is dependent on the factors both of volume and price over, which obviously Government has no control whatsoever. So yes, we are clearly benefiting from the increased volume for this year, but we cannot obviously assume that that will continue ad infinitum.

285 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Humphreys.

290 **Deputy Humphreys:** Madam, Deputy St Pier referred to a manual check being undertaken with regard to Income Tax refunds and that is taking up a significant amount of time. I am interested to know how many of those checks actually lead to a level of refunds that is necessary and appropriate, indicating whether the time-consuming exercise is actually necessary and appropriate alongside that.

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

300 **Deputy St Pier:** Deputy Humphreys' question is very pertinent. As I indicated, with 6,000 credits processed through assessments so far and 1,084 repayment cheques issued, the question though of the value of each of those cheques perhaps also links into Deputy Vermeulen's question of the total value of all repayments or credits that are potentially due. However, the whole question of the value of the process which is being undertaken, which underpins Deputy Humphreys' question, is absolutely what has driven Policy & Resources' interest in this area. Working with the Chief Executive, we are looking to ensure that the processes are as streamlined as they can be until such time as the system effectively catches up with where it needs to be to process these things automatically, which is not where we are right now.

305 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

310 **Deputy Gollop:** Really, it is a double supplementary on questions by Deputy Gabriel and Deputy Helyar. Because I would like to know if Policy & Resources are doing an economic analysis of what appears to be a static, if not declining, position on employee tax instalment (ETI) and social security and the reasons for that, whether they reflect economic trends. By the same token, we had good news on the volume of local market property sales, but I am wondering if that same positivity of document duty is reflected in commercial and open market property and, if not, whether that economic analysis is being looked at in those areas, too.

315 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier, that was about three questions in one (*Laughter*) so I leave it to you to answer which ones or if all of them up to you.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you for that challenge, madam.

320 In relation to document duty, of course, the information I think on property transactions is published quarterly, so I can do no better than refer Deputy Gollop to that.

325 In relation to ETI income and contribution income, are we doing an economic analysis in relation to that? Obviously as part of the Budget process we do take into account our economic forecasting for the state of the economy and, therefore, the impact on ETI. That forecast will be available when the Budget report is published in a couple of weeks' time.

330 I think the general state of ETI, of course, remains reflective, as we know – and to some extent this is implicit in Deputy Helyar's question – of our over-reliance on Income Tax and, in particular, with a gently ageing demographic, it does mean that we are becoming increasingly reliant on a smaller number of economically-active individuals as a proportion of the total number of taxpayers. That problem, that challenge if you like, continues and will be a pressing one for year to year, and it absolutely underpins the need for the tax review and, indeed, has done probably for the last decade.

335 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorrity.

Deputy Dorrity: Thank you, ma'am.

In the recent Future Guernsey newsletter, which I received on 18th September, I was interested to learn that rather than being a plan of P&R, the Tax Review Sub-committee was created in line with the recommendations made in the Future Guernsey manifesto. We also learned that Future Guernsey do not think the States should be asking Islanders to pay more in the form of GST-Plus. Given the bare cupboard financial statement that he has just made in a community with an ageing population and a shrinking working age population, does he not agree that GST-Plus is something we need to implement alongside other revenue-raising measures?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I think the first thing I should say is I am not responsible for any email traffic that Deputy Dorrity receives. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

In relation to the GST position, the Policy & Resources Committee, which is the Committee on whose behalf I am speaking today, has made its position clear. It has a twin-track approach. It will be seeking to bring a Policy Letter to the Assembly in the first quarter in relation to decisions that will need to be made in relation to GST, while at the same time the Tax Review Committee is looking at the wider alternatives with a view to this Assembly having the opportunity to make some final decisions on our future tax structure by the middle of next year.

The Deputy Bailiff: Any more questions? No. Thank you very much, Deputy St Pier.

General update – Statement by the President of the Economic Development Committee

The Deputy Bailiff: In that case, I will turn to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for a Statement on behalf of Economic Development.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, as a small Island community we are inevitably dependent on our connectivity to the world beyond our shores. We have seen what good sea connectivity looks like thanks to our new contract with Brittany Ferries. Overall passenger figures across all routes are up nearly 30%, while traffic between Saint-Malo and Guernsey is up 59% just six months in. This is thanks to the improved schedule, the strength of the Brittany Ferries customer reach, together with joint marketing and collaboration between Brittany Ferries, Visit Guernsey, Guernsey Ports and the Saint-Malo Tourism Authority.

Building stronger trade and tourism links with France is a key priority for the Committee. We have been actively engaging in trade facilitation, with five trade missions having taken place and more planned this year. We are going to see the return of the Normandy market in the middle of October, and the Committee is working to bring the Brittany market to Guernsey for the first time.

The Committee recently attended the Forum Économique Breton, a premier business event in the region. The Guernsey delegation received an extremely warm welcome from many stakeholders, including the President and Vice-President of the Brittany region, the Mayor of Saint-Malo, local Chamber of Commerce, local businesses and the port authority. Brittany is a leading agricultural production region in France, with many long-established farm co-operatives within hours of Saint-Malo. Having fresh produce on our shelves or restaurants within as little as 24 hours from harvest is a reality during the peak season. We would encourage businesses to explore trading opportunities with France as it can improve choice, quality and also price. We suggest that they contact the Committee to learn more or for support.

Passenger numbers through Manche Îles Express have gone up as well this year by more than 13%, with over 18,000 passenger movements between Diélette, Saint Peter Port, Sark and Jersey. Seeing thousands more French visitors this year has been transformational. I really hope Guernsey

385 can learn to 'parlez français' a little bit more next year. It will be great to see more menus translated into French and accessible through technologies like QR codes. French language lessons organised for the hospitality industry have been oversubscribed.

Inter-island connectivity with Jersey continues to be very important for us and it was central to our discussion during my visit to Jersey in August. This is why it is a contractual obligation for Brittany Ferries to provide a rotation in the peak season. The Committee supported the launch of
390 Islands Unlimited passenger service, which has seen 24,500 passenger movements since its launch on 6th June. I hope to work jointly with Jersey on improved inter-Island connectivity with DFDS next season and explore proposals to support other inter-Island providers in 2026.

Air connectivity is equally crucial and a key strategic enabler. A new Air Policy Framework and Air Transport Licensing Policy are being developed. While the existing framework updated in 2021
395 served its intended purpose to provide the necessary support to Aurigny following the difficult operating environment post-Covid, it is now viewed as not enabling Guernsey's air connectivity requirements. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Diversifying the number of airlines serving Guernsey was a priority of the previous Committee and continues this term. The Committee will continue to engage with Policy & Resources and the States' Trading Supervisory Board as necessary to prepare any new
400 Air Policy Framework.

On a positive note, the air route to Paris, launched in April 2024 and supported by route development funding, has continued to grow and to be popular both with Islanders and visitors. Sea and air connectivity are inherently intertwined and support our tourism and retail offering. I am very pleased that Deputy Van Katwyk, with his experience in both sectors, will be leading on this
405 work. There has been some great successes this year, including recognition for Visit Guernsey at the Travel Marketing Awards for their campaign 'Keeping Our War Stories Alive', promoting the 80th Liberation.

The tourism offering of the Bailiwick of Guernsey, our special archipelago including Herm, Sark and Alderney, is our unique value proposition. We want to ensure we work even more closely with
410 the respective tourism authorities in Sark and Alderney to capitalise on that. Plans for the Victor Hugo Centre were of strong interest during our trip to France. It is an increasingly strategic project for Guernsey to really rally behind.

The previous Committee funded the Guernsey Retail Group to develop a new Retail Strategy. The high street and Market Square are buzzing and it is exciting to see the ongoing investment in
415 the opening of new shops and outlets, including Creaseys and Iceland in the last week alone. The collaborative work of Art for Guernsey to reinvigorate Mansell Street has also been inspirational. One aspect of particular interest to the tourism sector is the potential introduction of a visitor levy. We intend to continue exploring this work in close collaboration with industry and taking into account the wider discussions around tax and public finances.

Digital connectivity is equally important to our sea and air links. The previous Committee and the States made significant steps to ensure Guernsey had world-class connectivity through the fibre partnership with Sure and the enabling policy for 5G and spectrum neutral technologies. Sure's physical buildout of the fibre network will complete this year, with 95% of properties already connected. This is a great example of a public-private partnership and a complex capital project
420 competed on time and on budget. About 70% of properties have now opted for fibre, and the rest will have until the end of 2026 to sign up as the copper network will be disconnected soon after. We are expecting the 5G rollout to begin next year.

Developing the next Bailiwick Digital Framework will be an important cross-government workstream. This will take into account artificial intelligence, skills, development of a digital ID, and
430 other infrastructure and regulation needs for an AI enabled economy. The first cross-government Digital Steering Committee meeting takes place next month.

The Innovate Guernsey Board, established at the end of the last political term, is busy developing an innovation plan and completing a review of the Digital Greenhouse. Facilitating and onboarding innovation quicker will be a key driver of economic resilience and success and is proven to
435 contribute to increased productivity, job creation, economic diversification and competitiveness.

Moving on to finance, which remains our core pillar of the economy, the Committee has just announced the commissioning of the Finance Sector Policy Framework. This is structured and co-funded as a collaborative project between Government, Guernsey Financial Services Commission, Guernsey Finance and Guernsey International Business Association. The purpose is to develop a strategy and delivery plan for the future of Guernsey's finance sector, focusing on areas of growth, defensible innovation and new markets. As part of the new finance strategy, the Committee recognises the opportunities with digital assets, blockchain technologies and the trend towards more decentralised and open finance.

The Committee took part in the first Guernsey Digital Assets Conference, with Deputy Camp delivering an opening speech. The Committee is very well placed to drive work on finance sector development, given the excellent political experience and skills we have in most sectors of finance. Deputy Niles will be chairing the important finance sector forum, providing general leadership for the finance sector, Guernsey Registry and the Office of the Public Trustee. Deputy Camp will be leading on digital assets and supporting P&R on tax and regulation work, and Deputy Humphreys will be leading on trade and energy as well as joint oversight of the construction sector.

One area which is seeing growing interest is the creative industries sector, particularly film production. I was very pleased to attend the launch event of 'Whispers of Freedom' and the documentary of the filming of 'Adele H'. This is potentially a new area of diversification which the Committee will be actively looking to support where it can.

The Committee's work on the tax treatment of shares and share options concluded with recommendations submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration in the 2026 Budget. We are grateful to P&R for their consideration of these policy changes and to those who engaged with the Committee to inform its recommendations.

The Guernsey Aircraft Registry, the 2-REG, one of our less known success stories, is going from strength to strength and has now become the leading global registry for transactional registrations. The Registry enables the provision of a service industry with many positive effects which we plan to grow. Guernsey Registry has completed the important IT upgrade projects. The final elements of technical functionality such as application programming interfaces (APIs) will be soon launched. These are important to ensure company details can be verified by payment providers, among the many other use cases of that technology.

The Committee will continue championing Guernsey's small businesses, the backbone of our economy, with a particular focus on the cost of doing business and regulatory burdens. We know that economic growth was a key theme in the election. The Committee has already held a prioritisation and strategy workshop and will work on the new Economic Strategy in consultation with other Committees. This will draw out the themes and levers that will enable us to remain competitive, resilient and diversified, unlocking private and public investment, and with threads of economic growth cascading throughout the economy and benefiting all Islanders. The Economic Strategy will enable us to capture key levers, including skills, infrastructure developments, investment, productivity, workforce participation, energy, AI and sustainability, all of which will require cross-government collaboration.

Our competitiveness is reliant on the fine balance and proportionality of our regulation as well as ensuring we meet our international and trade compliance requirements. The Committee is progressing the review of the Guernsey Competition and Regulation Authority and has launched another round of consultation with stakeholders. The Committee is particularly keen to ensure proportionate oversight of fair market practices, which meets the needs of our small-scale economy. The GCRA are also undertaking a market study of concrete and aggregates commissioned by the previous Committee, and we look forward to receiving the findings shortly.

One important area for the Committee's first few months has been direct engagement with many industry representative groups and individual businesses, which provides invaluable insights into the issues and challenges confronting our local economy. On behalf of the Committee, I would like to thank everyone who has afforded their time and efforts as only through working together we can achieve the best for Guernsey. We are committed to maintaining a high level of engagement

as this is one of the reasons why we have allocated political leads to so many different sectors to be able to provide a direct line of communication for all stakeholders. I am grateful to all members of my Committee for their enthusiasm and proactive approach with taking on their leads. We are also very lucky to be working with an excellent and strong team of officers, many of whom have years of experience of public service.

Last but not least, I would also like to welcome Barrie Duerden, who joined us just this week as a non-States' Member.

Madam, thank you, and I welcome questions from Members of the Assembly.

The Deputy Bailiff: Just before we get to questions, Deputy Falla and Deputy Niles, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Falla: Yes, please, madam.

Deputy Niles: Yes, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Yes, Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

I thank the President for her update and it was good to hear about the progress being made with tourism. Now, Jersey issued five permits on a catch-and-release basis for Atlantic Bluefin tuna this year. Could the President update me as to her remit with sea fisheries and what progress is being made in Guernsey on a similar basis, if it is being considered?

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I thank Deputy Vermeulen.

I was expecting a question on tuna today. I am pleased to confirm that progress is being made, but the ball is really in the court of the DEFRA. So we are waiting for DEFRA to do their work in terms of what is required for the extension of the treaty to Guernsey. With fair winds, we are hoping the progress will be made next year, but it is really up to DEFRA at this stage to take the next steps forward.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, ma'am.

Could I ask, through you, about connectivity? I was really pleased to hear the focus on air connectivity and the priority that is going to have for you as a Committee. However, I wonder if you will be focusing on helping us get the very basics right in connectivity in terms of how we treat consumers (**A Member:** Hear, hear.), especially when things go wrong with flight connectivity due to either technical or weather problems. This impacts Brand Guernsey, not just tourism but our finance sector and, indeed, those who have to go to hospital in Southampton. I believe it is unacceptable that when flights are delayed there are very different forms of communication and information available to people from airports and airlines. We need clarity as to what the impact of that delay will be. Would the President commit to looking at communication with consumers and ensuring that it is clear how long that delay is likely to be?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

540 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, the Committee does not run the airlines or the airports. I think probably some of those questions are more operational and should be directed to the STSB, and Deputy Helyar in particular. But I think it is important that Brand Guernsey and overall experience of being in Guernsey is being affected and I think it is important that we work collaboratively to ensure where we hear about problems we communicate together and work jointly. We have a very good example of the Ferry Working Group, which is working on the customer experience of sea passengers landing in Guernsey. Perhaps we could replicate something like that for air connectivity and create a working group which connects key stakeholders for that.

I thank Deputy Ozanne for that idea.

550 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Goy.

Deputy Goy: Thank you, madam.

Can the President please explain in detail what is the role of the consultant that the President mentioned that has been engaged and hired to work with the finance industry? What is the output that you expect and how much is the consultancy costing the States? What is the name of the consultant –

555

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Goy, I have four questions now in one.

560 **Deputy Goy:** Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: You just ask the one.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

565 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, I thank Deputy Goy for drawing the attention to this very important piece of work. Unfortunately, I only have about two minutes so I could not possibly explain in all the detail about what we are trying to achieve.

The Deputy Bailiff: One and a half, actually.

570

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Now even less. But I think this is absolutely a crucial piece of work. It went through a very competitive tender process and what is really important, it has been probably one of the first projects that has been commissioned in joint collaboration with the regulator, with industry, with Guernsey Finance, and it is also co-funded by those entities. I think what would be really useful is that as part of developing this strategy we offer more detailed engagement sessions and opportunity for Deputies to also take part, which I assume would be part of the strategy development anyway. So I would like to commit that we keep Deputies really updated and in the loop of how we develop this strategy piece.

575

580 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I am gratified to hear the emphasis and continuity, and I think the previous Economic Development Committee, led by Deputy Inder, which Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was a key member, made the right decision on the ferry links. Brittany have delivered clearly more French passengers and has been less controversial than our other Island alternative.

585

My question is, though, about the other Island. Will the new Committee work as you can with Jersey and the sea operators, both to bring forward a more long-term, year-round car ferry service to facilitate transport to and from Jersey for everyone, including business people, horse owners,

590

sports stars, arts people and everyone else? Because once or twice a week is not really what the Islands need for our economic and cultural future.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, first of all I am very committed to working with Jersey and, in fact, my first trip off Island was to Jersey to speak with Deputy Morel and Deputy Gorst on a number of points.

As I mentioned previously, it is a contractual obligation for Brittany Ferries to provide inter-Island connectivity, especially during peak season. We have committed absolutely to keep an open dialogue and to look at any proposal that comes forward. We are really keen to ensure that DFDS reciprocates with at least one rotation to mirror what Brittany Ferries is doing. If we start having those building blocks in place I think this will be a good foundation to exploring future opportunities for a longer-term, more sustainable service between the Islands.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

I would like to thank the President for a really excellent first speech from Economic Development on all the aspects. I would like just to raise two parts of something. One, the Victor Hugo Centre, which we have had really good support from the previous term talking about amounts of money being raised, etc. Could you give some sort of indication of where we are on track for raising the funds and getting there and if she would have any ideas on accelerating it.

Two, a tiny additional question: on the 2-REG, the commercial is the stronger one. You said there was a great success in it. Could you explain?

The Deputy Bailiff: That is a completely – it is not even a supplementary of the first question.

Deputy Blin: I tried.

The Deputy Bailiff: If there is time, people can ask a second question. There is no limit to the amount of questions that people can ask in the 20 minutes and I can extend it, but please try to be disciplined. It is one question.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, madam.

I am delighted with the question about the Victor Hugo Centre. We actually had a meeting with the team yesterday, who gave us a more detailed update. They have indicated that publicly they have now raised about £3 million out of the £7 million to £7.5 million. Obviously, part of that is the commitment of States' matched funding, and the States have also committed to provide the building as well, which is in the prime location.

I think this is something that I would really like the community to really rally around. We have even had discussions whether there could be a little retail levy, 50p in the cafés and restaurants, to support the Victor Hugo Centre. But we are potentially also exploring discussions of funding with French sources. This is the one project that I think was really visionary by the founders of that project team to bring forward, and I really encourage all of us to rally behind this and to really make it happen this political term.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you.

I might try and help Deputy Ozanne's question in some way, shape or form. Thank you. Good speech, the new President, and I wish her and her team a great four years ahead of them. They were very good – certainly Deputy Niles and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller were very good members of my Committee.

In January 2025 Economic Development conducted a review on air connectivity performance, affordability, connectivity and reliability, all before 2024. Connectivity, very good; reliability before 2024, very good. However, the affordability was pretty appalling. Guernsey in comparison to other jurisdictions, Isle of Man and Jersey, was shown at 15% to 30% higher than other jurisdictions. That is important for generating business, very important. Could I ask if Deputy Kazantseva-Miller could not lose sight of that report and could she at least try and work in the future with STSB, who are responsible for Aurigny, to see if we can do any more work on that in some way, shape or form, which may be –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy, you are going way over your minute.

Deputy Inder: Well, you know what I am saying.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, madam.

I thank Deputy Inder for the words of support for our membership of his Committee in the previous term as well.

Yes, absolutely, the Committee conducted a benchmarking analysis on understanding where we were with affordability, reliability and connectivity. I think what we should be doing is a regular benchmarking analysis, potentially on an annual basis so certainly every two years, so we have an impartial analysis of where we are with our key connectivity criteria. I think this is the work we could be bringing in-house, not necessarily outsourcing, because we can get access to data and we have some really good officers in the team who could do the data analysis.

So this is the kind of thing we will be exploring as part of the workstreams going forward with the Committee, but we have not yet confirmed exactly whether that is going to be taking place. But I would certainly advocate for this kind of exercise to be undertaken on a regular basis so we do not argue that someone is saying one thing, others are saying – we have an impartial analysis of actually our connectivity performance compared to other jurisdictions.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you.

I thank the President of Economic Development. Last term we received your Committee's review, 'Early childhood education and care in the Bailiwick', and the workforce participation appendix to the Government Work Plan report. These papers highlight the pressures facing the early years sector and touch on participation, but they do not provide a full economic analysis of the wider benefits of expanding entitlement from 15 to 30 hours, nor do they draw on the expertise of ESC's early years officers. Will Economic Development commission a report this term, working with ESC, to quantify the wider economic case for expanded provision, including its potential to boost workforce participation, productivity and long-term revenues?

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Madam, I know this is an area of interest that we share passionately with Deputy Cameron and have in the previous term made steps to try to push the States into doing more work in this sphere.

I think from the Economic Development Committee perspective, because we have oversight of different sectors of the economy, one of the key things we wanted to achieve with that report is better understanding of the challenges the sector was actually facing. So this was a foundational piece to indicate whether the sector was facing challenges and if we were to increase the provision, which would have financial and fiscal implications, we would need to make sure the sector was actually ready to absorb potential future capacity. This is exactly one of those areas of cross-Committee work that we would need to engage very closely, and I do hope that we can pick up that conversation soon between the two Committees, among many other cross-collaboration items we have between ESC and Economic Development.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

In the President's update, which I thank her for, she mentioned inter-Island connectivity, which some Members have picked up on and questioned. She also mentioned supporting other operators on an inter-Island basis. Will that be by subsidy or route development funding or any other onshore method?

Thank you.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: The methods we have been using is around route development but also potentially some co-marketing support. So I think that type of Government support seems to be working, and we obviously need to make sure that what we are doing actually has an impact. So we will always do an impact analysis whether the route development support works. But I think it is more we are not trying to completely reinvent the wheel here. It is doing more of what we have already done and working with operators that do come forward to understand their financial projections and what kind of support they need and whether that is the right thing for Government to provide.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

Economic Development are riding the wave of the power of the brand with Brittany Ferries. We have seen Cambridge Economics say that that is worth to Jersey's air connectivity £35 million. What opportunities are there for major carriers flying to new destinations such as Heathrow for Guernsey and could that generate more revenue?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I think Deputy Vermeulen has pointed very correctly to the power of what working with a global strong brand which has a much bigger reach and customer base and marketing power entails. I think that is exactly the kind of conversation we should be exploring for air connectivity as well. As I mentioned in my speech, it was a priority for the previous Committee and has remained a priority for this Committee. So while there is nothing I can say today, it is the kind of work we are undertaking as a Committee.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Thank you, madam.

745 May I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her contribution – my apologies, Sasha – and also congratulate her for mentioning the contribution of the creative arts to the economy and mentioning the Guernsey Film Institute, which the Guernsey Arts Commission – of which I am a board director – has been very pleased to support going forward so far. Similarly, may I also congratulate her insofar as her mention of the Oliver Wyman report, and congratulations for choosing an appropriate consultancy to undertake that research.

750 I muse regularly about the risk-reward of our finance sector and its contribution to economic growth. Can she reassure us that the review will take a very honest appraisal of our economic and financial performance over the last 10 to 15 years and that we are not well served by reports that tend to try and provide a disingenuous presentation of the stated reality?

755 **A Member:** Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

760 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, I thank Deputy Sloan for the many congratulations. The Committee has no intention to just publish fancy reports and leave them on the shelf. We are here to deliver for Guernsey and I think this was one of the central reasons that the approach undertaken with this report was to do it in a collaborative fashion, where you have all the key stakeholders around the table talking about and engaging with the project. As I mentioned before, it is co-funded by the different parties as well.

765 So that kind of structure we feel is quite innovative and will provide for those honest conversations that need to be had. There is no opportunity for a party in this process, including Government, to be dominating the conversation or to be editing whatever the recommendations or the review will show.

Thank you.

770 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you.

775 Can I just say thank you to the President for a very detailed update? Much appreciated. We had Vision Channel Islands present to the States of Alderney yesterday in the Chamber of Commerce about the benefits of Guernsey and Jersey working together and the economies coming together, and they suggested maybe a pan-Island strategic forum. Would that be something the President would support or are there thoughts already where this is already happening? They also did highlight potentially the tunnel project in the very distant future hopefully may be a benefit as well.

780 I would just like her thoughts around the Islands' strategic forum for the Channel Islands.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

785 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, there are already all sorts of Channel Islands collaborative workstreams that happen. I think probably the issue is that the public is not fully aware about them. The Chief Minister just recently I think wrote quite a good article in the *Jersey Evening Post* outlining just some of those examples of the existing collaboration that does exist. We are the Channel Islands and we are stronger together. This is why, as I said, we will continue our work especially on inter-Island connectivity. But some of the other discussion points we had with my counterparts in Jersey were around open banking and the opportunity to collaborate as Crown Dependencies, not just as Channel Islands but Crown Dependencies, for open banking and open finance initiatives.

790 We are active members of the Crown Dependencies network so I do feel actually there is probably more collaboration and engagement that does happen and also at Committee level, but
795 if there are proposals to formulate something further I am sure my Committee will consider that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, madam; and thank you to the President for her update.

800 When discussing and thinking about the diversification of airlines, could I ask if Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and/or her Committee have discussed their thoughts around to what extent, if any at all, that Aurigny should be protected?

Thank you, madam.

805 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: So as I mentioned, I think one of the key pieces of work this political term for us will be the updates of the Air Policy Framework. I think those kind of considerations will need to be undertaken within that framework. The protection of Aurigny used to be especially in relation to lifeline routes, so the Government's approach to the protection of lifeline routes, whether it is Gatwick and Southampton or other routes, I think will drive some of those discussions.

810 We currently operate a quasi-open sky agreement so it is only those lifeline routes that are specifically protected. As an Island community we need to ensure we have competition while at the same time maintaining those lifeline routes. I think that is exactly the kind of conversation we will be discussing and themes drawing out in the air policy framework.

The Deputy Bailiff: Are there any more questions?

Deputy Blin, please.

820 **Deputy Blin:** Thank you, ma'am.

To go back to the question on 2-REG, we know that the majority of the work is the off-lease transitional aircraft commercial, which do not really spend any time here. Then there is general aviation. She spoke about the increase or the continued success. Is there any indication she can give on what those numbers are and also, if they are net to public finances, they are a figure which is directly impacting and will remain self-funding as the intention always was?

825 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

830 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** The Registry is self-funding and generates a small income as well to the Exchequer. I do not have the numbers right now with me, but we are looking to potentially publish more information about the Registry's success. What currently has not been quantified recently is actually the adjacent growth to the service industry that it provides. So, for example, you might have service provider structuring aircrafts in corporate structures and providing services off the back of it. The last economic analysis that was undertaken was I think in about 2019 and estimated that that provided £1.4 million of additional economic benefit to Guernsey. So obviously we are five or six years onwards from that, and that is the kind of conversation we will have, is the ability to estimate that adjacent economic impact a registry like an Aircraft Registry provides to the economy. So I think we will draw this out in the workstreams this political term.

840

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I was excited to be, I think, one of two Members who attended parts of the insurance Airmic conference this week, which was very well attended in both Guernsey and London. An issue that emerged perhaps is the UK are looking at developing their own captive insurance sector. I would be interested to know if Economic Development are doing everything they can to

845

not only support our resilient and powerful insurance sector but work constructively with the UK on any proposals that hopefully will be complementary rather than ultra-competitive.

850 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, madam.

855 Yes, Deputy Gollop has picked up on the fact that the UK is launching a captive insurance product. I think this is one of the challenges of operating in the global economy: everyone wants to eat your lunch as well. So we should never be complacent about what we have and always be on our feet being able to defend what we have but also being able to innovate, to look at new markets. These are exactly the kind of conversations we will be exploring as part of the finance sector strategy: what are those defensible services and products and markets that we will be playing for the next five to 10 years, whether it is insurance, whether it is trust funds and beyond?

860

The Deputy Bailiff: Any more questions? No.
Thank you very much, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Questions for Oral Answer

COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Transport, traffic and highways – Improvement of pavement amenity and safety

The Deputy Bailiff: In that case we will move on to Question Time. Oh, yes.

865

Deputy Parkinson: May I be relevéd, madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Parkinson is relevéd. Thank you very much.
Deputy Gollop, your question.

870

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, madam, Deputy, President.

875 They are to the President of the Environment & Infrastructure Committee, Deputy Gabriel. Will the Environment & Infrastructure Committee through policy and work with transport, traffic and highways consider improving pavement amenity and safety and reducing car use parking or travelling on pavements with viable alternative traffic solutions, residential car parking options, perhaps in conjunction with Douzaines?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Gabriel as President of the Committee *for* Environment & Infrastructure.

880

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

885 The States of Guernsey's On-Island Transport Strategy aims to facilitate safe and convenient travel options for the community and sets out the transport hierarchy that prioritises modes of active travel over solo occupancy trips. As part of the roads resurfacing programme, opportunities to improve infrastructure for pedestrians are taken, which includes the creation of new pavements and enhancements to crossings. Road safety improvements are also made across the Island as part of our roads infrastructure programme. It is also committed to the introduction of School Streets.

Four have been introduced so far and this is a great example of improving safety and reducing car dominance.

890 Occasionally, driving a vehicle on a pavement is permissible – for example, where necessary to pass another vehicle – but this must be done with due care and regard for the safety of pedestrians and other road users and at low speed. The enforcement of such activities, of course, already falls under the mandate of the Committee for Home Affairs through law enforcement.

895 While the strategy aims to achieve a greater proportion of smaller and low emission vehicles on our roads, it recognises the vital role that private motor vehicles have for many in our community. The intention is to increase the number of transport options available to people to reduce the reliance on and dominance of the car but not removing it. Therefore, there will continue to be a need to consult with all stakeholders, including the Douzaines, about parking provision for a variety of activities, including residential and commuter parking.

900

The Deputy Bailiff: Three supplementary questions.

Deputy Gollop: My first question is: the President refers to the introduction of School Streets, four of which have been introduced so far. Are there plans to introduce other School Streets and can we as a community, estates and the parishes be made aware of that?

905

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

910 The introduction of School Streets comes primarily from the school community, the people using the school, and we are happy to facilitate those arrangements because of the necessary temporary road closures put in place. But it is a great example of communication between the community, the school and the Committee and, of course, in the usual manner it is publicised because it is a road closure.

915 Thank you.

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

Deputy Gollop: I thank the President and Committee for their answers, and I am aware as a member of Home Affairs of the law enforcement side of driving vehicles on pavements.

920

Your answer says driving a vehicle on a pavement is permissible occasionally where necessary to pass another vehicle, for example. But there is at least one street two minutes' walk from this court, Sausmarez Street, where almost every vehicle, unless it is the size of an old-fashioned mini, is obliged to mount the pavement and pedestrians have to cross the road. Is there not now the need for Environment & Infrastructure to look at how those pavements can be made safer and perhaps alternative parking be provided rather than sustaining what amounts to tolerating an illegal situation?

925

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

930

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

935 Of course, there are always options, other options other than driving on the pavement, but in some cases it is necessary. Deputy Gollop brings up the conundrum really because also in his question he asks about parking. So we have to provide parking and we have to provide a pedestrian facility as well, and it is about providing a balance. I am sure if I removed all of town parking there would be an outcry, especially from the drivers and also the residents there who need their vehicles. So it is about providing a balance. Certainly, Sausmarez Street and the legislation has not changed in a significant time, and vehicles have got wider as more safety aspects are brought in around the vehicle construction and use.

940

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. Sorry, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel. Sorry, too many double barrels.

945

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you for the answer to the question, Deputy Gabriel.
I wonder, in the Committee's deliberations on the highway code, which sets out how a vehicle should mount the pavement, whether there has been consideration, in order to help law enforcement, putting in a speed to that rather than just a vague recommendation that it be done at a reasonable speed. Having an actual speed would help law enforcement to enforce.

950

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you.

955

We are straying into the enforcement part of it, I think. I do not have an encyclopaedic knowledge of the Highway Code, but I do recall that there is a recommendation of a four miles an hour access and entry speed on to the pavement. But if that is not the case, then I am happy to be corrected. But also again it is very difficult for officers who might be enforcing that or just casually passing to assess the speed if they are just visually observing.

960

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, madam.

965

I wonder if the President would agree with me that there is something of a vicious cycle where roads are difficult or pavements are difficult or seem to be dangerous to walk on, which then causes more people to use motor vehicles in order to avoid walking on the roads that are dangerous and that some roads – and the Committee last term looked at Bailiff's Cross as an example and others – are simply too narrow to really support two-way traffic and that other solutions would want to be looked at in order to try and avoid the almost continuous use of pavements by motor vehicles.

970

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: I would agree with him in that it is a vicious, perpetuating circle, really, that you do not walk on the pavements because of the traffic but then you become the traffic. So that is an issue.

975

Two-way traffic, as I mentioned earlier, vehicles have become larger and our roads and our finite infrastructure has not been able to adapt. Some may say in a good way because again it protects the biodiversity and another reason why we have environment in our mandate as well as infrastructure. Some people have said to me why do we not make two-way roads one way or have a one-way system. The problem with implementing a one-way system is that it removes the jeopardy for car drivers and there is an instance that it could increase speeding and other road safety issues. So the introduction of one-way streets is certainly not something that is recommended carte blanche.

980

Thank you for the question.

985

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, madam.

Would the President confirm with me that yesterday he met with the President of the Committee for Home Affairs and these issues were discussed and we have jointly decided to have a joint Committee meeting in order to jointly address these important issues? *(Laughter)*

990

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Hold on, I will check. Yes. As an update to that, last term there was a very good report done by AECOM and as an outstanding resolution I believe that both Committees are to work on the outcomes of that around speed reduction and also licensing issues as well. So it is a work in progress still.

The Deputy Bailiff: Any more supplementary questions?
In that case I will turn to Deputy Gollop's second question.

COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Welsh Assembly Senedd policy – Reducing car speed limits in certain local and community areas

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much.

Will the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure consider recent Welsh Assembly Senedd policy reducing car speed limits in certain local and community areas to encourage more active travel and stable transport options and enhanced safety?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

The Committee recognises the benefits that slower speeds can offer and there are already a number of areas across the Island which have lower speed limits of 25 miles an hour due to the residential nature of the area, proximity to schools and other amenities. Seasonal speed limits also come into effect over the summer period on several coast roads, reducing the speeds from 35 miles an hour to 25 miles an hour. At times of roadworks and two-way diversion routes, temporary lower limits are sometimes used, too. The Ruettes Tranquilles network has a recommended speed limit of 15 miles an hour to improve safety for vulnerable road users and encourage walking and cycling.

When developing its areas of work for this political term, consideration will be given to the need for and potential scale of work to further review speed limits across the Island. However, the Committee is mindful that the implementation of any recommendations of the speed limit review will incur cost, which will vary depending on the scale of work carried out. Therefore, the Committee will ensure that any potential work balances the requirement for road safety improvements alongside wider resource implications.

The Deputy Bailiff: Any supplementary questions?
Yes, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

I thank the Committee, who are clearly open minded and ready to look across the States on these issues. But will they confirm that, all things being equal, they would wish to see a review of these issues as a priority for the Committee rather than just a maybe?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: I thank him for the question.

Of course, everyone wants to be safer on the roads and also use our roads for whatever purpose, be that economic or even just general transport of getting people to and from workplaces or businesses or even schools.

1040 Again, it is a fine balance about prioritisation. We have already heard from the Vice-President of P&R today about financial restraint and the need for that, and when the Budget is published on 7th October, again that is going to drive priorities for the next certainly year but again strategy over the next three to four years. That will come into play when assessing whether we need to review the speed limits or not.

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

1045 **Deputy Gollop:** Deputy Gabriel has almost foreshadowed my question because it is given the resource constraints but the evident desire to work on this, maybe with Home Affairs as well, the Home Department, will the Committee request Policy & Resources and, indeed, the wider States to give them the staff, finance and other technical resources they may need in order to make at least some progress on this workstream over the next three to four years?

1050

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, madam.

1055 I cannot necessarily speak for all of the Committee, and it is not a Committee decision that we have made yet. We are still assessing our priorities for the term and, again, I am mindful again of the financial warning, perhaps, and also putting in an extra request for extra staff and extra funding to review speed limit is perhaps not the best use of all of our Committee's time, considering all of the other aspects in the mandate.

1060 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Any further supplementary questions? No. Thank you.

STATES' ASSEMBLY & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Outcomes of investigations – Reports received

The Deputy Bailiff: In that case we will move on to the second question, which is posed by Deputy Sloan to the President of SACC.

1065 **Deputy Sloan:** Thank you, madam.

Yes, this question is to the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee. My question is: in accordance with the first schedule to the Reform (Guernsey) Law, 1948, the Code of Conduct for Members of the States of Deliberation, the Commissioner's Statement and established practice, the Commissioner for Standards and the Appeals Commissioner report the outcome of investigations into complaints to the States' Greffier, who then transmits such reports to the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee. Will the Committee or the President confirm what reports, if any, it has received under these arrangements during 2025?

1075 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: The Committee has received one report.

The Deputy Bailiff: Are there any supplementary questions?
Deputy Sloan.

1080

Deputy Sloan: Yes, madam.

I find the answer perplexing because if today's *Guernsey Press* reports are accurate, and I have no reason to doubt them since they have not been denied, then by my count there should be two reports. But no matter.

1085 My first supplemental question is: will the President confirm which Commissioner sent the reports, when it was received and when will it be laid before the States?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Sloan, I have counted three questions in there. What is your actual supplementary question?

1090 **Deputy Sloan:** Which Commissioner sent the report and when it was received, madam. I consider that one question. There are two questions –

1095 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, I consider it two questions, Deputy Sloan, and I am the Presiding Officer so can you ask one question, please?

Deputy Sloan: Which Commissioner sent the report?

The Deputy Bailiff: Then you have an opportunity for a supplementary, if you want.

1100 **Deputy Sloan:** Which Commissioner sent the report, madam?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes. Thank you.
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1105 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** The Commissioners have sent their reports and the reports remain confidential until such time as we publish them.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Sloan, your second supplementary question.

1110 **Deputy Sloan:** Madam, I am very perplexed. The President referred to 'reports' in the plural. Her first question that was in a written question said one report.

The Deputy Bailiff: So what is your supplementary question, Deputy Sloan?

1115 **Deputy Sloan:** My supplementary, madam, is about process. It is not personalities. Given that the President of Policy & Resources has said she wants the States to lead with openness, does the President of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee not feel a moral duty to be more transparent about these reports and their chronology and the procedure and process followed rather than keeping this information from the States today?

1120 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva – I am sorry. I am terribly sorry. It is the double barrel that is getting me very time.
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1125 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** The President of the Scrutiny Management Committee makes an interesting assertion that in following States' procedure we are somehow not being transparent. I would like to assure him that we are following the procedures laid out in the Code of Conduct and that confidentiality at this point in the process is and should remain a high priority for this Assembly.

1130 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I might be able to help, or probably not, knowing me. Quite clearly Deputy Sloan is driving at today's front press and the report, and as he said there is no reason to believe that it does not exist. When you are a President it is often the case that the President gets sight of information before the Committee so it is a straight question to Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: has she had sight of the referenced St Pier Commissioner report, which has not yet gone through the Committee?

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: The Committee has received the report but it has not been laid before the Committee, so it has been received by the Greffier and given to the Secretary. I have been made aware of the report.

Deputy Inder: Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Second supplementary question, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I think it is the same, because I am trying to help Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and it is just easier to say yes or no. Has the Committee President received the St Pier report, and it has currently not gone to the Committee? Has she received it, sir, herself and has it therefore not gone through the process to the Committee?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: The report has been received by the Secretary. It has not been laid to the Committee as yet. I fail to see how the confidentiality of the report, the processes that the Committee will have the report in Committee papers and as such I, along with the Committee, have not seen the report. We have received the report.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Any further supplementary questions?

Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

Just for the President of the States' Assembly and Constitution, could she confirm that the report that has been received by their Secretary is similar to the content mentioned all over the *Guernsey Evening Press's* front page today or is it relating to perhaps another matter?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: As it is still a confidential matter I will not be going further into any details.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy, I am afraid you do not get a third. You only get two supplementary questions to a question. You do not get two supplementary questions to one question. If you read the rules it is one question, two supplementaries.

Deputy McKenna.

Deputy McKenna: Thank you, Madam Bailiff.

1185 I am trying to make sense of this. Could the President of the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee tell us when did she receive this report?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1190 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** It is the Committee that receives the report, not myself personally, and the report is received by the Committee Secretary and then Committee papers are then created and that report will be in those Committee papers and discussed in Committee, and those are confidential.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
1195 Your second supplementary question, Deputy McKenna.

Deputy McKenna: Madam Bailiff, it was not meant to be a trick question. The question was: when did you see sight of this report?

1200 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Again, the Committee has received the report but I along with the Committee have not received – seen the report.

1205 **The Deputy Bailiff:** A supplementary question from Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I wonder whether the President would agree with me that there is an important distinction to be made between the office of the Committee and the Committee itself in terms of the elected members.

1210 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Yes, I would agree and perhaps that is where the distinction is and for Members, the political Members have not read the report. It has been received by the office of the Committee and will be prepared in confidential manner as such a report should have been remaining confidential.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen, your second supplementary question.

1220 **Deputy Vermeulen:** Thank you.
In the interests of transparency, could the President of the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee tell me which Commissioner sent the report?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

1225 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** The report I believe was received by the Commissioner for Standards.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am sorry to interject, but I think the question was which Commissioner.
1230 That was the question. I know there is only one but nevertheless that was the question. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: The Commissioner for Standards.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

1235 Are there any further supplementary questions? No? Thank you everybody. We will now move on to the question asked by Deputy Ozanne.
Deputy Ozanne.

COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

**Police Complaints Regime –
Review Project Team**

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, ma'am.

1240 I would like to ask the President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs, to maintain high levels of public trust in Bailiwick law enforcement it is of considerable importance for the States to know who shall undertake the review of the police complaints regime. Have appointments been made to the Review Project Team and, if so, who has been appointed?

1245 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, madam.

The Project Team is populated by suitably experienced officers from across the Office of the Committee *for* Home Affairs, the Guernsey Police and Law Officers' Chambers and it reports into the political Committee. The Committee will keep the membership of the Project Team under review and will expand should additional expertise be needed. There is a commitment to consult and also to engage with previous complainants to ensure that their experiences are fully considered.

The Deputy Bailiff: Are there any supplementary questions?

1255 Yes, Deputy Ozanne, your first supplementary question.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, ma'am.

I ask because back in 2018 a previous review for Home Affairs found that concerns were raised with us that some people do not feel it worthwhile complaining about issues with the justice system because they perceive that these issues will not be taken seriously or resolve satisfactorily. There was a feeling that even when there are independent complaints processes in place the system, i.e., the States, protects itself and a States' report recommended at the time that a review should also examine public perspectives on the existing complaints systems for the States. However here we are, it seems, with yet another internal operational review. So could I ask Deputy Leadbeater, to what extent the Committee has considered the need for the Project Team not just to have the requisite expertise but also to have members who hold the requisite public confidence for its findings and recommendations to be trusted?

1270 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, madam.

The Project Team is a team of officers, is a team of experienced officers that are experts in this field. They do not need politicians in these sorts of groups. I am quite surprised with the reference that Deputy Ozanne makes to concerns that go back to 2018 because this Committee has prioritised a review of the police complaints regime, a complete, fulsome review of the entire regime, in order to instil public confidence back into the legislation.

The Deputy Bailiff: Your second supplementary question, Deputy Ozanne.

1280 **Deputy Ozanne:** Thank you, ma'am.

In our last States' meeting we were given several reassurances by the President for Home Affairs that this review was a massive priority, that it would be a proper root and branch review and that there was nothing off the table. He also wanted for everyone to own this work, however he was unable to give an indication of the timeline for the review although he did commit to letting

1285 Members know in due course. Could I ask, given that it is clear from his answer that the Project Team has already begun its work, whether the terms of reference that include the make-up of the Project Team and which we States' Members were asked to input on, have actually been signed off by his Committee? Can he assure us that they will incorporate Members' concerns past and present specifically that we cannot have a complaints system that is publicly perceived as protecting itself?

1290 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: No one wants a proper, fair and just complaints system like the Members and the President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs. This is why we have made it one of our

1295 priorities, one of our number one priorities. We are listening, we are engaging with everybody along the way. Deputy Ozanne emailed my Committee Secretary with her primary question at quarter to eight on Tuesday night and then a Rule 12 came less than 18 hours later, so we did not have a chance to respond. We want to engage with people, we want to consider everyone's thoughts and we want to make sure that we are completely open and transparent.

1300 If there are any suggestions from Deputy Ozanne as to where she thinks we are going wrong then we are open to suggestions.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

A supplementary question from Deputy Bury.

1305 **Deputy Bury:** Thank you, madam; and thank you to the President for his answers.

It was good to hear that the Committee are committed to engaging with complainants, previous complainants. Could he tell me if the Committee itself intends to hear directly, meet with or hear directly from complainants rather than it going through officers and hearing it third hand.

1310 Thank you, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater:

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, ma'am.

1315 Yes, I think that is a good suggestion. We have been pondering this actually. We have not considered it as a Committee the exact route as yet that we are going to go for this consultation, but I have had some dialogue with my Committee Secretary and we are tossing around some ideas. I think having some direct engagement with the complainants and the Committee is a very valid and worthwhile suggestion.

1320 **The Deputy Bailiff:** A supplementary question from Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

1325 Given the interest across this Assembly in the process, does the President consider there may be any merit in having some form of political oversight which involved Members outside the Committee *for* Home Affairs as part of the process for the review?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater:

1330 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Thank you, madam; and I thank Deputy St Pier for his question because only yesterday I was discussing this idea with my Committee Secretary.

1335 I have yet to be able to discuss it with the Committee in full because we have not met since this has been tossed around, but a political oversight group could have some merit and, in my thinking, the political oversight group would consist of me as the Chair and the interested parties, as Deputy Ozanne has been the asker of the questions, and again bring in Deputy St Pier as also interested parties. So this is my suggestion that I am going to bring to my Committee next week and ask them to approve.

1340 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Any more supplementary questions?
Deputy Bury, your second supplementary question.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, ma'am.

1345 The President asked Deputy Ozanne if she had any suggestions but she has run out of questions so I am just going to chuck in one of my own instead. *(Laughter)*

1350 Would the President agree with me that perhaps for – to instil that public confidence that he mentioned that some membership of the Project Team, not necessarily political or internal officers, but external, whether that be previous complainants, people that have experience of other jurisdictions, might be valuable to instil that public confidence and make sure the optics are right around this review team.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

1355 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I think that is a suggestion and I will take that back to my Committee. As I said in my answer to the original question, the membership of that Project Team will remain under review and if we think there is anybody that can come that can add some proper value to that piece of work without creating any barriers and without elongating the process – this is our concern – if we can find somebody that can actually help the process and help instil some confidence certainly we will consider it.

1360 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Any further supplementary questions? No. Thank you very much. So that ends question time.
The States' Greffier.

Billet d'État XIII

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee – Election deferred to the afternoon

Article 1.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a member of the Policy & Resources Committee to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to 30th June 2029, of Deputy Jonathan Le Tocq who has resigned from that office, and a transcript of whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

1365

The States' Greffier: Yes, madam.

Billet d'État XIII, Article 1, Election of a member of the Policy & Resources Committee.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1370

Deputy de Sausmarez: Madam, I wonder, given that the Committee's nominee is *indispose*, whether we might be able to defer this until perhaps after lunch, assuming the meeting carries on that long.

1375

The Deputy Bailiff: The motion is that we defer the election of the member of the Policy & Resources Committee until after the lunch break. My suggestion is that whatever business is carried on over lunch we finish that business and then do this piece of business. That is an *aux voix* motion so those who support the reordering of business to move the election of a member of the Policy & Resources Committee until after lunch please say *pour*. Those against.

1380

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: The *pours* have it so that matter will be moved until after lunch or whatever matter we are still talking about has finished.

1385

So we will then move on to the election of a member of the Ladies' College Board, please, States' Greffier.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

2. Election of a member of the Ladies College Board of Governors – Deputy Strachan elected as a member

Article 2.

The States are asked:

To elect Deputy Jennifer Strachan as a member of The Ladies' College Board of Governors, who has been nominated in that behalf by the Chairman, the two States-appointed Governors and the one Governor appointed by the States on the nomination of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, to replace former Deputy Heidi Soulsby MBE whose term of office expired on 30th June 2025 when she ceased to be a sitting Member of the States of Deliberation.

1390

The States' Greffier: Article 2, the Election of a member of the Ladies' College Board of Governors.

1395

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes. This is a presiding officer element. The one person who has been asked to be as part of the Ladies' College Board is Deputy Jennifer Strachan. As this is effectively an appointment and the Bailiff has previously indicated that he thinks this should be an SEV vote we will do it by SEV vote. I will follow his example and so therefore I hope everybody has now signed in to their SEV.

The States' Greffier: They have, madam, yes.

1400

The Deputy Bailiff: States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

1405

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Camp, Haley	None	None	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina				Hill, Edward
Cameron, Andy				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Collins, Garry				Williams, Steve
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Deputy Bailiff: The voting in relation to the election of Deputy Strachan as a member of the Ladies' College Board of Governors: pour 35, contre 1. I therefore declare the Proposition has been passed.

1410

Congratulations, Deputy Strachan.

Billet d'État XIV

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. The Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986 – e-appointment of a Panel Chair and Members of The Complaints Panel – Proposition carried

Article 1.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'The Administrative Decisions (Review) Guernsey Law, 1986 - Re-appointment of a Panel Chair and Members of The Complaints Panel,' dated 16th September 2025, they are of the opinion:-

To re-appoint Advocate Michael John Adkins as a member and as the Panel Chair of the Complaints Panel;

To re-appoint as members of the Complaints Panel:

i. Mr Andrew James Castle;

ii. Mr Richard Denton;

iii. Advocate Simon Patrick Florance;

iv. Mr George Arthur Riley;

v. Miss Lisa-Jayne Vizia;

vi. Ms Gayla Lynne Le Pelley;

vii. Mr Roy Burke;

viii. Mr Ian Carter;

ix. Mr David Gwyn Harry;

x. Advocate Julia White.

The States' Greffier: Billets d'État XIV, Article 1, Policy & Resources Committee, The Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law, 1986 – Re-appointment of a Panel Chair and Members of The Complaints Panel.

1415 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez. Oh, sorry, Deputy St Pier.
That is all right. Do not worry.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

1420 The Administrative Decisions (Review) (Guernsey) Law was the creature of the former and late Deputy and Advocate, Roger Perrot. It effectively predated I believe – madam, you will no doubt correct me if I am wrong or His Majesty's Comptroller will – the development of any sort of form of judicial review in Guernsey.

1425 **The Deputy Bailiff:** That is right.

Deputy St Pier: It was intended to effectively provide that alternative remedy for those concerned about administrative decisions of the States as a public body.

1430 During its history it has received a number of complaints and dealt with those. The complaints panel is part of that architecture and the Policy Letter and the Propositions before you are to remedy the absence of a complaints panel given that the previous Proposition appointed members to the end of the last political term. So the panel, as the Policy Letter explains, can have an unlimited

number of members and when the panel has cause to meet its membership is drawn from the panel list.

1435 Again, as is set out in the Policy Letter, those members that are recommended by the Policy & Resources Committee to the Assembly are seeking to be reappointed and I think, notwithstanding that the panel does not have great occasion to meet, I think we obviously do take this opportunity to thank those members of the community for making themselves available for the occasions when it does indeed need to meet.

1440 So I hope that provides some background and history to Members, particularly newer Members who may be unfamiliar with this piece of our legal infrastructure, but the Policy & Resources Committee does encourage all Members to support both Propositions.

Thank you, madam.

1445 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you. Does anybody wish to speak in debate on this matter?
Deputy Ozanne.

1450 **Deputy Ozanne:** While I welcome the time given by those being appointed and indeed the Chair, I did want to express my concern and dismay that little over quarter of the people being reappointed are women and the gender balance I think is sadly not reflective of our society or the world that we now work in, so I would hope that in future we would bear in mind gender balance because this is woefully short of what I think any of us would see as normal.

1455 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak in debate?
Deputy St Pier, do you wish to reply?

1460 **Deputy St Pier:** I think Deputy Ozanne has made a valid observation. As I am sure she is aware, ensuring appropriate diversity, not simply gender diversity, obviously remains one of the challenges which is not just for this body but indeed for many areas of public service, but it is a valid observation.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Members, the States' Greffier will now put the SEV voting Proposition up. Apparently we are already voting.

1465 **The States' Greffier:** Yes, sorry.

The Deputy Bailiff: For those who did not know, you can now start voting.

1470 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Curgenven, Rob	None	None	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina				Hill, Edward
Cameron, Andy				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Camp, Haley				Williams, Steve
Collins, Garry				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				

Humphreys, Rhona
Inder, Neil
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Laine, Marc
Leadbeater, Marc
Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Ozanne, Jayne
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon

1475 **The Deputy Bailiff:** The voting in relation to the Proposition: pour 35, contre 1. I therefore declare the Proposition has been passed.

APPOINTMENT LAID BEFORE THE STATES

Appointment of an ordinary member of the Guernsey Banking Deposit Compensation Board

The States' Greffier: The following appointment is laid before the States, the appointment of an ordinary member of the Guernsey Banking Deposit Compensation Board.

1480 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes. This is a matter for the Assembly to note.

LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025;

The Parochial Elections (St Martin's) Regulations, 2025 and The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules, 2025.

The States' Greffier: The following legislation is laid before the States: The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025, The Parochial Elections (St Martin's) Regulations, 2025 and The Immigration (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) (No. 2) Rules, 2025.

1485 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I have not received any motions to annul. Will you please move on to the next item of business.

LEGISLATION

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

**2. The Country Hospital Charitable Fund (Guernsey) Law, 2025 –
Proposition carried**

Article 2.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Projet de Loi entitled "The Country Hospital Charitable Fund (Guernsey) Law, 2025", and to authorise the Bailiff to present a most humble petition to His Majesty praying for His Royal Sanction thereto.

The States' Greffier: Article 2, the Committee for Employment & Social Security, The Country Hospital Charitable Fund (Guernsey) Law, 2025.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, madam.

1495 This Projet brings to a conclusion decisions made by the Assembly in September of last year. These decisions were, one, to bring the trust established by the Country Hospital Charitable Fund Law, 1958 to an end, to agree that the assets of the trust, both trust property and accumulated income, be transferred to the Committee for Health & Social Care specifically to fund works and the provision of essential equipment at The Croft with the remaining balance, if any, to be transferred to the Friends of the Princess Elizabeth Hospital and, thirdly, to repeal the Country Hospital Charitable Fund Law, 1958.

1500 A brief background of this matter for Members that were not part of that decision-making at the time, the Country Hospital is what most of us would now refer to as the Castel Hospital established approximately 270 years ago at a time when it was the responsibility of Guernsey's poor relief system to care for vulnerable members of the community and, in that light, the Country Hospital was funded from donations by nine country parishes and the trust property that remains is the Country Hospital Charitable Fund.

1505 As at 31st December 2023 when the Policy Letter was brought or prepared the fund had a balance of £31,000, which was held by States' Treasury. The fund is dormant and has been for some time so given the original intent of the fund to provide health care and support to vulnerable community members ESS consulted with HSC in July 2024 about how best to use the value of the fund to benefit patients receiving care in Guernsey and HSC suggested that the balance of the fund should be used to pay for essential improvements to The Croft, which provides invaluable support to children and young people with moderate to severe learning disabilities and/or complex physical disabilities.

1515 So ESS was very pleased to make the proposals in support of this worthy cause and further propose that if there is any money left over it should be transferred to the Friends of the PEH to assist in the important work that they do in providing services to patients receiving treatment at the PEH.

1520 So the States agreed to these proposals and this Projet brings this to conclusion so I would ask Members to support the Projet today so that the positive use of these funds can be put into action. Thank you, madam.

1525 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Does anybody wish to speak in debate on this matter? No. Well, in that case we will go straight to the voting. States' Greffier, would you open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

1530

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	Inder, Neil	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina				Hill, Edward
Cameron, Andy				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Camp, Haley				Williams, Steve
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to this Proposition there were pour 35, 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare the Proposition has been passed.

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

3. The Health and Safety at Work (General) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025 – Proposition carried as amended

Article 3.

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Health and Safety at Work (General) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

1535

The States' Greffier: Article 3, the Committee for Employment & Social Security, The Health and Safety at Work (General) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

1540 **Deputy Bury:** Thank you, madam.

Before I start on the substantive matter I will just quickly say that for some reason the Health & Safety Executive sits under ESS. Members can feel free to go into the ins and outs of why that might be but we will not reach a conclusion; it just does. So the only light I can shed on it is that it is likely because of the link to employment and part of our remit, which is the primary function of the Health & Safety Executive is to secure the health and safety and welfare of people at work and to protect others from risks to health and safety from work activity. So hopefully I have tried to prevent Members going down that rabbit hole, but that will remain to be seen.

1545 So moving on to the details, I would not normally spend much time on bringing an ordinance like this but because half of the people in the room were not around for the initial Policy Letter debate I just thought that some background might be useful so that people can be assured of what they are voting for.

1550 So if the States approve this 2025 Ordinance, firstly, the Committee will have the ability to make regulations to license certain work activities but only where these activities involve significant hazards, risk or public concern. Secondly, it will be an offence to contravene the requirements or prohibitions in those regulations as long as those regulations specifically designate the breach as an offence. Thirdly, the Committee will be able to charge fees in respect of applications for the issue, modification and renewal of a licence.

1555 So a bit of background. The Health & Safety Executive regulates health and safety across sectors and industry ranging from major hazard sites, such as onshore gas and petroleum installations to more conventional sites like quarries, farms, construction, retail and healthcare. The Health & Safety Executive does this by applying a proportionate and appropriate mix of intervention techniques. These include inspection, auditing, provision of advice and support, awareness raising and implementing enforcement action when necessary. However, there are only a few high-risk work activities that can be regulated through formal licensing, and these are the importation and storage of explosives, petroleum and pesticides and the erection of scaffolding over a footpath, road or verge interacting with a public highway. In these few instances where there is a formal licensing scheme, a licence fee is paid by the business which covers the cost of the Health & Safety Executive providing the service. However, where there is no formal licensing the cost of the Health & Safety Executive is covered out of its own annual budget, i.e., is paid for by the taxpayer and not the business that delivers the high risk service or activity.

1560 It is important to mention that, as with now, the Committee has no intention of making a profit from any fees charged. The intention is simply to recover the cost of regulating the relevant activities. The current licensing schemes in place all came into force at different times and many are quite historic. Explosives for example was 1905, petroleum 1925, pesticides is 1995 in its current form however previous legislation exists from the 1950s and scaffolding is 1967, which I hope demonstrates that Guernsey has a long history of using licensing proportionately to regulate high risk activities.

1570 As far as I am aware, we do not have hordes of complaints about how the existing licensing regimes are being applied so hopefully these examples illustrate how the future licensing authority can also be applied proportionately where a work activity presents a significant risk to workers or the public.

1580 The Policy Letter did not look to predict the future of what potential businesses might come about that might require licensing. The whole point is to be able to respond to changes in the market. However, some potential future uses of the licensing authority that have been identified by our Health & Safety Executive are asbestos removal contractors, gas installation maintenance contractors and another example might be the adventure activity providers. I am sure that Members would agree these are exactly the sorts of activities that our community and visitors alike would expect to have robust safety measures around, but to be clear again, any introduction of a new

licence would only be to work activities that involve significant hazard or risk or otherwise engender public concern. This was a midway proposal between doing nothing or looking to regulate medium and lower risk businesses too. This was the proportionate but safe option.

In summary, the ordinance will not introduce any new licensing schemes at this time but it will enable the Committee to be more responsive to changes in business and risk in Guernsey. It will also allow the Health & Safety Executive to set clear expectations and standards for businesses undertaking work-related activities and it will make it easier for businesses to understand and meet the health and safety standards required of them. It will also allow the Committee to recover the costs for these services from the provider rather than the taxpayer subsidising this, and of course if the Committee does consider introducing any new licensing schemes it would follow any investigatory or consultation processes deemed necessary.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. States' Greffier, can we deal with amendment 1? Deputy Bury, do you wish the States' Greffier to read the amendment?

Deputy Bury: No, thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Could you formally lay it then, please, States' Greffier? Oh, yes, sorry, you are absolutely right. Deputy Bury, would you like to talk on the first amendment?

[Amendment 1.](#)

Immediately after ""The Health and Safety at Work (General) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025"", insert ", subject to the amendments below" and at the end of the proposition, insert the following:

"Amendments:

In section 1(3) -

(a) at the end of subparagraph (I) of inserted subsection (1D) of section 36 delete """, and

(b) after inserted subsection (1D) insert -

“(1E) Regulations under subsection (1A) shall be laid before a meeting of the States as soon as possible and shall, if at that or the next meeting the States resolve to annul them, cease to have effect, but without prejudice to anything done under them or to the making of new regulations.”.

Deputy Bury: Sorry, it is me again. Thank you, madam.

This amendment was important to bring because rather unusually the original 1987 Ordinance is a bit of an anomaly in that it does not require regulations made by the Committee to be brought to the States. So for Members not yet familiar with the process, it is generally as we saw just a moment ago with the Proceeds of Crime Ordinance or the Parochial Elections Ordinance, while they are not debated as a matter of course they are at least brought through the Assembly so that the States has the opportunity to annul them should the Assembly disagree with what a Committee has decided, but this ordinance does not have that provision in it.

As a part of the debate on the Policy Letter relating to this matter, there were several Members that shared concerns around the licensing as what I would term as mission creep or, to the more extreme end, there were concerns that the Committee might go completely rogue and start licensing everything from goldfish to going to the toilet. Yes, these are things that were actually said in debate. We have no intention of licensing any of those things but the previous President of ESS, former Deputy Roffey, assured Members that that is not the case and that anyway Members would have the opportunity to annul any such outrageous regulations should they occur. But then former Deputy Taylor chipped in, ably assisted by His Majesty's Procureur, to highlight that that in fact would not be the case as this ordinance does not require that.

Former Deputy Roffey thinking on his feet and consulting his Members by looking around the room for nods, offered assurance to Members that ESS would therefore include that provision in

1630 this amendment ordinance so that any regulations made under it should be brought to the States. Officers and legal drafters were not aware of this verbal commitment so unfortunately it was overlooked in drafting, I am afraid, but when I was preparing my speech and looking at *Hansard* I noted it and felt it was important to keep to former Deputy Roffey's word and to ensure for Members that they have that safety net in place.

1635 So hopefully the desire from myself and the Committee to do this shows Members that there is no intention to be licensing anything outrageous or in a disproportionate manner behind the backs of the Assembly and to show that they will always have the opportunity to annul anything coming through should they disagree with it.

I would ask Members to support this practical and reassuring amendment.

1640

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you second that, Deputy Ozanne?

Deputy Ozanne: I do.

1645

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody wish to speak on the amendment?
Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

1650 I am brought to my feet by the excellent speech there by Deputy Bury about what went on before but remember we – are we not looking at licensing dog walkers at the moment? I know it is not the goldfish that Deputy Roffey alluded to but are we not perhaps going in that mission creep direction already?

1655 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment? No. In that case, Deputy Bury, do you wish to reply?

Deputy Bury: Not really, madam. Dog walkers does not fall under my mandate.

1660 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I thought it did not. States' Greffier, would you open the voting on the amendment, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

1665

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	Inder, Neil	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina				Hill, Edward
Cameron, Andy				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Camp, Haley				Williams, Steve
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Leadbeater, Marc				

Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Ozanne, Jayne
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the amendment there voted pour 35 and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the voting. I declare the amendment passed.

I will now go to the debate on the Proposition. Does anybody wish to speak in general debate?
Yes, Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Madam, thank you very much.

Madam, Members, I will be voting against this ordinance. I just want to explain why and Deputy Bury, yes, I did read *Hansard* in the transcript of the previous. I was amused by the reference to goldfish in the previous and it was good to see that the amendment coming was consistent with previous Deputy Roffey's promise.

Madam, earlier this year we all saw what happened with the diving board at La Vallette and the Health & Safety Executive issued a prohibition notice declaring it unsafe and overnight an iconic community facility was closed. The States moved to remove it until Islanders came out in force, hundreds gathered in protest making clear that the board was part of our shared heritage, not something to be swept away by a clipboard. Eventually, after dredging and remedial works, it was reinstated. That episode is more than a local curiosity. It is a textbook case of power being exercised without nuance, without proportionality and without regard for community values, and it had to be challenged before common sense prevailed. That is why this ordinance troubles me.

On paper it amends the 1987 Ordinance to allow the Committee to license work-related activities deemed hazardous or, my underline, public concern. In practice it gives the Committee a blank cheque. We are told it is about cost recovery, shifting the burden from taxpayers to those engaged in risky activities, but the drafting process goes much further, albeit with the amendments. It allows the licensing of any work-related activity with the details left to regulations we have not yet seen and, as we have just seen, three pieces of legislation voted through on the nod without many people reading it that is a risky activity in itself.

We have no clarity on what fees will be charged. We have no impact assessment on how small businesses will be affected at a time when many are already struggling with rising costs and we are asked to approve it anyway. That I do not believe is good government, but my concern goes deeper. This is not just about technical gaps. It is about culture. As I have written on several occasions this summer, the growth of government has not just been about spending, but it has been more about money, it has been about culture itself. Today it is almost impossible to find any area of life untouched by official oversight. Madam, inspired by Deputy Montague, I feel compelled to reference two great English philosophers in my conclusion. Hobbes taught us why we create authority to protect ourselves from chaos. Mill taught us why we must restrain it because liberty should only ever be curtailed to prevent real harm, not vague risk or public anxiety.

Guernsey has thrived because we have been different; proportionate, pragmatic, light touch. However, that is being eroded. This is not just about safety; it is about culture and every time we

take powers like this we lose a little of the Guernsey way. Today it is hazardous work; tomorrow who knows and once the clipboard brigade takes hold it never lets go.

For those reasons, I cannot support this ordinance.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I actually have a lot of sympathy and empathy really and resonance with the words Deputy Sloan has made and, to a degree, Deputy Helyar has made too in the past and in the media. I think one of the issues this States have to grapple with from the top down is how far we delegate statutory powers, policy powers, decisions to senior professional qualified officers and how much there is political involvement. I would say over my long career in the States – 28 years – I have definitely seen a direction of travel which is clearly less political and more professional and technocratic led. Actually, I sat on Employment & Social Security for 10 years when it gained Employment. As Deputy Bury says, it might be anomalous but I thought that in the past when we had a Commerce & Employment Committee that looked after the minimum wage, for example, and these matters there was a tendency perhaps for the Committee to be very employer-friendly and have a lot of contact with employers and slightly less focused on employees, I think perhaps changing it to ESS has transformed that balance.

We know that the people who work at Health & Safety do excellent work. Indeed they work with Trading Standards too, and I did not appreciate there was a link there at senior level, which is in the Home Department. That is another curious one, because I really would have thought that was under Economic Development but Trading Standards, consumers.

I think you have to balance though our responsibilities as a modern society. Being on ESS we have regular updates from the team at Health & Safety and we have the opportunity as anyone does to go to their breakfasts that GOSHA would organise, the Guernsey Occupational Safety & Health Association. They used to have them usually at La Villette Hotel in St Martin in January, and amazingly enough they got a full house partly because it is dark early mornings in January and partly because they were giving away bread rolls and coffee.

I went for the information of course, not for the bread rolls, but we had many talks on both local and external health and safety and they were exploring all sorts of things from obviously boilers to building sites, to scaffolding, to other areas. I suspect on the Island, although some areas are already legislated, there have been areas from workshops to mechanics places which could be better. We somehow have to balance improving a culture's safety which helps everybody, not just health in terms of preventing accidents and loss of economic potential but perhaps also in terms of ensuring we have professional standards, ensuring that we are benchmarked appropriately and that we are not falling behind the times.

We have to balance that against local situations, and I have already re-read the legislation in the context that the Scrutiny Committee Legislation Panel and yes, we did debate to a degree, as you might expect, particularly the points about specified work-related activities, that in the view of the Committee involves significant hazards or risk or otherwise engender significant public concern. Now at these Guernsey occupational health meetings and conferences you did get buy-in. The audiences were predominantly, but not exclusively, male. It did not just include people who worked in building. It would include people who worked in fuel, surveyors, architects and so on.

I think the nub of this debate, as Deputy Sloan really has identified, is what constitutes not just significant hazard or risk – actually it is a reworking of a Proposition that was slightly broader. It actually was narrowed. We put in 'significant' but otherwise it is slightly different from I think the original Policy Letter but 'otherwise engender significant public concern'. Now, we had significant public concern more recently at the prospect of the diving board being closed, and perhaps that did not qualify. But I think if you are training officers as professional health and safety surveyors or reviewers and you then give them the powers under legislation to make decisions you cannot complain if they do. In fact, you could complain more if they did not because that would suggest lack of input and lack of work. So to me, one has to not just listen to the Facebookers on whatever

significant public concern it might be and the fickle world of social media but allow the Committee to ensure that the Health & Safety Team are able to get on with their job.

The Committee may from time to time make regulations providing such that it is in the public interest to be undertaking these activities to be so controlled and regulated. I would read that as not just a rubber stamping of giving it to, as I have already said, experienced and highly professional health and safety officers who will benchmark what is going on in Europe and the UK. It does also I think strongly imply if not state that the Committee is in the driving seat, that is to say Deputy Bury and her four political colleagues.

What we may need to see in the future is to pass this today but for everybody involved to have a dialogue to ensure that the Committee is fully involved with what might be more controversial or far-reaching areas, and they are made aware before they happen. That if there is an element where politicians feel there is a political element here whereby the community or public or some commercial interest needs to be listened to, to then sit down with the professionals and look at a way forward that perhaps moderates the solution or finds cost mitigation or a degree of negotiation – is the wrong word – but a degree of mitigation really, and reasonable adjustment to ensure that although we do delegate these broad powers to people who have the community's interest at heart and have significant case law and experience, that it is not completely detached.

So to perhaps misquote Deputy Helyar, you want the bus driver to drive the bus but you want to know the direction of the route and to press the bell if you want to get off at a particular stop.

So my conclusion against Deputy Sloan is I think, given the work and the fact that we do not want to have unnecessary accidents or hurt or fall behind other areas, we should pass this but at the same time have a strong scrutinising eye on what happens and mitigate perhaps decisions that could be perceived as not entirely in the public interest.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you.

Since I have been quoted before I spoke I thought I ought to say something. I have said several things about delegated authority and it does concern me, and one of the primary reasons it concerns me is because of all the discussions we have just had with the general public about the cost of government and we have to run a government system with only 40 of us and thousands of employees where we trust those to whom we delegate authority to act and to do everyday activities. But that all comes at a public cost and those two things need to be in balance. I am increasingly concerned that there is an imbalance between Government making up its own things to do and Deputy Vermeulen mentioned doggy daycare. It is not part of this particular subject matter but it is something that will be coming before us.

I am concerned that we have officials whose authority is delegated to them to do things but actually what is happening is there seem to be a lot of officials who spend their time thinking of more stuff to do, not less stuff to do. That is costing money and we cannot impose higher taxation on the public without demonstrating that we can cut our cloth as a Government. This tiny ordinance is in itself quite innocuous, and I have supported the amendment before it because that curtailed its otherwise what would be known as Henry the VIII powers, to simply make regulation without coming back to us, but this is a power-making framework. People will go away and think of things to regulate once this ordinance is passed, and those things will stop people from doing things they are doing today without spending more money and it will cost the Government more money because we will have to employ more people to do it.

Lots of these things will happen without any of us, and Deputy Gollop implied that the Committee would be involved in it. The Committee had no involvement at ESS in the diving board prohibition notice. It knew nothing about it. It happened under a delegated authority. It became involved afterwards, and I am really glad to see it has been fixed and resolved, but the practical reality of what happened is we do not know from day to day what has been done in our name

because we cannot be over all of it so we have to make sure that those we are responsible for, because we are on the TV when it goes wrong, we have to make sure that they are doing things responsibly and that it comes at a proportionate cost.

I think most of the public think that Government is too much involved in our day-to-day lives and for that reason I will not be supporting this. Members, if you want to legitimately decide on increasing taxation in the forthcoming Budget and in the time after that you must, in my view, start to demonstrate to the public that you can control Government from growing, and this is a sure sign of it wanting to grow to do new stuff and we are responsible for stopping that. I would urge you to vote against it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir. Oh, I am so sorry. That is auto pilot, is it not? It is in the same bucket as the double-barrelled names. I do apologise, madam. (*Laughter*)

The diving board situation has been referenced a couple of times and I wanted to address that because I was probably the person in this Assembly who was most closely involved in that situation. I think there are some less well-informed views that were circulating at the time and seem to persist to this day that I would like to take the opportunity to straighten out a little bit.

I think the most important thing to note is that the bathing pools – I am a very enthusiastic user of them myself – but they are an example of an inherently very high-risk environment, and we know this because there has actually very tragically been loss of life in the pools on more than one occasion and in recent years, and so it is inherently a high-risk environment and it is important that high risks are managed appropriately.

I think there is something about consumer confidence. I think irrespective of whether we are talking about particular services offered by businesses or whatever it is, I think consumers expect Government to have made sure that any inherently high-risk operation is suitably and proportionately managed and this is where this licensing scheme comes in. I think Deputy Bury did a really good job in her opening speech in explaining what the current very outdated situation is and how it would change.

I think with respect to the diving board situation itself, it is important to explain that when we involved the community groups who included, for example, at least four commercial partners, and I am very grateful for their *pro bono* support on that, and it included a lot of people who did some fantastic work and research, their conclusion was not that there was no risk. Their conclusion was that that risk needed to be appropriately managed and to evidence the fact that it was a complex situation with a lot of risk. It took many months of working together to resolve that situation and to manage it. I do have to correct Deputy Sloan. It was not simply a bit of dredging. There was a lot more work than that that went in to actually making that situation safe.

I do think the HSE has been unfairly characterised as the clipboard brigade. I think you only need to look at what happens on the other side of the coin, when someone is seriously injured or indeed loses their life in tragic circumstances, all the same people – sorry, I am not talking about any individuals but the members of the public are rightly outraged that actually not enough was done to prevent that tragic situation from occurring. I think it is really important that we keep that core focus in mind.

Deputy Helyar mentioned public cost, and actually I think that is a relevant point because the human impact is by far to me the most important, but there is another important consideration and that is liability and the States could be liable for significant costs if those risks are not suitably and appropriately managed. I think it is also very important that we keep that in mind because actually any Members that follow the news will be aware that there are liability claims now that have stretched into the tens of millions of pounds, and if it were to be the taxpayer that was responsible for paying that that would indeed have a significant cost to the taxpayer and would make a material impact on what we are trying to do as a Government. I do think it is important to look at this issue in perspective. I think it is important that we keep in mind its core purpose. I do trust the Committee

1860 and the way they are going about this to make sure that that action is proportionate but I do think it is important that we keep that core rationale front of mind.

Thank you.

Deputy Helyar: Madam, a point of correction.

1865

The Deputy Bailiff: You have to make the point of correction during the speech.

Deputy Helyar: I did not want to interrupt Deputy de Sausmarez's speech.

1870

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, that is what you have to do with a point of correction. I am terribly sorry.

Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, ma'am.

1875

I obviously want to speak in favour of this ordinance, which I am seconding, and I just want to remind Members that this is the Health & Safety at Work Ordinance and that actually this is, as Deputy Bury explained, to make things easier for business and it is a proportionate response. While I am very sympathetic with Deputy Helyar's concerns about cost of governance, do we really want to start sending signals as our first on health and safety legislation, which is all about managing risk? We are an island and risk has got to be something particularly, when we are looking at hazardous circumstances or high risk elements, that we must prioritise more than anything else. So while I am sympathetic to a bigger issue around how do we look at making Government smaller, I think we have to do so in a proportionate and measured way that makes sure we get the right things right. For me health and safety is the one thing we should not be compromising at this point.

1885

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, ma'am.

1890

I agree with a number of comments being made by various. It is necessity, it is being proportionate, it is the balance, but I just want to bring back to when Deputy Bury was talking about saying that some of the legislation goes back, what, 1930s or 1920s and longer but also commented that not much had changed.

1895

Now as soon as things are mentioned like dangerous explosives or explosives, gas, etc., then immediately, yes, I think this is health and safety and necessary. Then we have the talk – and thoroughly explained through Deputy de Sausmarez regarding the bathing pools – but then we hear other things like if you have a food van and you have all these additional checks you do, it reaches a point where the food van going to one of our great shows cannot afford to do something or if it is the hotel pools, they are talking about now looking inside the internal hotel pools. So it is a bit like the comment that Deputy Helyar was making is, you give this to a good civil servant, a good team and they will actually go out and find more and more work to do to go and create what they have to do. We would like to say that they do not, but this is the reality of what happens in some cases.

1900

So I believe what Deputy Sloan was talking about was comparing it to a subculture. I would like to take it further. It should be fit for purpose for our community. We are a small community. We try to do things well. We are currently talking about taxes. We have Deputy Kazantseva-Miller talking about growth of the economy and to do that we have got to have less restriction and less – we have to do things right but we have to do them with proportionality, so I just struggle a bit. I know that this is something necessary for all health and safety, but, as Deputies, we have to look at this and consider how far we need to go.

1910

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, madam.

1915 Quite a few Members have talked about the proportionality when it comes to things like this, and clearly that is really important. But just going back to the debate we had last term, I think it was Deputy Haskins that stood up and he was going, 'Has health and safety gone mad?' and these kind of things. But he never worked in construction in Guernsey, and I have got quite a history of working in construction in Guernsey, and we are so far behind the curve when it comes to health and safety.
1920 We really are.

Even to go to Jersey, if you go to the UK, go anywhere in Europe, and you have a look at construction sites, you have a look at the level of PPE, you have a look at all the scaffolders wearing harnesses, all the stuff that does not go on in Guernsey. You have some big companies operating in Guernsey that are owned by national or international organisations, and they have the proper
1925 levels of PPE and health and safety protocols in place. But not everybody has, and we are behind the curve.

This is a step in the right direction. I take the warning from Deputy Helyar that we do not want to overstep the mark. But if we are just going to be looking to bring ourselves in line with modern-day, accepted national practices, then it has got to be a good thing.
1930

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

Now, it is my daughter that reminds me that you pronounce it mam as in ham, and not marm
1935 as in marmalade. I do apologise if I mispronounce it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Please do not worry, Deputy Vermeulen. As long as it is not insulting, I will not mind.

1940 **Deputy Vermeulen:** So yes, I grew up in Guernsey and around the swimming pool, the bathing pools in particular. At that time, we had a springboard, which my older brother showed me how to use. We had a two-tier system stage, which had a higher platform, which I managed to go off at quite a young age – it was mentioned about the upset that was caused when it was closed last year – and I attended that with my seven-year-old daughter at the time. She was very worried at that
1945 age that she would not be allowed to use that stage. But, more importantly, ma'am, she wanted her children to be able to enjoy that, the future generations. She is yet to come along.

That is really important. It is really important. When I looked at what was there, it was no longer a springboard, it was no longer a high stage, it was pretty pathetic, really. It was a raised platform, which the children absolutely love because there is nothing else. But it is only about 3-foot-6 high,
1950 or 4-foot. It is very mediocre compared to what I enjoyed back then.

But, nonetheless, it was deemed a risk, being so close to the water. Nothing compared to what we had there back in the good old days, back in the 1960s, the 1970s, and the 1980s. This summer, I took a short break in Saint-Malo. I often stay around Saint-Malo on my way back from my long drives on the Continent. This time, we stayed in the city and I was quite surprised to find a saltwater
1955 bathing pool. Very similar to La Vallette, but on steroids. Probably two or three times the size. There it was at the end. I have never swum in it before. I have never been down to it, but there was this beautiful pool, and a lovely beach with a crèche, trampolines, coast guards, everything was in place, and my daughter wanted to go off the diving board.

It was a magnificent structure – still is – and it is two tiers; very high. I observed numerous young
1960 people enjoying themselves, diving off these boards at the lower height, at the higher height. I even saw some people doing risky things, handstands, handsprings off the handrails on the top level.

Deputy Gabriel: Point of order, ma'am, 17(6),

1965 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, I was hoping there was going to be a denouement when –

Deputy Vermeulen: I was just about to get around to that, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: I thought you might be.

1970

Deputy Vermeulen: That brings me back to are we too risk-averse in Guernsey? That was brought back to me this year when I sat down with a group of hoteliers and the Health and Safety Executive. They were massively upset. It was a very tense meeting, where it was explained the new regulations coming in and why they had to come in and the tests that they had to do. These operators had outdoor pools, which they generally maintained, filtered them, they treated them with chemicals every day and kept the pH levels in a reasonable order. It helps a hotel to have crystal clear water in their swimming pool, and the guests love it.

1975

But now they had new regulations where they had to test every hour the quality of the water. That surprised me really, because these are outdoor pools. They do not burn off much pH or use too much chlorine, like an indoor pool, which I operated, as well as an outdoor pool, for many years. We had automatic dosing units.

1980

At the end of it, hoteliers were threatening to shut their swimming pools down and not use them. They were struggling to get over the hurdles that Health and Safety put down to hinder their progress. At the end of the meeting, the hoteliers went off and I spoke to the Health and Safety Executive and asked, 'Why is it coming in?' 'Well, we had a swimming pool and this was the incident and the whole thing had to be closed down. It caused a lot of disruption.' It turned out it was not a hotelier swimming pool at all, but it was an indoor pool which the Government run.

1985

So there you go. Are we getting too risk-averse? Which direction is health and safety going in? The one thing I would allude to, health and safety on a building site or anywhere, if you are riding a motorbike, you have to wear a crash helmet, pads on the shoulders. You have to, on the building site, have the high-vis jackets, the steel toe caps, the gloves, the hard hats, very much like the YMCA. But all those things are going to be getting a GST if it comes through. So, are we genuinely serious about Health and Safety or are we just virtue singling?

1990

I am probably going to err on the caution and not support this, and I will let other Members make up their own minds. But if the dreaded GST does come in, I will certainly lead to an amendment to get that safety equipment exempt from GST, like they are in the UK.

1995

Thank you, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

2000

Deputy Niles.

Deputy Niles: I was struggling as to whether I should –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Niles, this is your maiden speech, is it not?

2005

Deputy Niles: It is. (**Several Members:** Oh.) I was hoping no one would notice, ma'am. (*Laughter.*)

My issue with this legislation, and I praise any legislation that protects our workforce and considers proportional risk, but my problem with this is also around the inflationary impact of introducing legislation that perhaps has not been properly thought through. Because the primary concern that I have is around the use of, or the overuse of the word 'significant'.

2010

Now, when I referred to my primary source of information, which is undoubtedly Google, it pointed me in the direction of the Oxford English Dictionary, which said that 'significant' meant noteworthy. So when we have any noteworthy consideration as to what is risky and what is

2015 hazardous. We then have to take a step backwards and think, does this require a licence and other proportional measures for us to undertake it?

Now, in a workforce, in many aspects, whether it might be delivering mail, if you are a postman, or whether you are working on a building site, there are many instances where you have to be on your feet and you have to consider all measures and you have to use your training and you have to use the sense that you may have been born with.

2020 Now, to consider as to whether something is significant or not is a very difficult, I suggest, proportional measure for you to have to take at every instance. So I struggle to be able to support this Proposition.

Thank you. (*Applause.*)

2025

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Rochester, another maiden speech.

Deputy Rochester: Thank you, ma'am.

2030 I was going to save my maiden speech for great significant impact, but I am moved to speak without planning at this point, because there is a really important principle for us to consider.

As a States, we have much to do in the next four years and by making the amendments that Deputy Bury has, she has put in place good process that, if regulation is passed, it comes before the States and we are able to annul that if we wish. So, we have to effect the art of delegation if we are to be collectively effective over the coming four years. This is a good example of that. It is not about trusting blindly in what is going to be done. It is about having trust and good process.

2035 With this amendment and this ordinance and regulation come back to the States, we have that. (*Applause.*)

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

2040

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: The argument at hand really is, and this debate has highlighted, how we are often amending quite outdated and adding things into outdated legislation. Part of that is because the process of creating a whole new legislation, which might be more modern and more streamlined and provide all of the assurances, takes quite a substantial amount of time to get the Policy Letter to the States and then to eventually draft the legislation, take it and change it.

2045 So, often we are, as Committees, amending and doing what we see as the most practical and least time-consuming and resource-intensive way of doing something in order to operate in the modern world. We cannot spend hours and hours with brand new legislation continuously, even though it would help us as an Assembly not to have to debate these strange anomalies and mechanisms that we have to insert into outdated legislation in order to operate in the modern world.

2050 Many of the concerns that have been raised by Members do fall into this grey area where the legislation is not as simple as we would like, but the way that we operate with as slimmed-down a Civil Service as we can, and how we try to operate with the legislation that we have, and when we implement it, and we as a Government oversee its enforcement, we have to make these decisions as a Parliament that balances that risk. I accept that there are Members who do not feel that this is proportionate, but in the circumstances this is proportionate legislation, and there are checks and balances that can be used.

2055 So, I would urge Members to support this legislation so that we can get on and allow the Employment & Social Security Committee to deliver their mandate.

2060

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

2065 I would just want to say, regardless of the scenario or good intentions behind this Law, and regardless of a will to have quick routes to legislation, my concern is that we are living within a

culture of unfounded fear leading, instead of true risk assessment and true risk outcomes. So, I worry that we are continually using levers that take us out of the realms of sensible and proportionate legislation. Nothing in this legislation proposed today protects against a propensity to regulate more and more because of that risk shift to the realm of unfounded fear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak?
Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, ma'am.

I am going to try to stick to amendment matters, which not all Members did. So I might not address every single point that has been made. That is the point I am making there.

I would like to thank Members who were unwittingly playing bingo with me for filling my bingo card, mentions of diving pools and the phrase 'health and safety gone mad'. But it was used in a different context than I thought it would be.

But I will start with Deputy Sloan. I think he raised some wider issues with big Government, etc., which I will not comment on. But one of the things he did say was that essentially this ordinance is giving the Committee a blank cheque and that we will be able to license any work activity. That is incorrect. It very clearly states the types of work activity that will be able to be licensed, and I will come on to that shortly.

A few Members have brought up the wording 'significant hazard or risk'. This is legal drafting, so my understanding is that we will have an accepted standard in legal terms that will need to be met. It is not Google standards; it is legal standards.

I just wanted to point out that there is a difference between the licensing regimes that this ordinance relates to and general health and safety regulation that already goes on. I referred to that in my speech around the types of work that the HSE already does. That is inspection, auditing, provision of advice and support, awareness raising and implementing enforcement action where necessary. All of that goes on already in many businesses. Deputy Vermeulen mentioned swimming pools, indoor pools, etc., all of that happens already by the Health and Safety Executive team, but they are not licensed. We cannot recover any costs. That is paid for by the taxpayer.

The licensing puts us on more of a firm footing where the businesses themselves that deliver these high-risk services are the ones that will cover that cost, and it is just covering the cost. That is the really important distinction, that a lot of this health and safety regulation already goes on.

I thank Deputy Gollop for his support, and that was what prompted me to mention that all this regulation does already happen.

Deputy Helyar mentioned, again, some bigger issues that relate to Government rather than this specific piece, but there was a mention of increasing resources and more staff, and that is not the case in this case. This will be managed within the existing team.

I thank Deputy de Sausmarez for addressing the diving board issues. I am going to leave that with her because she explained it fairly fulsomely. However, it is also not relevant to this because this is about licensing work activities. However, to her very valuable point around costs, perhaps there will be some costs to businesses, but costs to businesses when something goes wrong or costs to Government when something goes wrong, I believe, will be far greater than some of the fees that are necessary to cover costs of the HSE.

It is about keeping people safe. We cannot lose sight of that. If we want to be a place where businesses can operate safely and we can encourage tourism, we need to be safe. We cannot be a backwater. We have to be up with modern standards. So that goes to some of the points that Deputy Blin was making around money and concerns around that. Sometimes the cost of not doing something is greater than the cost of doing something.

I thank Deputy Leadbeater for his support and his insight from the construction industry. It is always very valuable. As I said, I agree with him; we cannot afford to be behind.

Deputy Vermeulen mentioned about swimming pools. Yes, that has been something that the Health and Safety Executive has been looking at recently because pools can cause very serious

illness if they are not looked after properly. After some consultation with hoteliers that have pools, etc., as I am to understand it, the outcome has been better for the hoteliers because now they have all been trained how to look after their pools properly themselves under the direction of the HSE, and it is saving them money from paying someone else to do it.

There is another page of notes. I had not realised we would have so much input. But to Deputy Niles's point, he made a point about introducing legislation that has not been thought through. That is not what is happening here. This legislation already exists, some of which is licensing regimes have existed for hundreds of years. As I mentioned in my opening, 1905 was the first licensing regime for explosives, if I remember correctly. So it is not introducing new legislation. This is legislation that already exists, has been operational for quite some time but just in a very narrow area. We have moved on somewhat from 1905 in some places and we need to be able to respond to changes in the market looking forward as well.

Deputy Rochester, thank you for her support and for mentioning again the safety net of the amendment that has just been placed. So, as per all other regulations, it will come through the States and Members do have the opportunity to annul them if they think that regulations are outlandish, outrageous or any other outs that they might be able to think of.

So, I thank everybody for their contributions, ma'am. I hope I have been able to reassure fears around disproportionality or health and safety gone mad. That is not the intention and the safety net is there now in place for Members should they see that happening.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Greffier, would you open the voting on this Proposition, please?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 25, Contre 9, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Bury, Tina	Blin, Chris	Snowdon, Alexander	Inder, Neil	Burford, Yvonne
Cameron, Andy	Camp, Haley			Hill, Edward
Collins, Garry	Curgenven, Rob			Le Tocq, Jonathan
de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Helyar, Mark			Williams, Steve
Dorrity, David	Kay-Mouat, Bruno			
Falla, Steve	McKenna, Liam			
Gabriel, Adrian	Niles, Andrew			
Gollop, John	Sloan, Andy			
Goy, David	Vermeulen, Simon			
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
Montague, Paul				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to the Proposition as amended by Amendment 1, there voted pour 25, contre 9, there was 1 abstention; and 1 Member was not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I declare the Proposition has been passed.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

4. The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025 – Debate commenced

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled “The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025” and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States’ Greffier: Article 4, Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, the Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance 2025.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you very much, madam.

I cannot remember whether I was told to avoid speaking before lunch or directly afterwards, but here we are. Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak on the Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025.

Three weeks ago, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture brought forward enabling legislation to the States. The States’ approval of that legislation marked a significant step towards establishing genuine governance boards within our educational settings. Now, since that time, we have engaged in many constructive discussions with colleagues across the Assembly, and through you, madam, we are sincerely grateful for the feedback and suggestions we have received.

On Friday, 12th September, we held an online meeting attended by many of the States’ Members present here today to discuss the draft ordinance in greater detail. Once again, and through you, madam, we, the Committee, extend our thanks to those who gave up their time to support this process. As a result of this feedback, we have lodged an amendment to the ordinance which we will discuss in due course, and we are particularly grateful for the contributions of Deputy Sloan in helping us think through some of those issues.

Over the past three weeks, we have also had the opportunity to meet with many of the governors currently serving on our interim governance boards. Their feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. They recognise that they are on a journey and they have expressed appreciation for the training they have received. They are eager to take the next step.

That said, we have also heard concerns about the pace of change. They have advised us to proceed gradually and iteratively, ensuring that appropriate support is in place as these boards transition towards greater autonomy. They understand that meaningful change takes time and that building strong, sustainable governance structures cannot and should not happen overnight.

When the Committee began its work on this inherited piece of legislation, Deputy Matthews wisely, I believe, pointed out that we had lost an important connection to the parish system and its elected representatives. After reflection and in response, we met with parish representatives and we are grateful for their time and insights. We are committed to working with them to explore meaningful ways to establish strong, effective links between the education governance boards and parish representatives.

If the Assembly chooses to support this ordinance, and, madam, I truly hope it will, I believe it will mark a meaningful step in the right direction. But let me be clear, I am not suggesting that this legislation alone will deliver the full autonomy that some may hope for.

2190 So, if the ordinance does meet with your approval today, what then? Well, in the short term, the existing school committees will be stood down, and I want to take this opportunity publicly to thank them sincerely for their dedicated service over the years. Of course, some of the members of those committees are now serving as interim governors. Looking ahead, our five designate chairs of governing board clusters will be able to begin their training ready to take up their roles in the new year. In addition, we will be able to appoint three more governance chairs to lead the remaining
2195 clusters. These boards will then begin the process of recruiting additional volunteers from our local communities, individuals with the skills, experience, passion and commitment to support our schools and settings.

In time, we could see over 170 governors actively challenging and championing our educational settings across the Islands. Now, some may believe this ambition is too bold, but I am optimistic. In
2200 Guernsey, I believe we are fortunate to have so many people willing to give up their time to support education. Someone more cynical than myself might say, taking a quick look at social media, the Island is absolutely full of educational experts. I am not so cynical. But I am reminded recently of someone who described this community service we see in so many areas of our Island as Guernsey's superpower, and I am inclined to agree with him.

2205 Madam, if the Assembly will forgive me briefly for returning to previous comments, there are some early and tangible benefits that would follow the passing of this ordinance in the months ahead. First, the chairs of governors will play a central role in supporting headteachers and principals through their appraisal processes. This is not a superficial change. It represents a very deliberate shift in focus away from the so-called centre and towards the governance boards themselves.

2210 Second, educational settings will gain immediate control over the non-pay elements of their budgets, enhancing both efficiency and autonomy.

2215 Third, our educational settings will take a more active role in recruitment. They already make the hiring decisions, but this additional change will allow them to respond far more swiftly and effectively to vacancies. That is something that I know my colleagues in education would appreciate across the board.

But, beyond these specific improvements, the broader impact is even more significant. Our 19 schools and The Guernsey Institute will become more deeply supported by and engaged with their communities. For those people who have not worked in education, when one considers governance, the focus might well be on the delegated management of finances and resources. But
2220 for schools, so much more impact of governance boards will be felt in the area of local stakeholder support, challenge and development activities.

Following on from today's decision on this ordinance would come regulations setting out these changes. But this Assembly would also establish the Education, Devolution & Delegation, Investigation & Advisory Committee, or the beautifully named EDDIAC for short. It is this task and
2225 complete committee that will work on the delegated management of finance and resources and services currently delivered by education office. It is the Committee's hope that elections for the remaining seats on that Committee will take place at the next States' meeting in October.

To be clear, EDDIAC will play a vital role in ensuring continued progress. It is tasked with reporting back within 12 months and will undertake the hard work of developing recommendations
2230 on some of the more complex aspects of devolution.

Now, these complexities are outlined in the ordinance today and they concern decisions around autonomy in areas such as IT provision, premises and estate management, education-based services, procurement and contract management services. These are not simple matters. We must remember that we are dealing with 20 educational settings, 19 here in Guernsey and one in
2235 Alderney, and each setting is unique.

It may be that our secondary school partnership, which comprises of the three 11-16s and the Sixth Form Centre as one cluster, and The Guernsey Institute, may be able to move far more quickly

down this process than perhaps our primary schools. From my perspective, I hope that EDDIAC, of which I will be a member as the current President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, will approach this task pragmatically and with an open mind. Madam, I would like to reassure the Assembly, should there be a need to do so, that I am looking forward to getting started and I hope to be a very active member of that Committee.

I would like briefly to pause to ask you to reflect on just some of the issues that we as a Committee have been dealing with this week that demonstrate the difficulty of finding the sweet spot between the central control and the autonomy that we talk about with our schools. These are two things that have occurred this week. The first one, I think it will be of interest to Deputy Curgenvin who asked a question on 3rd September about results analysis. We have been looking at results analysis very carefully this week and what is very clear is, if your settings are not all doing the same qualification, it becomes very hard to compare progress. Also, if your settings are not doing qualifications that you can compare with schools in England, it becomes also very hard to compare that. Is it up to the centre to dictate to schools, 'You will do GCSEs, not IGCSEs', or do we say to schools, 'Do whatever you want'?

When we go back 15 to 20 years in the UK, there was a tendency in a lot of schools to do whichever qualification would boost them up the league tables as much as possible. We have moved away from that now. But once again, if you give complete autonomy to schools, what is to stop one of our schools deciding that it wants to go back to an IGCSE in English? Furthermore, if we do not have set assessments at the end of year 6 and the beginning of year 7 as we do, set external assessments, the ones we currently use are called Granada Learning (GL) assessments, we will be unable to demonstrate the value added by our schools. So what if a primary school chooses not to do those GL assessments because we have devolved all that authority? That is just one example of the complex process that we are going to have to go through.

If you allow me, I will give you one more. Deputy Rochester and I have been communicating a lot lately about the issue of smartphones in schools. Is that something that we as a Government dictate to schools, a school with 11 to 16-year-olds, and say, 'We know what you should do and you will do this' or do we devolve that to the senior leadership in that school to make that decision? That is an important decision about the welfare of our young people and that dividing line is also something that we need to negotiate.

I just thought I would share with you those two examples to demonstrate, and that is before we are even getting to HR, IT, management, and so forth. So I hope I am not putting anyone off putting themselves forward to be a member; it is going to be great fun.

While the move towards governance boards has received broad approval, particularly within our schools, The Guernsey Institute, and the wider education community, we recognise that some concerns remain. Madam, I would like to take a few moments to address these.

It has been suggested that the current ordinance does not clearly define devolution, and therefore the processes may not go far enough. It is important to clarify that within the Policy Letter, and in education governance more broadly, the terms devolution and delegation carry specific meanings. Devolution refers to the transfer of power and responsibility and it is conceptually linked to accountability structures. Whereas delegation refers to empowering the individuals or bodies to take action, to have the tangible levers and the resources to fulfil that power.

In legislation drafting in Guernsey, I am advised that devolution is not typically used as a formal legal term. The term 'delegation' is preferred. However, the Policy Letter refers to both devolution and delegation using definitions that are consistent with those found in education systems elsewhere. Some accept the principle of a staged approach to devolution, but argue there is a gap between the Committee for ESC's stated intent and the legislation itself, suggesting that it delegates rather than devolves.

This reflects, I believe, a misunderstanding of the legal language. The ordinance enables delegation as a first step with the EDDIAC – Education, Devolution & Delegation, Investigation & Advisory Committee – that is then tasked with exploring and recommending the extent of future devolution. These recommendations will be debated and voted upon by the Assembly. In that light,

2290 concerns about the absence of the term devolution in the current legislation overlook the iterative nature of this process. This ordinance does not constrain future progress. It lays the foundation for it.

2295 There have also been one or two misconceptions about the cost of transitioning to governance boards. One such claim is that all governors will be paid. This is simply not true. Governors will continue to offer their time and expertise voluntarily. However, a modest retainer will be available to the chairs of the governance board clusters in recognition of the time and effort required to ensure the system functions effectively. This is a voluntary payment, and I have already spoken to one chair who has said they will not be accepting it. They are happy to give up their time and expertise as a community service. But it is worth stating that in England there has been a similar move to some modest payment for governance boards chairs in recent years.

2300 Because the number of schools within each cluster varies, the retainer may differ accordingly. These payments will be benchmarked against those made to non-voting members of committees. When we compare the overall cost of governance boards to similar models across the channel in England, our approach is both modest and proportionate.

2305 That said, these boards must be well-organised. There will be administrative costs to ensure that meetings are professionally run with clear agendas, papers, minutes, just as we enjoy as Deputies in our Committee meetings. I have reviewed agenda minutes from some of the interim governance board meetings, and I have been impressed by the breadth and depth of the material being considered. This level of organisation takes time, structure, and commitment. This documentation is already used and will be used far more as evidence of effective leadership and good governance during our external inspections that we currently employ the Ofsted to do. Ofsted are surprised when they come to our Island to discover that we do not have a governance mechanism like almost every other school that they inspect.

2315 Madam, during our presentation to States' Members on 12th September, we also clarified what the ordinance means regarding the Committee's appointments to governance boards. In practice, it will be the boards themselves that select their candidates and recommend their appointment to the Committee who, subject to routine checks, will formally appoint them. This is not unusual. Indeed, it mirrors the process at Ladies' College, where two governors are technically appointed by the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, but they are selected by the College itself based on a thorough analysis of the skills and experience it wants to bring to the governance board. That will be the same the way that our governance boards operate.

2320 Madam, one or two people with admittedly very impressive platforms have suggested that this ordinance may in fact do the opposite of what we intend, that it could make it harder to devolve and delegate responsibility to schools. I do not understand that view. There are many routes to a destination and, while this may be the path we have inherited and have chosen to continue with, it is one that allows for progress. This process must be iterative. A big-bang approach, as we have said many times, is neither realistic nor desirable. There is nothing in this ordinance that prevents us from taking further steps in the future.

2325 Some critics have challenged the ordinance without offering specific evidence of its shortcomings. For example, it has been claimed that achieving real autonomy would require unwinding much of this legislation now being approved. Yet senior colleagues in the Law Officers' Chambers have repeatedly confirmed that the ordinance offers flexibility. It has been deliberately designed to accommodate a wide range of governance models, from maintaining the *status quo* to enabling a far more independent style structure. It does not tie the hands of Government to any fixed or limited degree of autonomy for our education settings.

2335 As some might be concerned about the lack of legal personality for the boards, suggesting this leaves them subservient to ESC and undermines their autonomy, in fact the boards will be statutory entities, meaning they will exist beyond the individuals who serve on them, even though those individuals are volunteers.

2340 The requirement to establish these boards is not optional. It is the Committee's responsibility to ensure they are in place. The degree of legal personality they ultimately hold, such as whether they

become incorporated bodies like academy trusts in England, will be shaped by the outcome of EDDIAC's work. Both the ordinance and its associated regulations can be amended to reflect those developments.

2345 Finally, some have questioned why EDDIAC has not yet been constituted and suggest it reflects a reluctance by ESC to move the work forward. That is simply not the case. Neither the Committee nor its officers have any intention of obstructing EDDIAC's progress. On the contrary, we welcome its role in helping shape the future of governance in education, and we anticipate the elections to its membership will take place at the next States' meeting.

2350 Madam, the ordinance laid before the Assembly today is a purposeful and necessary step on a long but deliberate journey towards high quality, more autonomous education governance that will bring sustained and tangible benefits to the learners of today and tomorrow. What matters now is that we move forward with conviction, approving this ordinance that in turn will shape the regulations that follow, and trusting EDDIAC to do the detailed work necessary to bring forward proposals for the long-term education governance solution many have grappled with, but has been left unresolved for more than a decade.

Madam, I urge the Assembly not to delay this progress any further.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Montague.

2360 Right, we will now adjourn for the lunchtime. You may have seen on your screens that there is a motion to vary. We will deal with that when we have finished with Education and before the vote on the P&R member. But are there going to be circulated paper versions of that? Okay, yes, so you will get a paper version of that motion to vary, but it is on your screens now.

We adjourn then until after lunch.

2365

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.38 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.31 p.m.*

**The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025 –
Debate concluded –
Proposition carried as amended**

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, good afternoon, everybody.

Deputy de Sausmarez, you are laying Amendment 1.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

2370

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you wish the States' Greffier to read the Amendment?

[Amendment 1.](#)

To insert immediately after 'of the States' the following:

"subject to the following Amendment:

"To delete Clause 4(7) and replace with the following Clause:

"4 (7)The Director of Education (or a person nominated by the Director of Education for this purpose) may attend one meeting of each governance board each academic year, or more frequently only at the –

invitation of that governance board, or

the direction of the Committee, where the Committee has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a material failure in governance, safeguarding, financial management, or compliance with applicable law or policy, and has recorded such grounds in writing."."

Deputy de Sausmarez: No, I can just explain it, thank you.

2375 I will try to keep this quite brief because I appreciate it is a relatively straightforward amendment, and so I will try to keep this introduction fairly brief to explain its effect and why we are laying it.

2380 So, this is really to support the devolution that Deputy Montague referenced when he opened on this debate. One of the important phrases, when he spoke, he talked about the feedback they had had that many people in those education settings think that that devolution should be gradual and iterative. But essentially what we are trying to enable with this Ordinance, and specifically with this Amendment, is a devolution to schools and their governance boards. Deputy Montague called them genuine governance boards and that is really important.

2385 So, at the moment, Guernsey has got quite an unusual system, compared to many other places. Certainly, the States sector is quite unusual compared to the independent schools that we have in the Island and it is also different from even the state schools in the UK in that we do not have individual school or education setting governance boards as they do.

2390 What this amendment does, really it addresses one of the core concerns that has arisen throughout this debate from the first time that the previous ESC Committee brought the Education Law Policy Letter. There was a concern – a high-level concern – that there was some resistance to genuine devolution, genuine delegation of those functions to those governance boards. What this amendment specifically does is address a concern in a specific aspect that the ordinance, unamended, may well prove to be a barrier in that respect.

2395 What it seeks to do is, unamended, the ordinance allows for the Director of Education to attend any of the governance board meetings, and really this gives it further definition and clarity, and so it is to delete the current clause, clause 7, and replace it with:

The Director of Education (or a person nominated by the Director of Education for this purpose) may attend one meeting of each governance board each academic year, or more frequently only at the invitation of that governance board, or the direction of the Committee, where the Committee has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a material failure in governance, safeguarding, financial management, or compliance with applicable law or policy, and has recorded such grounds in writing.

2400 So it is really just about the balance. Deputy Montague referred to the so-called centre, and that is probably quite a good way of describing it. That is certainly where a lot of the concerns have been focused throughout this debate.

2405 But one of the functions of this amendment is to balance more equally the role of the political Committee with that so-called centre because the clause preceding it, or one of the clauses preceding it, explains that Committee members shall attend one meeting a year. So, unamended, the ordinance would provide for political members of the Committee to attend governance boards once a year but the Director of Education, or a person nominated by them, to attend whenever they like.

2410 Now the really important point about this is – and this goes back to Deputy Montague's point about the education settings, the school and education settings themselves wanting this process to be gradual and iterative – is that in no way does it prevent the attendance of representatives of the Office for Education, Sport & Culture or the Education Department. It is crucially important to stress that, if boards want officers or the Director of Education or someone nominated by the Director of Education to attend, they can request it and that officer, or someone nominated by that officer, can indeed attend.

2415 It does not really materially change anything with respect to those education settings that do want that involvement, especially for now, but what it does is it effectively rebalances that distribution of power and it really supports the trajectory towards genuine and meaningful devolution in due course. I would stress that, as Deputy Montague rightly explained, no one is looking at this as an overnight seismic shift. It really is gradual and iterative and it just means that the ordinance will be able to better support that, so we are not inadvertently putting a barrier in the way of that devolution as and when the time comes.

2420 I hope it is a fairly straightforward amendment but I will just wait and see what happens in debate.

Thank you.

2425 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Bury, do you formally second?

Deputy Bury: Yes, I do, ma'am.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you, yes.

2430 Deputy Montague, if you speak now, you will not be able to speak in reply, like before.

Deputy Montague: Thank you for that clarity. Thank you.

2435 I am not opposed to this amendment. My colleague has made some very good points. There is an argument that it could be slightly premature; that this is where we might have got to in a year's time after EDDIAC has done its work. However, with the idea that the Director of Education and anyone nominated by him may have the right to attend once a year and the crucial thing to look at is 'or any time at the invitation of the Board.'

2440 Let us be clear about this. When I spoke earlier, I was saying that many of our governors are concerned about being cut off too quickly from the expertise that they will never be cut off from. When I spoke on 3rd September, the vision is that the Education Department becomes a service, a support service to those schools. This is exactly what will happen here.

2445 Take an example, if there is on the agenda the analysis of attainment, we have some incredible expertise in the Education Department, people who have devoted their professional lives to understanding the barriers to this. It is absolutely right that the governance board could, of course, invite those people in. It might well be that the Director of Education has attended a meeting in November, but subsequently in March the governance board might invite the Director of Education in again or another senior officer.

2450 Furthermore, if we look at some other areas, for example, we know we have got a bit of an attendance problem. There are people who, as well as analysing assessment, are very good at understanding attendance. Or what about additional learning needs? We have some incredibly high-level expertise in that department and they will never be cut off from being able to visit those governance boards, but it will be at invitation.

2455 I just wanted to emphasise the expertise we have got on our Island. One of our senior officers is being asked by the Government in the north of Ireland to go and help with their curriculum development. So we are very proud of the expertise we have got and there is no sense in which our governance boards will be cut off from them. As Deputy de Sausmarez says, this amendment would not impede that in any real terms.

For these reasons, I am not minded to oppose the amendment.

2460 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

2465 I fully support the direction of travel when it comes to the governorships. I have got the utmost respect for Deputy Montague. It is quite reassuring to have somebody as positive and as go-ahead as that, with that experience of being a teacher, being in charge of Education. I really am quite happy. So I will go with what he advises me to do.

2470 But my head is screaming that the way we do things in the States is not like the way we do things in private industry. It can be like wading through treacle. It is often too bureaucratic. For it to be more successful, Deputy Montague and his Committee, who I have got respect for, need the utmost flexibility. It is unfortunate that he has spoken before because he cannot really address my concerns on this. I am happy to give way if you wanted to address them. Probably not. So, yes, I shall listen. But I do seriously have my concerns about people who have looked at being governors and have found it overly difficult.

2475 Once the States gets hold of things, too much is often put in the way, too much detail. So we have got to tread carefully on this one.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, ma'am.

2480 Far be it from me to speak against our – I was going to say Chief Minister – but our President of Policy & Resources on her amendment. Far be it for me to do it after lunch, when most of you are probably having a little rest. But I am speaking as a newbie who is on Education and who has had the privilege of working and getting to know our professionals who we employ because of their expertise. I understand there is a lot of history that goes into the reason why this amendment has
2485 been laid, but that context is for a past Assembly and for a past history. It harks back to last term and I am concerned that we are fettering ourselves by acting on fear and myth, dare I say, of what we think has been perhaps an overreach in the Education Department.

This amendment has made me feel really uneasy, and I have been trying to think why for some time. I have been trying to find what is at the core of it. I think it is because of the way that we look
2490 at expertise and experience among our professionals and how we value it and how we choose to either give it power or not power. If we understand the experience, we do tend to automatically value it because we recognise it is something that we might have got experience of ourselves, and we are happy to grant it power because we find it easy to trust because the risk is minimal.

But, if we do not really understand that experience, or if we do not value it, there is a reluctance
2495 to trust and there is a reluctance to give it power because we see the risk as being high. If that trust has been undermined due to fact or perception of fact, then we are even less likely to give it power.

In this context, we have an office holder and their team who we have chosen to employ because they have exceptional professional experience, which matches their job description. One of those descriptions is to look and oversee governance. The purpose of attending the meeting, the reason
2500 why the phrase is in the ordinance is because we want those professionals to be able to share their experience at any point of the debate. Not when there is necessarily a problem or something that we know of because we have heard about things, but because of the way that they do business, they can learn and hear from each other.

We must remember that the context at the moment is these governance boards are in their very
2505 early infancy. We have got professionals around the table but many of them have not worked in an educational governance setting before. If I can be honest, they do not know what they do not know. That is why we have professionals in the room to help them.

I hear what both my Chair and Deputy de Sausmarez says, 'Well, they can be invited in', but that is really not valuing their expertise and the value that they can bring to the table because that is
2510 what they are employed to do. Governance is something that we all think we know something about but governance in educational settings is new to most of us. It is not new to our education professionals who have often had a huge amount of experience, and that is why they want to see this journey and they are managing this journey.

There have been comments made to me that, 'Oh, Jayne, it has been taking 15 years.' Well, yes,
2515 that is often because of the resource issues they have had and the multiple priorities they have had in their in-tray that has stopped us going at a speed we would like to go. The argument has been made to me, 'But would we stop the Director of Public Health attending health meetings? Would we remove that from the ordinance?' No, because we value their experience.

We have had a headteacher write to us all, I believe, and I have checked with her, she is happy
2520 for me to quote her, who points out that she really needs this experience in the room and is very concerned about us removing it at this stage. She says:

Based on my extensive experience with interim governance, I can unequivocally state that the presence of a representative from the Education Department has added substantial value to our board. The contributions of the Education Office include deep and current knowledge of contextual educational developments, experienced reasoned

guidance in navigating complex issues, a balanced approach to challenge accountability and constructive critique, and a Bailiwick-wide strategic perspective, i.e. they understand all our schools.

2525 So, I believe this amendment is premature. The whole point of EDDIAC, as you have heard from my Chair, is to discuss with headteachers and key stakeholders what the relationship needs to be between the Department of Education and the range of education settings they serve. That is the whole point of EDDIAC.

2530 Then they come back to us saying, 'These are the responsibilities and the relationships that we like, this is what we want devolved and delegated, this is what we want.' So, to make that decision beforehand is inappropriate for us as an Assembly to do if we are setting up an EDDIAC to do just that.

2535 The question for me is: how much power do we give our professionals who we have employed to do a specific job? Do we recognise there may be things that we, from governance boards, do not understand and do not know and do we trust people enough with power to be able to go to those meetings and help? Because for me, ultimately, the best thing is what we know is going to serve our children in those schools best.

Having the right expertise around the table, certainly at the start of this governance journey, is the only way we can ensure that we do not open ourselves up to making wrong decisions without the expertise that we, frankly, need to value and respect.

2540 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, madam.

2545 I thought it was going to be quite a short debate after Deputy Montague's speech, but I am brought to my feet now by Deputy Ozanne's speech. I want to be clear that this amendment is not personal to the current postholder. It never is personal for me because it is always about covering all bases. That is what we do in here. We are thinking about covering all bases and what a worst-case scenario might look like, because we attempt to legislate for as many situations as we can think of; particularly the worst case. We do not legislate thinking, 'Oh, well, so-and-so in that role is really great. They would not do anything untoward.' It might be accurate, but the legislation often lasts far longer than the current postholder.

2555 Throughout my speech, I am going to refer to the Director of Education, but as is clear in the amendment, it is a Director of Education or a nominated person. That is quite unwieldy. So, for me, in supporting this amendment, I am doing so thinking of the worst-case scenario.

2560 As the ordinance currently stands, the Director of Education can attend any meeting of any governance board that they wish. So, in practical terms, hopefully what that might look like is a Director of Education popping into each board once a year, say, to offer their expertise and make sure things are ship shape. But, in worst-case scenario, in the future, say we end up with a Director of Education who is power hungry, controlling, and wants to be in charge of governance, they could choose to attend every meeting of every Board. That is how it stands in the ordinance right now and that negates the point of shifting the responsibility of governance to the boards.

2565 So all this amendment does is nudges that control just slightly to who decides what attendance might look like. But it still retains the flexibility to allow the Director of Education to attend one meeting each year. There is quite a lot of boards, by the way, so even that will keep them pretty busy. But it also allows the boards to invite them in should they value and want that expertise there. But it also allows the boards to take more of an arm's-length approach if that is what they would wish to do. So, really, it nudges the dial just slightly.

2570 If there is a real pushback to that, that is what starts to demonstrate the concerns that some people have, that there is a grip on control and it is not wanted to be let go of. So I am grateful to Deputy Montague for his non-opposition to it, because all it does is nudge slightly, but it still retains the flexibility to the points that Deputy Ozanne was making. As she alluded to, we had an email

from an educationalist in the last couple of days stating just how much they valued that input and expertise. Well, that is great news, because under this amendment, they can still invite the Director of Education to attend every single meeting that they hold if they wish to. So it really is the best of both worlds.

That probably covers it, to be honest. I hope that it allays people's fears that it is not about cutting off. It is just allowing a greater degree of flexibility so that these governance boards can operate in the way that they wish to, which I believe, or as we have been told, is the direction that we are going in.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I am going to support this amendment laid by Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Bury and would agree with Deputy Bury particularly in that when we do legislation, and I have had 20 years of it virtually; we always have to think ahead of what the words mean. We had an interesting speech from Deputy Niles today about the word 'significant'. Of course, the boot is on the other foot, really, because over the years I remember we had a regime at Environmental Health which changed, there was a linkage with Jersey, and sometimes, I am afraid, me personally, if not most of us, we do tend to think of who is in the job at the time, whereas you do have to think ahead to future potential officers or directors or people in particular roles.

Perhaps I can understand, therefore, some of the concerns about Health and Safety because we may have a good relationship with those who are there, but not in the future. The same goes for Education. But I understand where Deputy Ozanne is coming from with her perspectives. But I think the amendment really covers that. I might get to this in general debate, there is a little bit of perplexing issues about the role of the Bishop with the two particular Roman Catholic primary schools, which are excellent.

But, as a generalisation, there are two fail-safes here. First of all, the Director of Education or a person nominated may attend one meeting each academic year. Does not say whether it is autumn, summer, or winter, spring, I do not know. But they can attend more frequently at the invitation of that governance board or the direction of the Committee where the Committee has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a material failure in governance.

Now, I would hope that, if a headteacher, an able headteacher, wishes to take advantage of the experience of the senior educationalist or Director of Education, and I do agree with Deputy Ozanne, there is merit in experience and expertise, that that person will be able to request the governance board to invite the Director or an alternative more frequently than one year. But, given the fact there is – I do not know – 24 schools and numerous, at least five or seven governance boards, assuming they all have a meeting at least once a term, that would be a lot of time spent by the Director of Education at these boards, and that might not be the best possible use in any event.

There are areas here which allow a flexible approach, and we are keen to see the governance boards be semi-detached from Education. The next amendment, which I also support, clarifies a point that was unclear in the initial legislation of how many governors or how many board members they are able to have, because was it an additional person or not. The Director of Education will be yet another additional person. It might make the boards more cohesive because the number would not extend too much and there will be a better balance between the directors from the community, who are chosen for their generalist skills, and educationists. Because, of course, do not forget we will have a teachers representative and a headteacher in the room, and they will not be subject to term limits necessarily.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Williams, do you wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Williams: Yes, please.

2625 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

In the spirit of trying to continue some clever phrases that we all know, and I apologise, this probably is not that clever, but I have always heard it said, 'Give a man a fish, he will eat for a day. Give a man a rod and you will feed him for a lifetime.' My concern is that the iterative nature of handing down delegation, proper devolution, does risk this being a case of providing governance boards with the odd fish here and there, but denying them the rod to be able to learn how to maintain themselves. To address Deputy Ozanne's point, this is about a sea change in attitude, a recognition that the experience of those people in the senior service part of education is valid, but the direction of the role is changing.

This amendment, which I will support, gives choice to boards to take on duties with appropriate support and oversight, which is the right direction of travel, but we must be clear that it does not yet change the fundamentals. Whether the Director sits in the room once a year or every term, these boards still have no real powers of their own. The real challenge is not the Director's attendance, but the authority that remains with the centre, regardless of who is present. We are still not addressing the fact that boards still cannot hire, they cannot set budgets, they cannot sanction, they remain subordinate committees.

That said, as I said, I will support this amendment because it is a helpful signal. It clarifies that Education's proper role is one of oversight and support rather than day-to-day direction. That is a step towards a healthier balance and it deserves support. More importantly, I want to make clear that I am ready to work with Deputy Montague and ESC to build on this first step. The task now is to keep moving towards real local management of schools and I stand ready to play my part.

2650 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, Madam Deputy Bailiff.

Deputy Ozanne, when she spoke before, she talked about education governance and it being different and probably not many people in this room are familiar with education governance and it is the professionals that are. We have one over here that is heading up the Committee, which is supporting this amendment. Also, I noticed one of the chairs of the governance boards is a former Chief Officer of ESC that has got equally a glowing record and experience in the educational field.

One observation that I would just like to make is, since I have been in the States, education has been a hot topic. We have been through selection debates, we have been through two schools, three schools, four schools or whatever it may be. We have had a considerable amount of dialogue and our inboxes have been overflowing with emotive feelings from parents, and a lot of educationalists have contacted us as well. Our inboxes were overflowing with comments on whatever side it may be. We are not having this now. We are not having this at all. We are getting no correspondence whatsoever because educationalists just want to go on and take this first step in the right direction. It is not perfect, as the President of ESC has told us, but we will get there.

If we are consistently looking for perfection, we are never going to get anywhere. We are just going to remain where we are, just like churning away and just revisiting decisions all the time. So I am going to support this amendment and I am going to support the Committee, and I really hope that the rest of the Members do and we can embark on this process to achieve what we all want, which is proper local management of schools when we can get there.

2670 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak?
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

2675 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Thank you.

I would just like to point out the wording in the amendment and just to focus Members' attention on to that. In the ordinance, I will just get that up.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy, please do not sit down.

2680

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: In the ordinance itself, the section that gives the Committee the right to attend one meeting of the governance board, the word 'shall' is used and the word 'may' is used for (7):

The Director of Education may attend any governance board meeting.

2685

That 'may' has transferred into the amendment on purpose. It is very important to understand that distinction. The Committee members shall attend one, but the Director of Education or someone appointed by him may attend. That distinction carries into the amendment.

2690

Now, I, along with Deputy Montague, am agnostic about this. I do think there is a subtle change to what is being directed or allowed. I take Deputy de Sausmarez's intention in laying this amendment and setting that first boundary. But there are still concerns as this is the beginning stage of these governance boards that this might be too soon. However, I do not feel strongly enough that this either hinders or stops the support that will be necessary for those governance boards to start to fulfil what I believe we all want them to fulfil and start to really support the schools with that.

2695

One other point that Deputy Gollop has alluded to is the distinction between the powers in (8):

The Bishop, and members of the Bishop's office nominated for this purpose by the Bishop, may attend governance board meetings of St Mary and St Michael primary school and Notre Dame primary school.

2700

So, there is a discrepancy there between the power that our own local Director of Education has and, should this amendment pass, which I do think it will, the Bishop would have slightly more powers than our local Director of Education.

2705

However, in practice, the difference is – and this gets to Deputy Vermeulen's concern, which is would we be, by agreeing this amendment, adding in a layer of bureaucracy – and yes, there is always the danger of that. With bureaucracy, where we are adding in clauses that, should something go wrong, they speak to the Committee, bureaucracy is used when people do not want it to work well. That is the danger, is the more things in a Law, the more reasons you can use not to do something. But, in the spirit that everyone has shown that, I hesitate to say, or we should agree this or not agree it based on what the spirit of the Law is. But the imperfection of this entire process, I would say that the spirit of collaboration and the intention of the Education Office to support the governance models going forward, outweighs the concern about an extra layer of bureaucracy.

2710

But, again, although I genuinely do not wish to abstain from any vote, on this particular vote I will abstain because the pros and the cons cancel each other out. Whether we voted for this amendment or not, I do not see a substantial difference in the ordinance, as long as the ordinance passes.

2715

Thank you.

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

Then Deputy de Sausmarez in reply.

2720

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam.

I thank everyone who contributed to a fairly short, but I hope constructive debate.

Deputy Montague really reiterated the core point, which is that this amendment in no way constrains the ability of the boards or the schools through their boards to access that professional expertise. The Director of Education or someone nominated by the Director of Education will be

2725 able to attend if the board so invites them. Or obviously in the other circumstance, which is outlined in the amendment as well. So I thank him very much for his early clarification on that.

Deputy Vermeulen said something really interesting. I thought the juxtaposition between what he said and what Deputy Ozanne said was striking, because Deputy Vermeulen said that, once the States gets hold of things, it struggles to let go. That encapsulates the core concern that many
2730 people have. We have got a system which is unusually centralised for perfectly valid historic reasons. That is just the way in which the system has evolved in Guernsey. We are a very small place. We do things differently, often for very good reason. But he has really hit the nail on the head there. It is very difficult to let go and really this is what this amendment is trying to do. It is about enabling that letting go a little bit more effectively. So he is quite right in that respect and that is certainly
2735 what this amendment tries to do.

Then Deputy Ozanne talked about trust. That is absolutely the key point too. This is why the juxtaposition between what Deputy Vermeulen said and what Deputy Ozanne contributed is so interesting. Because, to me, it does come down to trust. My personal view, I see it slightly differently from Deputy Ozanne, for me the way I look at it is do we or do we not want to trust these
2740 governance boards to govern the schools, to get on with the role that we want them to carry out?

I should also stress, this is something else that has come up a couple of times with various speakers, is under the unamended ordinance, there is absolutely no guarantee, as Deputy Bury pointed out, that the Director of Education or indeed anyone nominated by him would attend a meeting at all. As Deputy Hansmann Rouxel says, the word is 'may'. They just have the right to
2745 attend.

But, as Deputy Bury pointed out, that would be a huge amount of work for only one person because we have got 20, so that is a minimum of three meetings a year and they are able to have more than three, it is just the minimum is three, so there would be a minimum of 60 board meetings per year. So, even at just the once a year, that is quite a lot of work for one person, admitting that
2750 they can nominate to other people.

But the key point is that, by not amending the ordinance, we are in no way guaranteeing that the Director of Education or anyone nominated by them would be able to attend those meetings. It just gives them the right. That is all it does. This just clarifies the frequency. So this is not about membership of the board itself. It is just clarifying the frequency and putting it on a more even
2755 footing with the role that committee members themselves have.

But the core question is: do we or do we not want to trust our governance boards? If we are serious about this direction of travel, if we really do want to gradually and responsibly and iteratively pass that baton over and let them spread their wings and do their job, then we do need to give them this additional flexibility.

Deputy Ozanne did quote from some correspondence. I think that has been slightly overtaken by events. I have checked with Deputy Montague that he is happy for me to confirm this, but he did have a conversation with that correspondent over lunchtime and that correspondent is satisfied that the concerns that the correspondent raised are suitably addressed.

It comes back to another point that Deputy Montague mentioned, which is about flexibility. We do have certain educational settings which are going to need a slightly different approach. That correspondent was a really good example of one, which is in a special category for really good reasons. It is going to need a bespoke approach and I really endorse the flexibility of being able to adjust the parameters so that we can make sure that it is the best possible fit for that educational setting itself.

I will not reiterate Deputy Bury's points, but I do thank her very much, especially for her considerable contribution to crafting this Amendment. I have to confess; I was inconveniently not on Island for much of it. So Deputy Bury did more than her fair share as seconder. So I do thank her. But she is right to reiterate the point, and I fully endorse this. It is absolutely not about individuals or the current postholder in particular. We have to think when we are talking about
2770 legislation, and goodness me, are we not all aware of examples where legislation was drafted a century ago and we are still working with it? We really do need to think more generally and at a

higher level than that, and it is responsible to think about the worst-case scenario. That was a point worth making.

2780 To reiterate again this core point, there is absolutely nothing in this amendment that constrains the school's access to the professional expertise, which I completely endorse their valuing of, but it does remove a potential constraint on the board's ability to govern more independently. That is what it comes down to.

Deputy Gollop helpfully set out that we do indeed have two fail safes written into the wording of this amendment.

2785 Deputy Camp, again, hit the nail on the head by saying that it is not about clinging on to the way in which we have been doing it up until now. The whole point is we are shifting that focus and shifting that direction and that the amendment is a helpful signal.

Yes, I do endorse Deputy Leadbeater's point that, again, not perfect, but it is a step in the right direction. This further supports that direction.

2790 I hope I am not wrong, but I really do sense, more so even in this Assembly than the previous one, that there is a genuine desire to see something more like local management of schools. I know we could argue all day about what that means, and Deputy Montague gave some great examples when he opened on this debate in general about some of the complexities around that. But in its essence, do we or do we not want to give schools and other education settings more autonomy? If we do, this amendment is a very good way to not just signal that intent but make a small but significant difference in that.

2800 Deputy Hansmann Rouxel was right to point out the semantic differences, but they were conscious and I have covered them. It is an absolutely valid point to draw out the discrepancy with respect to the Catholic schools, but, again, it is another really good example of a specific set of circumstances which does require slightly different treatment.

I cannot see how it is an extra layer of bureaucracy. That is completely beyond me. I do not think so at all. It is really just a case of, at the moment, the Director of Education may or may not turn up at any of these board meetings. But this just more clearly delineates the frequency at which that is more likely to happen. It really is as simple as that.

2805 But, as Deputy Leadbeater says, we should not be hanging around waiting for perfection, we should just get on. This is a helpful stepping stone in that direction, so I would urge Members to please support this Amendment.

Thank you.

2810 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

States' Greffier, would you open the voting on Amendment 1, which is on the (SEV at the moment?

There was a recorded vote.

2815

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 6, Did not vote 2, Absent 3

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Ozanne, Jayne	Cameron, Andy	Goy, David	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina		Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah	Snowdon, Alexander	Hill, Edward
Camp, Haley		Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha		Le Tocq, Jonathan
Collins, Garry		Matthews, Aidan		
Curgenven, Rob		Montague, Paul		
de Sausmarez, Lindsay		Sloan, Andy		
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				

Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Laine, Marc
Leadbeater, Marc
Malik, Munazza
McKenna, Liam
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

2820 **The Deputy Bailiff:** In relation to Amendment 1, there voted pour 28, contre 1, 6 abstentions, and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare Amendment 1 passed.

Deputy Cameron, I understand that you are going to be introducing – Deputy Montague, did you just want to say something? You are proposing it? But are you going to speak on it? Deputy Cameron is going to speak on it first. All right.

2825 Do you wish States' Greffier to read the Amendment? I do not know which one of you want to ask.

Deputy Cameron: No, it is okay, ma'am.

2830 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.

[Amendment 2.](#)

Immediately after ""The Education (Governance Boards) Ordinance, 2025"" , insert " , subject to the amendments below" and at the end of the Proposition, insert the following:

"Amendments:

In section 1 -

in the section heading for "Constitution" substitute "Purpose and constitution", and after subsection (1), insert –

"(1A) The purpose of the governance Board of a relevant educational establishment is to –

(a) contribute to and promote the ethos and strategic direction of the establishment,

(b) hold the headteacher and management to account in respect of safeguarding, educational standards, attendance, staff performance and professional development,

(c) hold the headteacher and management to account in respect of the use of financial and other resources by the establishment, and

(d) facilitate and promote the giving of effective and appropriate communication from parents, staff, learners and the community to the headteacher and management of the establishment.",

(c) in subsection (2)(b) for "four" substitute "five",

(d) at the end of subsection (2)(d) insert "and", and at the end of subsection (2)(e) for " , and" substitute " .",

(e) delete subsection (2)(f),

(f) in subsection (3)(b) for "six" substitute "seven",

(g) at the end of subsection (3)(d) insert 'and', and at the end of subsection (3)(e) for " , and" substitute " .", and

(h) delete subsection (3)(f)."

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, ma'am.

2835 This amendment has been laid as a direct response to feedback from States' Members. The Committee has actively sought out those views, welcomed them, and reflected them here. Some of the points were raised in the debate on the related amendment to the Education Law earlier this month, and others were raised in the briefing session the Committee held with Members more recently that Deputy Montague has already referred to earlier.

2840 Through you, ma'am, I would like to begin by thanking those who engaged constructively with the Committee. Their contributions can be seen reflected in this amendment. The first change the Committee is proposing via this amendment is the addition of a clear purpose clause at the beginning of the ordinance.

2845 It sets out at a high level that governance boards must support the ethos and strategic direction of their setting, hold leadership accountable for safeguarding educational standards and the use of resources, and ensure strong and effective communication between schools and their communities. This gives governors a clear mandate from day one. If the new temporary Investigatory & Advisory Committee later recommends changes to the core purpose of the governance boards as part of its work on the devolution, then it can also recommend that this clause is updated accordingly.

2850 The second change responds to concerns that the boards might be too Education Office heavy. The Committee has listened to those concerns and therefore proposes removing the requirement for there to be an Education Office representative governor on each board. To balance that, the Committee is also proposing an additional associate governor role. So the overall number of governors who can serve on each board remains unchanged, as this ensures boards have sufficient seats to enable them to attract the full range of skills and experience they need.

2855 Some have argued that the purpose clause is irrelevant at this stage, and that removing the Education Office representative is just window dressing. Ma'am, I must disagree. Purpose is the foundation of accountability. It sets expectations and gives governors a clear direction of travel. While the detailed work on devolution is carried out by the new Investigatory & Advisory Committee, removing the Education Office seat matters because it makes clear that boards are not an extension of the Education Office, but are community led. That is a real and genuine step towards independence.

2860 The Committee's amendment seeks to reassure, where reassurance is needed, and demonstrate that it is committed to make governance purposeful, balanced and independent. It ensures boards begin with clarity and credibility from the outset. For those reasons, I commend the Committee's amendment to the Assembly.

2865 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Cameron, I should ask you, do you formally second this? I imagine you do, given you have just spoken, but let us go through that procedure.

2870 Thank you very much.

Deputy Cameron: I do, second it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Who wishes to speak on the amendment?

2875 Yes, Deputy Strachan. Maiden speech announcement.

Deputy Strachan: Thank you, madam.

2880 While I am here, also thank you to the Assembly for my election to the Ladies' College Board of Governors. This is relevant to my point, because while I agree with many of the key devolution topics that have been included in this purpose clause, I am concerned about the difference this ordinance and amendment will make to school culture.

I ask, because we ignore the importance of school culture at our peril, and this amendment is silent on this issue, but I would suggest it should be at the heart of the purpose. The pride that students feel in their school is very evident at the Ladies' College, and I would argue this has nothing

2885 to do with money. It is because they factor a strong culture and identity into their governance, from the Ladies College' Board of Governors down through the management staff and students.

Strong school culture fosters, among other things, belonging, motivation, high expectation and engagement, which all factor into academic achievement, better behaviour, better mental health and discipline. Whether emphasising school pride, supporting a nurturing environment, or
2890 encouraging a rounded academic and non-academic experience, this desire to take part, belong in something larger, and to have the support of fellow students and teachers to do so has a positive impact on a school. They say it takes a village to raise a child, and that is why I am so pleased with the wide variety and excellence of board members who have been selected to date.

I will be voting for this amendment, but I would argue that school governance boards should be striving to go beyond this amendment and encourage the EDDIAC to include school culture and
2895 the role of school governors in supporting this as a part of their key consideration.

Thank you. (*Applause.*)

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

2900 **Deputy Camp:** Thank you.

Amendment 2 introduces a purpose clause and replaces one Education member with an ordinary member of the board. I have a bit of a dichotomy here because I agree with one and not necessarily the other, but I do welcome the intent and I thank Deputies Montague and Cameron for bringing
2905 this forward.

The amendment sets out the boards will promote ethos, hold leaders to account, scrutinise finances and facilitate communication. I would say they are the right aims, but we are still lacking the ability to act on them fully or in any meaningful way. You cannot promote strategic direction without the power to shape policy or budgets. You cannot hold leaders to account without the
2910 ability to appoint or sanction. I appreciate before talking about appraisals, but the reality is at the end of that Education could say, 'So what?' You cannot scrutinise finances if you cannot move a penny and you cannot facilitate communication if you are little more than a post box.

The amendment is progress in terms of clarity, but not yet in terms of substance. For that reason, I cannot support it today. But I do not see this as the end of the matter. I am coming to realise that
2915 there is a shared journey now developing within this wider group of people. Deputy Montague and I have spoken about this and we are now working towards empowered boards with real powers, real accountability and the ability to make a difference.

I look forward to continuing that journey, although I cannot support this amendment.

2920 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Thank you, madam, just very briefly,

Yes, I will be supporting this amendment. I want to just personally testify to the work of the Committee and particularly the President, Paul Montague, into the amount of work they have gone
2925 into in trying to accommodate people's views and their concerns and to the point of the purpose clauses. I can testify that was some serious work in action by the Committee.

I personally had some preferred wording, as it were, and I can appreciate where Deputy Camp is coming from, but in the spirit of, for those of you who remember the ex-Deputy Chief Executive, the late Nigel Lewis, I might not quite agree with exactly the wording of all of the purpose clauses,
2930 but as far as I am concerned, it is good enough. We can work on that and move forward.

I just wanted to say, well done for listening and moving forward. I do believe in the principle of subsidiarity and now it is up to the Education Committee and EDDIAC to move this forward.

So congratulations and well done.

2935 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, madam.

The way the amendment is laid, it combines two key Propositions. One is around inserting the constitution and the other one around removing the Education Office representative.

2940 I almost feel, in the quest for devolution and decentralisation, we are potentially going too far. So we accept currently that the model is highly centralised, but in the proposals – so the current proposals without the amendment are that we will have up to nine members on the governance board, only one of which would be effectively a representative of the Education Office, one out of nine. That does not give them any majority vote, etc., and I just feel are we not going too far?
2945 Because having a tether, it could be quite useful to have that representation from the centre because it will feed back into the work of the central Education Committee.

When we in Economic Development set up different boards, with the governance arrangements there is often political representation or there are political observers or there is a link back to the Committees, because that creates that collaborative approach where the information is feeding
2950 back and forth and you are creating very close collaborative relationships. I am just concerned is that, in that quest, we are potentially going so far and potentially in that not trusting that the Education Central Office is there to do also the best for our Island and we are not creating those more collaborative natural links that should exist with the centre and the governance boards.

The issue right now is that the amendment is laid in a way that I cannot vote for half of it. So
2955 I am in an uneasy situation to decide, well, do I not vote for the amendment or do I support it at this stage? But I do feel we have gone too far mistrusting the centre and that we are losing something, but removing this single person out of a potential board of nine and that it may not be in the best intentions and the best outcomes of future governance models.

Thank you.

2960

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir. Cannot believe it. Very, sorry. Very sorry, madam.

Just in response to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's point, again, this is not about not trusting the
2965 centre; it is about trusting the boards. I am in no way an expert in other governance models, but my understanding is that what is being proposed here is very similar to the standard governance model that we would find elsewhere, where there is a local education authority. So I do not think that it is going too far.

The same point that was made and reiterated in the previous debate on Amendment 1 stays
2970 relevant because it is not about constraining the Board's access to that professional expertise, it is just about making sure that we are not introducing any other constraint that might curtail their ability to govern a little bit more independently in due course, as and when they feel able and enthusiastic to do so. So it is not about expecting anyone to run before they can walk, but it is about making sure that we are not including any potential unintended impediments as that journey
2975 progresses.

I would say this is absolutely not about not trusting the Committee, otherwise this ordinance would not be here at all. It is just about trusting the governance boards to do what we are setting them up to do.

Thank you.

2980

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, ma'am.

2985 Just to clarify the points raised by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy de Sausmarez, one of the ideas behind amending the Education Officer role out of being a requirement to then adding that number into the total number as opposed to making it a specific requirement to have that was responding to a perception.

However, what the Committee has discussed is, by making it optional, and certainly to begin with the chairs, who all have, or all will have once we appoint the remaining, clear expertise in areas, will know, will have guidance from us in the handbook about the makeup of their board, and will therefore have the ability to create their board with the right makeup.

Now, it could be that the chair themselves is an ex-officio of the Education Office, so therefore they have that education expertise that would have been provided by that governor, but they do not have other expertise, and therefore they can make up their governance board based on those criteria. They have that ability. So it is not necessarily removing any of that. It is, as many Members have said, shifting the responsibility to the chair and the governance board to choose what best makes up their board.

I will be supporting this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak on the amendment?
Deputy Montague.

Deputy Montague: Thank you, madam.

Obviously, I am asking you all to support this amendment. I am just going to run through some of the key things that have arisen in the debate.

Deputy Strachan, I am very pleased that you have been appointed. I am very pleased that Deputy Strachan has been appointed as a governor of Ladies' College, which is an establishment that I have some very close family links to, but you spoke about ethos. It is not the position of an ordinance to direct the ethos of an establishment, and in fact the very first line of our additions, which we are calling the Sloan amendments, even though he denies the wording is provided by him, 'Contribute to and promote the ethos and strategic direction of the establishment', and this is something that is very close to my heart.

When we consider how groups of people create an identity, even in this Assembly, we are busy creating our own identity now, which is distinct from the one before. I am sure you are all big fans of Sven-Göran Eriksson, the one-time manager of the England football team, and he used the words 'cultural architects'. Every group has cultural architects and I have seen the problem with the ethos in some of our States sector schools is when the turnover of staff is so quick, you do not get to build those very important things about ethos. It is the responsibility of the governing board to support the ethos of those establishments, not necessarily to direct it, but that is why the associate governors are going to be so important.

There will be a staff governor on, and to correct someone who said something earlier, that is time limited. There will be a staff governor. There will be community governors. There are parent governors. There will be associate governors drawn in. They will all help direct and support the ethos of that establishment. So, Deputy Strachan, I am not concerned. I think the Ordinance does not dictate what that ethos should be, but it does say to the governance board that it is absolutely their role to support that.

I am very appreciative of Deputy Camp's contribution, although I think she is toying with me because she keeps saying this will not happen yet, and I know she just wants me to use that very ugly word, EDDIAC, which, as I said before, reminds me of the old Guernsey word, *boudiac*, but anyway, I would highlight that, in fact, the four points that we have added, some of those can begin to be done even before EDDIAC has done its job and dictated the extent to which we do have that devolution. So, as I mentioned with reference to Deputy Strachan's contribution, the promotion and contribution to the ethos and strategic direction, but also, even the one holding the headteacher and management to account, there will be support in the appraisal, performance management of our senior leadership teams. So, that journey will begin, I would say to Deputy Camp.

Deputy Sloan was absolutely right when he made intervention in our previous debate, and I met with him, and he gave us some very wise ideas, and that introduction of that purpose clause is very important to give the directing, and when he is worried about the wording, I need to say that people

who are paid far more than he and me were the ones who made that decision, so let us leave it up to them.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, thank you very much for your contribution. The reason why the Committee has supported this amendment, and we did not propose Amendment 1, was because this amendment was an Education staff representative, and they were seen more as a conduit. They were not there as a person of expertise, and so that was why we felt that it was appropriate to remove that, and do not forget, we have then increased the number of associate governors that the board can then adopt. So it would be perfectly possible for them to ask someone, to get someone from the Education Office to do that role. Incidentally, that staff representative was doing it as a voluntary role for CPD. They were not there in the role the Director of Education would have been there in.

Just a couple of final things. Deputy de Sausmarez, madam, referred to the UK, and we sometimes need to be careful. We talk about Local Management of Schools (LMS). We talk about the UK. It is the case that there are multi-academy trusts in the UK with more schools than we have that are far more centralised than we are, so some multi-academy trusts are absolutely centralised, dictating everything about the way their schools run because they have got a brand in the UK, and if you are in their trust you perform in this particular way. So I do think we need to go into that open-minded.

I just want to reiterate what Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said about the associate governors. They are going to perform a really useful purpose. As well as the governors in the ordinance that are dictated, you will have a staff governor, you will have a parent governor, there are all these associate governors as well, which the governing boards will look at what the needs are in their situation and recruit appropriately. As Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said, that associate governor pool is going to be crucial to making sure this is successful.

I do not think there is any more that I need to say at this moment, madam, except to say I would urge you to support this amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, you have before you on the SEV Amendment 2, and I will ask the States' Greffier to open voting on that Amendment.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 2, Absent 3

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Camp, Haley	Curgenven, Rob	Goy, David	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina			Snowdon, Alexander	Hill, Edward
Cameron, Andy				Le Tocq, Jonathan
Collins, Garry				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				

Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Ozanne, Jayne
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

3075

The Deputy Bailiff: In relation to Amendment 2, there voted pour 33; contre 1; there was 1 abstention; and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I therefore declare the amendment has passed.

We now return to general debate, and who wishes to speak in general debate?

3080

Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Oh, that was the least great way to stand up. Yes, apologies, bear with me one second.

3085

Right, so we come to the ordinance itself. I will be plain, I still believe it does not yet deliver the level of devolution that we promised to Islanders, or that it can achieve it. The Policy Letter spoke of giving schools greater responsibility and decision-making power within an agreed framework. That was the promise that looks like local management of schools.

3090

This ordinance is a starting point, but it falls short of that promise. Education will still define the role of boards, can remove their responsibilities at any time, and does ultimately have the power over the constitution of membership when you get to the end of the powers. This is still a centralised model.

3095

Yet I was struck by Deputy Montague's excellent speech today. It confirmed my view that our final destinations are not far apart. His words were good, well-chosen, and well-delivered. He made clear that this is not the end of the journey. Autonomy will come step-by-step. I am going to put my faith in Deputy Montague's words. I cannot vote for the ordinance, but I will support the journey it begins. I am not walking away. I want to help make this model work and help take it to the next stage.

3100

When the Assembly forms the EDDIAC at its next meeting, I will put my name forward, and if fortunate enough to be appointed, I particularly look forward to working with Deputy Montague and other members of the EDDIAC to turn this starting point into something that truly empowers our schools. Because, at the end of the day, this is about children, teachers, and parents. They deserve governance boards that are real, with powers, with accountability, and legal standing.

That is the goal we must not lose sight of, and I stand ready to help deliver it, but that is far from where we are today.

3105

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Who else wishes to speak?

Yes, Deputy Collins.

3110

Deputy Collins: Thank you, madam.

Now, just to be very brief – I will be very brief, just to declare an interest – I do sit on our school parish committee, so I believe I am getting sacked today. I was elected technically to the end of the year, but my understanding is today, if this does pass, I will be out of a job, which is absolutely fine. Section 10 does make it very clear, people's Deputies cannot be governance boards. So thank you

3115

very much for easing my burden in not being on the committee. My wife is – for some of you who know, I got married only last month – so she will be very pleased. (*Applause.*)

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

3120

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I read with sadness that Deputies cannot serve, as I stood for a board, but I let it go to a Douzenier in the end. But, no, the thing is, I think Deputy Collins is right, but if you go to page 13, the last page, the ordinance will come into force on the date appointed in regulation to the Committee, and the transference from the shadow boards and the parochial committees –

3125

I am not entirely sure when that will happen, but probably the President will be able to advise us. I will support these proposals, although I have been in part a critic for some of the reasons Deputy Camp, Deputy Bury, and others have identified. I think the amendments, both which passed, have made it more palatable and perhaps give a clearer sense of direction. I note one of the amendments talks about strategy and ethos, which are important. Deputy Strachan made a great speech about culture as well.

3130

I pop in sometimes to the school open days at independent schools out of interest. I am an old boy, or is it an old girl, the Ladies' College, but it is certainly interesting there. They have very much their own culture and are able to establish an independent style of direction.

3135

Yet, as we heard today the paradox, like Elizabeth College, I am an old boy there as well, as Deputy Strachan has made us realise, there are still links to the States. I also would like to see, as part of this process, the bonds strengthened between the independent sector and the other schools, because after all, we are still electing States Members to serve on - we will call them the independent schools - so we are family in that respect.

3140

I have already identified I do support the independence of the faith schools, and we may have other faith schools in future. But I suspect that, in the interests of co-operation, Education worked to create a situation which was probably acceptable to the Bishop of Portsmouth, the Diocese and the church. But it does seem to me to give them quite a lot of autonomy. As somebody else pointed out, a greater degree of direct linkage than now the Education Office has. I do suspect, in the hypothetical future, when maybe there are personalities or issues that jar – hopefully that will not happen – that there might be a slight tension between the structure of those schools and the rest and Education. Because, as I understand it, the Bishop, perhaps with the advice of the governing board, would make the appointments to the Board, unlike the Education Committee in the other instances. But that is a detail.

3145

I note that we brought in, what you often see in professional and corporate organisations, what amounts to a term limit, eight years for individuals. But that is not necessarily the same for directors, headteachers, or specific representatives. It is very much those from the community. So there is a slight disconnection there.

3150

We have a lot of potential, the people, many governors – what is it now – five, I suppose, for some schools, seven for the College of Further Education, hopefully the Institute, they will be filled.

3155

I was heartened to hear on several occasions, including in his speech today, Deputy Montague make the point that he wants to work with the parishes. I am not sure if he met parochial representatives for Education or through what used to be Policy & Resources Douzaine Liaison Group. But it is good to have a relationship with the Constables and Douzaines.

3160

Part of me would have quite liked to have done a rogue amendment here to bring specifically to some or all of the boards parochial representatives. But I realise that was really beyond what we could reasonably do in this new model. Because such a construction would have been different for different places because some of the parochial committees serve one parish, some serve many, the parochial committees were directly elected at parish meetings, not Douzeniers or Constables. This is clearly a different system. But I do think the door should be open for Education and the new committee to look at ways in which Douzeniers and Constables and parochial people can be more involved. That, I think, would be strengthening the balance.

3165

The one thing that is very important in this way that has not been emphasised is material on page 9. Because Deputy Camp has cast doubt, as other Members past and present have, on the speed at which real delegation will occur, real devolution. Of course, the point has been well made recently that these are education boards of governance, they are not boards of directors. But if you look at page 9, it says:

The services the performances of which that may be delegated ... are (a) information technology provision services, (b) human resource services, (c) financial management services, (d) property and estates management services, (e) procurement and contract management services, (f) public and media communications and other services.

Almost all of those, if not all of them, are actually part of the States, but they are part of Policy & Resources. This is what makes our system perhaps different from the UK. In fact I was doing some research only today that many of the schools in England are owned effectively by local authorities or trusts or whatever, whereas our schools generally are owned by the States and, therefore, really fall within Property Services.

I do think if we are going to have meaningful devolution beyond focusing on performance, focusing on truancy and on the morale of the school, it will have to include, as we know, a dialogue with things done at the centre, not just through what used to be called the Education Council but actually through central services at Policy & Resources. That is a big conversation; there are risks there. I think we all seem to be quite happy today in saying everyone is on the same journey. I think they are in the sense of wanting better schools, better delegation, a new start, a new structure for the 21st century, but I suspect the destinations are still different. Because there are some educationists who really want to keep a degree not just of control for reasons – as Deputy Ozanne and others have identified – to ensure standards and experience, but also, as Deputy Montague has said, a difference to the way academies are run in the UK, for example.

I think there is still a theory out there that if we gave too much delegation to the individual schools they would go off in different directions, like the different ideas of examinations, and like Deputy Montague's argument about different determination boards – because I remember when I was young we were advised to do religious studies because it was easier to get an A in that, than some other subjects, so there you go. But talk about the fickleness of fame; I met two young people yesterday and they said, 'I kind of recognise you, who are you?' He then said, 'Oh, he was in a TikTok video with Deputy Montague.' So there you go.

The point I am making is times move on but I think the fear among some educationalists is the boards will become too radical and want the schools to change, to be competitive, to develop specialisms, to maybe have their own culture, and others would say, 'Bring it on.' The conversation will have to happen, how we can accommodate both sides. But with the reservation that I think we should have had parochial representatives as well, I think this is the best compromise we can attain at the moment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak in general debate?
Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, ma'am.

I was not going to speak to this ordinance but I just thought I might add a little to Deputy Gollop's speech and his concerns really about representation from the parishes, because there were not proposals that obviously this Committee generated; they were generated by the previous Committee, they were something we inherited. They have a number of weaknesses; this is not the way that I would have approached it myself. But one of the ones that struck me most specifically was that it was losing a link that had historically been there between the parish, Douzaines, and the schools in each parish.

Now, the school committees, although they are hosted by the Douzaines, they are actually not really part of the Douzaine itself. The parish Douzaines provide the facilities and the hall and everything else but they do not necessarily have any relationship with the Douzaine itself. Although

there is quite often a relationship, as Deputy Collins would know, being a Vale Douzenier and also a Committee member; there is quite a lot of crossover between the two. But when we looked at it we did think about and discussed in the Committee, and I think Deputy Montague agreed with me that it would be useful if we could try and build and preserve that link between the parishes and their school.

It is not at all straightforward because there used to be historically much more of a one-to-one relationship between parishes and parish schools; there are not anymore. Some parishes do but some do not. Especially in the secondary space where there is a much broader catchment and it crosses all sorts of parish lines, and of course the Sixth Form Centre and the Institute are Island-wide in their catchment.

Then there is a second question of if you wanted to have parish representation would you do it on the basis of the catchment area that pupils going to the school come from, or would you – because there is also a role just of where the school building is located in its parish. A really good example of that was one of the first issues I think that we faced was with the planning proposals for the Institute potentially to alter the Water Lanes, which we decided to not go ahead with. But that is a local issue where that input from the parish officials could be really valuable and I do not want to lose that.

This ordinance and the amendment does not specify that we have a representation from the parish, which is our intention. We do want to do that. The reason why it does not specify that is because we are thinking that we can address that through the handbook guidance for governors in the same way that we could for any other requirement, and also that there were differences between the parishes. When we met with parishes some said they really wanted a link between governing boards and the Douzaine, but not necessarily a Member, whereas others were more keen to have a Member. Ideally I would like to see a Member place reserved for the Douzaine representative. Exactly how you would divvy that up is not straightforward, but that is a piece of work which, as a Committee, we are committed to progress and to see if we can find a way that will work and will preserve that link between the parish and the governing boards.

So it was just adding that information for Deputy Gollop about the parish link and what our intentions are going forward to hopefully preserve that link.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, Madam. I will keep it brief.

I was not going to speak but I think in light of the way I will vote it would be remiss of me not to. Despite the amendments – obviously one of which I was involved in – making an improvement to the ordinance, which I am grateful to see, and also grateful to both Deputy Montague and the Committee for their really active and proactive engagement on the matter, listening and seeking to make improvements, the ordinance as a whole for me still does not reach the mark of what the intention was of the original Policy Letter. So to that end I do not think I can support it.

Like Deputy Camp, I support the direction and the destination, but this is not where we were supposed to be starting and I can almost sense this Assembly already there, a bit tired, maybe it is just late in the afternoon, but it is obviously going to go in this direction but that does not mean I should just support it because that is what everybody else is going to do. I should stick to my values and what I think we should be doing, so that is what I will do. But that is not to dismiss the really positive engagement and listening that has gone on from the ESC, and I hope that will continue and that ultimately we do all get to the destination that we are looking for.

Thank you, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Anybody else?

Alderney Representative Hill, do you wish to be relevé?

3270 **Alderney Representative Hill:** Yes, sir, thank you. *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: I preferred it when you called me 'Your Majesty' but 'Sir' will do. *(Laughter)*
Does anybody else wish to speak?

In that case I will ask Deputy Montague to respond.

3275 **Deputy Montague:** Thank you very much, madam.
Can I say thank you very much to all those people who have made contributions to this debate

this afternoon, and to the amendments, which I am not referring to because I am only doing the summing up of the main debate, as I was reminded last time.

3280 I would like to remind Deputy Camp that whenever we talk about Education not willing to give up control we do need to make sure that we understand there is a difference between the Education, Sport & Culture Committee and the Education Department. As a Committee, in terms of the principle of subsidiarity, we have been elected and put in these roles to make these decisions and so it is up to us. I absolutely want to ensure that we are held accountable as an elected Committee, and if we do not do what we say we are going to do it is absolutely right that we are scrutinised about that.

3285 There was one reference that Deputy Camp made to the membership and the Committee appointments and I do want to reiterate once again that the governing boards themselves, for example when they are looking for associate governors, they will work out what expertise is lacking in what they need, they will find those governors, and then they will refer them to us and they will technically be appointed.

3290 With regard to the EDDIAC, thank you to Deputy Camp for making me say it again, I am looking forward to working on that. I gave you two examples earlier of the kinds of things where we will need to find that sweet spot. It is going to be really difficult, and that is before we get to the list that Deputy Gollop made about all those things where actually they are P&R related and it is going to be a really difficult job. However, I am confident that there are people in this Assembly who will step up to that role and we will be successful.

3295 With regard to Deputy Collins, I am not sure whether I am meant to be apologising that he has to spend a little bit more time with his wife. *(Laughter)* But there was an important point there, and Deputy Gollop mentioned this as well. First of all, in all the work that went up to this – and I was not involved, I was still teaching – as I understand it, when they were researching how they would set up the governance boards there was no appetite to have political membership of those governance boards. So I apologise for that.

3300 With regard to stepping down from the committees for Deputy Collins, I am going to read this to make sure I get it right:

The Committee has been advised by the Law Officers that section 9 of the Interpretation Law, which deals with the anticipatory exercise of powers, can be brought into play.

3310 In my lay understanding, this allows for appointments to be made and notice to be given in effect to get the administration in order in advance of enactment. In reliance on that legislation, if the ordinance is approved today it will not be necessary for the school committee elections that would otherwise take place on 1st November to happen. So I hope that makes it slightly clearer to Deputy Collins where we are on that role.

3315 With regard to Deputy Gollop's contributions, I have already referred to the fact that there was an indication that there was a desire not to have Deputies on those. With regard to the Roman Catholic schools, we cannot challenge the autonomy that they will have while at the same time saying we want autonomy. I am very keen to pursue more links with the grant-aided colleges. We are working at a principal and headteacher level to make some really meaningful links, and I do not see why this is not extended to the ways that governance boards might learn from each other also.

3320 Deputy Gollop also asked about term limits and it is indeed the fact that the ex officio governor, who is the principal headteacher, will not be having any term limits. If a headteacher at a school is serving there for 12 years then they will be on the governance board for 12 years by dint of the fact that they are the principal.

3325 I will not go into much about the parish links, except to support what my colleague, Deputy Matthews, has said. There are real problems there because of course The Guernsey Institute, which will have a governance board, will be located at Les Ozouets Campus, and which parishes will feed into that? Similarly with the Sixth Form Centre drawing its students from all over the Island. So even some of our primary schools will have difficulty making those links. But one thing we did get from our meeting with those parish representatives is a real willingness to try and find some mechanism where there can be meaningful links.

3330 Finally, when we get to the different services that Deputy Gollop mentioned, we can see the EDDIAC will have a genuinely difficult task. Not only will it be unpicking the things that relate to the Education Department and the Education Committee, such as curriculum and smartphone use, but then we will need to looking at those other, in a sense, bigger issues. I do not pretend for a moment that EDDIAC has not got a difficult job ahead of it, but I am confident that it will do it well.

3335 Finally, just to say with regard to religious studies GCSE. For your information, Deputy Gollop, I did take that exam and I got a U grade in it. *(Laughter)* But having taught religious studies for 30 years I now see that karma does in fact exist and so my slackness then I was punished for much later.

3340 Finally, before I finish up, I do want to say that it is a biting disappointment to me that I have not been able to persuade Deputy Bury to change her mind. I am aware that when the February Policy Letter was debated there were only two people who did not support it; one did not vote and one opposed, and they were Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Bury. So I am very impressed by the fact that you are sticking to your guns. I will not stop continuing to try to prove to you and the Assembly that this is the right direction.

3345 Finally, I think crucially the message I would like to leave you with, before I ask you to support this ordinance today, is something that Deputy Gollop said, and it is all about this balance. This is going to be an exercise in finding that sweet spot. We cannot approach this with an ideological frame of mind that autonomy necessarily is good. We have got to find what is right for our schools and for Guernsey, and that is going to take a lot of hard work, a lot of evidence, a lot of reasoning, and a lot of resolve. So on that note I would please ask the Assembly to support the ordinance.

3350 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much.

3355 Members, you have before you the Proposition as amended by Amendments 1 and 2. States' Greffier, would you open the voting?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 2, Absent 2

3360

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina	Curgenven, Rob	Goy, David	Burford, Yvonne
Cameron, Andy	Camp, Haley		Leadbeater, Marc	Le Tocq, Jonathan
Collins, Garry				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				

Inder, Neil
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Laine, Marc
Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Ozanne, Jayne
Parkinson, Charles
Rochester, Sally
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

The Deputy Bailiff: There in voted in relation to the Proposition: pour 33, contre 2, there was 1 abstention and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I, therefore, declare the Proposition has been passed.

Billet d'État XIII

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

**Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee –
Motion to vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure –
Proposition carried**

To vary Rule 16(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, for the purposes of the current meeting of the States only, to the extent necessary to permit the Presiding Officer, where a candidate is absent from the Meeting by reason of illness, to invite another Member to speak for no more than 10 minutes in respect of the absent candidate.

[Audio blank 4.06.08 to 4.06.57]

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

The Policy & Resources Committee understand that the election may well be a contested election, in which event of course there is then provision for candidates to speak. The candidate that Deputy de Sausmarez is intending to nominate, namely Deputy Burford, is of course *indisposée* today, she is really quite unwell and has been for a number of days so is unable to attend. So it is an unusual set of circumstances.

I think there has been the suggestion that the entire matter should be deferred again, but that obviously does have further knock-on consequences. So this variation of the rule is simply to allow a Member to present the words that Deputy Burford may have uttered, had she been able to be

here. It is an unusual set of circumstances but it does feel fair and reasonable to allow that to happen, in the absence of which there is an asymmetry between the candidates who may be present and speaking and who will have the opportunity to present their own case, and Deputy Burford who will not.

I hope that is logical and I hope it is seen as fair and reasonable under the circumstances, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you formally second that motion, Deputy de Sausmarez?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, I do.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members, you have –

Deputy Vermeulen: Can we speak on that?

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you know what, I had not actually contemplated that? Yes, you can. Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, ma'am.

Ma'am, it is a glorious day today. I entered politics at the ripe old age of 61 or thereabouts. I know you might find it difficult to believe but that is true. So before then I had a life. I had a proper job, and I must have interviewed close to 4,000 people over a period of 43 years.

I can comfortably say that never once did one of those 4,000 enquiries send somebody else to the job interview. *(Laughter)* Never once. So why I am so joyous is I truly thought I had seen it all up until I came back after lunchtime and then I read this. I think the optics on this – and I am not a prude, by any sense – to me it is really important that we show good governance and this is nothing like good governance.

I have got high regard for the Deputy who is *indisposée* and nobody can answer for her in any shape or form, no matter how close they are. Nobody can answer the questions that come from the floor, if it is a contested –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen, I should point out that at the moment the variation that is proposed is only that they speak on behalf of Deputy Burford, not that they answer the questions. That would require a further amendment to the Rule. So at the moment it is in relation to speaking for 10 minutes, just to be clear.

Deputy Vermeulen: Well, I still stand by nobody can deliver a speech for Deputy Burford as well as Deputy Burford can. So I do not think that is in her interests. I mentioned it to Deputy St Pier just before we sat down, that the best thing to do if one of the candidates is not available would be to push this back until they are all available. Of the 4,000 people I interviewed a number had to reschedule because they were unwell or because of other things. So there it is.

But it is unclear to me what the future holds for P&R but I think good governance is really important. I do not know if we are going to have a by-election and how many people in this term; we will wait and see. But we have got to do the right thing. It is very important to me and it should be very important to all of you. So I will not be supporting this.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.
Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I do not entirely disagree with what Deputy Vermeulen says; he said he has interviewed some 4,000 people ...

Deputy Vermeulen: Over 4,000 people.

Deputy Inder: Over 4,000 people. He had a great firm; I just am a bit concerned about the turnover in staff over the period. *(Laughter)* Maybe if he had not have interviewed them they would have stayed longer. *(Laughter)*

3435 In the last debate we were talking about sticking to our values and sticking to our guns and everyone is being consistent all the way through – Deputy Bury said that she was going to be consistent – but I recognise a 16(5). I recognise to vary the Rule 16(5). I recognise:

The amended Proposition contributes to the States' objectives and policy plans by seeking to ensure the effective scrutiny of candidates for the Senior Committee.

3440 The reason I recognise it, I think it was myself and Deputy Camp who laid one on 2nd July this year, and all I simply wanted to do – myself and Deputy Camp – is question the members of Policy & Resources. It is almost perverse that the three people involved in this – Deputy St Pier, Deputy de Sausmarez, and the recipient of this, Deputy Burford – they all voted against that 16(5). So where is the consistency? Where are the values today?

3445 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

3450 **Deputy Kazantseva-Miller:** Madam, building on the complete inconsistency of the approach to varying Rules, which I said it is exactly what is going to happen. In one debate there will be people arguing for the change of the Rules, and in exactly another debate when it suits them they will be arguing exactly the opposite. I do think it is exactly what is happening right now.

3455 We have actually had a situation where a Deputy – and I hope she does not mind me mentioning – Deputy Humphreys, who was away at the beginning of the political term, was unable to attend the elections. We have actually investigated with the Greffier and I believe the Bailiff whether there was any other options of making her speech heard or in any way sharing it, and the Rules were the Rules. It was very clear that the Rules of Procedure is such that her speech would not be able to be heard.

3460 If I remember correctly, I think Deputy Humphreys actually shared her motivations for standing via email, so there are alternative means available to Members giving a speech, sharing it via email or other means. The Rules of Procedure are the Rules of Procedure. We cannot be in one debate saying one thing and another debate saying something else. We have already changed the election to today to suit political absences; this is laying yet another really bad precedent for changing Rules based on political absences. This is really just going downhill.

3465 I will not be supporting this motion and I think we need to continue with the same Rules that Deputy Humphreys had to abide by, which is the speech from the proposer is heard – and perhaps Deputy Burford's speech could be circulated to Members via email and we might be able to read that. We could maybe potentially for 15 minutes and to read the speech. There are Rules of Procedure available today by which we as an Assembly stand, so let us use them or change the Rules, we can go to SACC, they can change the Rules and we can have a debate on the change of Rules.

3470 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

3475 **Deputy Gabriel:** Thank you, ma'am.

3480 I am not a fan of rule changes at short notice for one or two specific instances, and I would perhaps through you, ma'am, like to ask His Majesty's Procureur what would the procedure be if this amendment failed and we are left with Rule 16(5) as it is with Deputy Burford not in the Chamber.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Do you want to answer that now, Madam Procureur?

3485 **The Procureur:** Well, madam, it seems to me if she is not here she will not be able to participate in the election. It is simple as that.

3490 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I wonder if we can look at – the speech part is an invitation to speak, is it not, rather than a requirement to speak? It might put her at a massive disadvantage but she does not have to speak in order to be a candidate?

The Procureur: That is correct, ma'am.

3495 Sorry, I am assuming it is contested and there would be speeches from others but, yes, she does not have to so there could be a nomination put forward and the States may decide that is enough and they can vote accordingly. That is absolutely correct.

3500 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I should perhaps say, because I have pointed this out to Deputies de Sausmarez and St Pier just before, if there was a tied vote and there had to be questions and answers, which would happen after three tied votes, then we might be in uncharted territories. But I think we will wait until that is a problem before we make that a problem.
Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam.

3505 I was not expecting this debate and I certainly was not expecting the tone of the debate. There has been much laughter and merriment but actually Deputy Burford is absolutely unable to make it to the Chamber today and she is devastated by that. Absolutely devastated. But it would not be responsible to have asked her or expected her in any way to come in. I have spoken to her personally; she is really very unwell, and I do not think any other Member would thank her for coming in because that could risk the health of other Members as well.

3510 So it is a very unusual circumstance. We did have a discussion as Committee whether to defer. Members will remember that actually because of some uncertainty and unexpected twists leading up to the originally scheduled election, we have already deferred this election once. Notwithstanding the risk that the Presiding Officer has outlined, which we think would be statistically unlikely to arise, it was worth trying to secure a member of the Committee because we have got our work cut out; we really do.

3515 In response to some of the points that have been raised by Deputies Vermeulen, Inder and Kazantseva-Miller, I do not think those analogies, with respect, are relevant. Deputy Inder's amendment was seeking to enable the questioning of candidates. Aside from the statistically very unlikely circumstance that does arise if we get to three tied votes, that is not what we are talking about here. What we are talking about is the ability to give a speech.

3520 So what would happen without this motion to vary the Rules is that – and this is the other thing. Members will be aware that I have had a chance to have conversations with – or the whole Committee has – people who expressed an interest, and I made a point of speaking personally with all of the people that had been good enough to give us their time. All of those people had indicated that they did not intend to stand. That is fine. I absolutely welcome a contested election, that is no problem at all, but what we are talking about is a speech, and it is a written speech.

3525 So in the event that the Assembly does not support the motion to vary the Rules what it would mean is a very asymmetrical election. It would mean that one candidate has the opportunity to have up to five minutes from their proposer and up to 10 minutes from the candidate themselves. But in the case of the Committee's nominee there would simply be up to five minutes from the proposer. We do not feel as though that would be a particularly fair reflection. Deputy Burford had obviously prepared a speech; she is too unwell to give it in person.

For those that are saying there is no precedent, well there is a precedent because I remember personally – it was not in terms of an election but when Deputy Oliver was very unwell in a States' meeting in the 2016 term it was a topic that was absolutely pertinent to her area of knowledge and expertise, and I was given permission to read her words out in order that her words could contribute to that debate. It was a really valuable contribution. I did not change her words.

So apart from the fact that I do not sound exactly like Deputy Oliver and I do not look like Deputy Oliver and I am not Deputy Oliver, she was able by proxy to contribute to that debate, so we were able to consider the words that she had prepared on that particular subject. That is the best analogy.

The analogy that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller raised about Deputy Humphreys was not an analogous situation because Deputy Humphreys for that position would not have had the opportunity to speak, if I recall correctly, or certainly not for 10 minutes. So I do not think that those are particularly –

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: A point of correction, madam.

The Deputy Bailiff: What is your point of correction, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: My point of correction is that Deputy Humphreys' situation was I think exactly similar. The only difference because she is a member of an ordinary Committee, her speech would have been three minutes, not five minutes. But it is exactly the same situation as currently.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, it is actually 10 minutes. The difference is up to three minutes and up to 10 minutes, and that is a very significant difference, so I still do not think it is necessarily a particularly good analogy.

We have struggled with this one. We are in a really difficult situation. We have tried to find a pragmatic and reasonable response. I do not think we are being unreasonable. In fact I think it would be more unreasonable to deny Deputy Burford the opportunity to have her words considered as part of the considerations around the role. That is really what it comes down to. I think anything else, going into the minutiae of Rules and all the rest of it really misses the point. The fundamental point is we have got a responsibility here as an Assembly to elect the best person, as this Assembly sees fit, for that role. If we do not support the motion to vary the Rules then we will have an asymmetric election process and I do not think that that really speaks true to democratic principles. So that is what it boils down to for me.

Deputy Burford would have moved heaven and earth to be here but she is really too unwell, and so this is just a pragmatic response to the unfortunate situation that we are in. I have known Deputy Burford for a long time, she never misses meetings, she is very diligently, and so it is with a very dark irony that of all the meetings to miss this is a meeting that she is unable to be here in person. So I think the next best thing is if we can enable Deputy Burford to have a say on the same even footing as other candidates will have an opportunity to contribute, and that is really all we are asking with this motion to vary.

So I really would ask, for the sake of a good, democratic process that the Assembly please supports this motion.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: I must admit, I do not actually see what the big deal is. I am devastated that Deputy Burford is not here too, and I feel for her. I would prefer her to be here. But I just find it

3585 strange that we are trying to create a situation where she gets to speak in absence. She is not here. She is just not here. That is the way the cookie crumbles.

We have moved this debate once for whatever reason. We then moved the meeting from yesterday to today, and I will share my exasperation at this. I was due to go away because my aunt who lives in Canada was over in the UK and I cannot get to her because we moved this meeting. So it just falls on today, and sometimes that is just the way of the world. I do not really see what the big deal is.

I feel it is a surreal experience that somebody is going to read out Deputy Burford's speech for 10 minutes. Yes, okay, she is P&R's preferred candidate. It is already an asymmetric election. (Laughter) I do not even know whom this other person is purported to be, but she is the preferred candidate. I was coming along expecting to vote in the way I was originally minded to. But I cannot see how the Alice in Wonderland arrangement of having her speech – it is not a big deal to me and I do not believe, therefore, that we should change the Rules. We will just have the election; if she is not here, she is not here.

3600 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: I would just like to add a bit further.

Should it be contested and it comes out as equal votes then what happens?

3605 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Are you asking the question? I should ask Madam Procureur rather than opining from the –

Deputy Blin: Well, if I could just finish the rest of it and then I will sit down.

My question is we then have another situation unless this is not all followed through. The other one is there will be the decision on should she be elected. I am very sorry she is not here. As Deputy de Sausmarez said, she is a consummate politician, she is always here for everything. But if it is delayed by another month and should she be elected there is still the work to go through replacing her as the President of DPA. Why can this not wait? If I could hear that as a very strong argument, why this is all so imperative, given the fact that – as Deputy Sloan has said – it is the way it is.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

3620 **Deputy Matthews:** I was going to speak in support of the amendment, similarly to Deputy Sloan, I cannot really see that there is really very much of an issue here. Every time we get a motion to vary the Rules a few Members sort of feel obliged to stand up and remind us that they are sticklers for the Rules and are very precious about making sure that they are never changed.

The extent to which the Rules can be varied is to my mind there for a reason. I do occasionally find myself sort of inconsistently on this, but when I get my son ready for school in the morning I say, 'Well, you have to go to school, it is the law, I do not make the rules' and occasionally get reminded that actually technically we do. (Laughter)

I appreciate that to some extent Deputy Inder maybe feels a little bit bitter that his amendment at the beginning of this term did not go through. I did support it actually. I just think that the Rules are there with the facility to be amended to take account of unforeseen circumstances, and that is what this is. So I am entirely happy to support it and have a speech read out and take it as read.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ozanne.

3635

Deputy Ozanne: I too support this amendment and I am very sorry to hear that Deputy Burford is ill. I can only imagine how difficult it must be for her probably listening in to this.

The whole point of, I thought, the change that happened with this Assembly is that we wanted to work in a different way, and that different way was a new open, transparency, particularly in the way that we entrusted P&R to interview and choose among us. As you will know, I stood as one of the potential P&R members and I was disappointed not to be chosen, but Yvonne was their choice and, frankly, most of you know that that means that we want to get behind it.

You can contest if you want to but I do not see the point of that, if I can be brutally honest. I think we want to show a different way of being, and one that is ruled by frankly being able to adapt to the moment. We are in unprecedented waters with P&R right now. They have been through (A Member: Hear, hear) a really turbulent summer. We have got a Budget which is probably like no other that we have had to look at, and I think they need a full contingent to look at that.

I am going to name the elephant in the room. We have obviously seen, many of us, the front page of the press, so there is more to come. So, please, let us show some common sense. Let us give Yvonne I think the backing that personally – and I say this as someone who had probably the most to lose – she deserves. She has worked exceptionally hard. I am sorry, I do not even feel personally that I need to hear her speech but ultimately if it is contested then I think we should be able to because I think we are in unusual times and it is about time we changed the way that we worked here.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Madam.

I would like to support Deputy Ozanne in what she has just said –

The Deputy Bailiff: Sorry, I should just say, Deputy Oswald, this is your maiden speech.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you. It gets the monkey off the back, I have to say. (*Laughter*)

I did not anticipate making my maiden speech in these circumstances. But I came into this Chamber and I hoped that with the influx of our new Members, and particularly what I think of as the technocrats, we have a much more elastic approach to the way we approach the business of the States, and I think we need to be flexible and we need to show pragmatism. As Deputy Ozanne says, we are in a totally unprecedented situation and we need to allow P&R to get on with the job for which we have elected them into that role. So I would support this amendment.

Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody else wish to speak before I turn to Deputy St Pier?
Deputy Niles.

Deputy Niles: I would just like to say a few words.

I congratulate Deputy Oswald on his maiden speech, and I also congratulate him because I think that we should show pragmatism and flexibility at all times. I can remember three months ago as a naïve young Deputy (*Laughter*) who when Deputy Inder proposed that there was a variant to the Rules and that we could hear speeches from the proposed P&R, I thought that sounded like quite a good idea at the time, naïvely, but pragmatically and flexibly I thought that was a good idea so I voted for it. Perhaps if we had heard from all of those Members we may have made different decisions at different times, but we did not. We did not have that opportunity.

I can remember some of the shaking of heads when I voted against, and I felt – I was young, naïve, new, and it was almost as if I had done something wrong. We should not feel that way in this Chamber. We should be able to challenge and if we want to vary the Rules then that is okay at all times if that is the way we want to conduct ourselves. It cannot be on one day it is okay and on another day it is not okay. So I think if we are going to find our way through this and become a

flexible, pragmatic Assembly we need to be consistent and we need to be happy with that pragmatism.

3690 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: If nobody else wishes to speak I will ask Deputy St Pier to respond.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, madam.

3695 I have very little to add in response to the debate. I think the comments that those have contributed in debate are self-explanatory. I think only to acknowledge the mag – I cannot say the word – the magnanimous manner in which Deputy Ozanne has addressed the matter, given her expressed interest in the role, and I think that should definitely be acknowledged and commended in replying to the debate.

3700 But beyond that I think the issues are fairly obvious and Members will no doubt have made up their minds enabling them to vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you. Deputies you have before you this motion to vary Rule 16(5). I will ask the States' Greffier to open the voting.

3705

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 27, Contre 8, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 2, Absent 2

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Dorrity, David	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Goy, David	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina	Inder, Neil		Leadbeater, Marc	Le Tocq, Jonathan
Cameron, Andy	Kay-Mouat, Bruno			
Camp, Haley	Malik, Munazza			
Collins, Garry	McKenna, Liam			
Curgenvin, Rob	Sloan, Andy			
de Sausmarez, Lindsay	Van Katwyk, Lee			
Falla, Steve	Vermeulen, Simon			
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Laine, Marc				
Matthews, Aidan				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Williams, Steve				

3710

The Deputy Bailiff: There voted in relation to the motion to vary: pour 27, contre 8, there was 1 abstention and 2 Members were not in the Chamber at the time of the vote. I, therefore, declare that the motion has passed.

**Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee –
Election commenced**

3715 **The Deputy Bailiff:** We will now move on to the actual election.
Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Madam, to the surprise of absolutely nobody, I would like to nominate Deputy Yvonne Burford please.

3720 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Who seconds that nomination?

Deputy St Pier: I do, madam.

3725 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you.
Is there anybody who wishes to nominate anybody from the floor?
Yes, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I would like to nominate Deputy John Gollop.

3730 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you, and who wishes to second that?

Deputy Dorrity: I do, Madam.

3735 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Seconded by Deputy Dorrity.

We all should be very familiar now with Rule 16(5) but in accordance with Rule 16(5), as there are more than one candidate, it is necessary for me to invite in this case the proposer and then the person who is going to speak on Deputy Burford's behalf, and then the proposer on behalf of Deputy Gollop, and then Deputy Gollop. So I am going to do it proposer, then candidate or candidate proxy, proposer then candidate proxy. Deputy de Sausmarez.

3740

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, madam.

I am delighted on behalf of P&R to nominate Deputy Yvonne Burford as a member of the Committee. I will not waste any time reiterating how disappointed she is that she is not able to be here today, but I am very grateful to the Assembly's support for the motion to vary the Rules to enable her words to contribute to that decision.

3745

Political colleagues will be aware that we invited expressions of interest for this role and had conversations with a number of people, which informed not just the decision with respect to our nominee, but also helped shape and further ideas regarding how we can work with each of those individuals to make sure that we are maximising the considerable knowledge, skills, and expertise within the Assembly. That is something to which P&R remains committed.

3750

I should also explain that this is about the best fit for our Committee. We did not have any specific criteria in mind and we were not looking to recruit to a specific role, for example the role of External Relations lead, which Members will probably know Deputy Falla is doing with great aplomb, if I might add. He has had a real succession of events, both in the last few days and in the days to come, so he really has hit the ground running with that.

3755

While I am nominating Deputy Burford on behalf of the Committee, I do not mind admitting that immediately following the election in which she secured around 9,500 votes, the first thing I did was encourage her to seek a seat on P&R because I considered her to be so well-suited to the Committee. Then once I had decided to throw my hat in the ring for this role myself, I encouraged her to consider a role as part of that team, should I be successful. However, with as ever the best interests of the Island front of mind rather than any personal ambition, she decided to focus her

3760

abilities in other areas at that time. However, given the change of circumstances I am delighted that she has reconsidered and is now keen to take up this new challenge.

3765 Deputy Burford has a lot of highly relevant professional and political experience. She has 10 years in the local finance sector and 25 years as an airline pilot, including as captain for BA, Aurigny and Flybe. Her considerable voluntary work includes as an air search pilot, director of Safer and the Women's Refuge, and the president of *La Société Guernesiaise*. Governance is a key strength of Deputy Burford. She holds the IoD certificate in company direction, and a Masters in renewable energy.

3770 Politically she served as the President of Scrutiny in the previous political term, which gave her a wide and indeed deep understanding of work across the States. That role builds on her considerable experience in other Committees, boards and authorities over the nine years that she has served in the States of Deliberation. Most notably perhaps, her current role obviously as
3775 President of the DPA, but also formerly of Planning, which indicates her intricate knowledge of land use planning and housing, which I feel will be indispensable as housing and infrastructure is such an obvious priority for our Committee this political term.

She is very well-known and very well-respected for being practical, pragmatic, analytical and hardworking. Her work ethic is second to none. She has highly relevant experience, not just in terms
3780 of policy areas but also having served as a President of a Committee with a really challenging brief. She would say herself that she learnt a lot from that experience and has come out of it all the stronger, well-rounded, and well-respected.

She has an amazing ability to engage with the community. Anyone that has witnessed the way in which she respectfully engages on Facebook I am sure will be admiring of her skills, whether or
3785 not they agree with her views all of the time. She has a huge political mandate and indeed came second in the poll. She is very clever, she is a safe pair of hands, and I think paramount is she has excellent political judgement.

If I can end on a personal note. I have been in this role for not quite three months and P&R has been constituted for about the same amount of time, and I think it is fair to say we have had our
3790 fair share of challenges, but we are well aware that we have even more challenges ahead. So I would ask the Assembly to please trust the Committee's judgement in this matter and support our nominee for the role in the form of Deputy Burford.

Thank you.

3795 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Who is going to speak on behalf of Deputy Burford?
Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Madam, I cannot help feeling something of a disappointment to you all (*Laughter*) but in the manner of a bridesmaid when the bride has not turned up, I shall do my best. (*Laughter*)

3800 Madam, Deputy Burford stated in her manifesto that if returned to the Assembly she would seek a seat on Policy & Resources, something which one might be assumed to have concurred with by the electorate propelling her into second place in June's election. Indeed, Deputy de Sausmarez offered to nominate her, as she has just told us, at that time. Nevertheless, she decided that given the considerable depth of experience proposed for the Committee at that time, her skills would
3805 perhaps be best used in the leadership of another Committee.

However, recent events mean that some of the institutional knowledge and experience once held in P&R has been lost. Now in her third term, with experience gained across various Committees, she wishes to step up and put her considerable skills and ability to the best possible use. Members will have already heard the breadth of her experience following the nomination speeches for both
3810 the DPA and STSB in July. In short, however, since being first elected to the States in 2012 her Committee experience has covered the DPA, the forerunners of the current E&I and STSB, and for five years she had the privilege of preparing and chairing public hearings across all States' Committees as Scrutiny President.

3815 This cross-cutting vantage point has given her an in-depth appreciation of the interconnected
issues facing the Government, and the mandates of all Committees. She is comfortable both in
leadership positions and as a team player, and in the Policy & Resources Committee Members are
required to be both. Since first entering the States she has immersed herself in active and visible
participation in policy development, cross-departmental collaboration, and meaningful
engagement with Islanders. She has also served on the Policy Council, chaired both the Energy and
3820 Environment Policy Groups, and led policy initiatives including amendments to the Domestic
Violence Strategy and work to advance sustainable transport solutions. She has held three
presidencies.

Her financial background, coupled with nine years involvement in Government, enables her to
advocate for responsible and accountable management of the States' resources. Something that is
3825 more crucial now than ever before. Deputy Burford recognises that the Committee will have already
established its initial direction and style, so her purpose here is not to propose changes to the
Committee but instead to set out her broad values that she believes will integrate with and
strengthen the existing team.

She is committed to analytical and evidence-based decision-making, to the rigorous use of data
3830 in policy, and to open, constructive debate. She believes that every policy decision should be
measured against its impact on people's daily lives, always with fairness and wellbeing in mind. She
has a commitment to protecting and enhancing Guernsey's natural environment, recognising its
importance to the Island's culture, its people, and its economy. Our Island faces challenges on many
fronts. The way P&R leads on strategic planning, oversight, and financial stewardship is more
3835 important than ever. In uncertain times the Island needs clear, credible leadership and
Deputy Burford believes she can contribute to that.

Madam, the Policy & Resources Committee is charged with the leadership and co-ordination of
the work of the States, driving fiscal policy, economic development, safeguarding public funds, and
representing Guernsey externally. The Committee's mandate reaches across all areas of
3840 Government, influencing policy planning, budget management, external relations, and cross-
committee collaboration. Effective Committee work rests on respectful engagement and
partnership within P&R and across the principal Committees. Deputy Burford's practice is work
collaboratively, listen with intent, and ensure that the best ideas are taken forward, regardless of
their origin.

3845 However, she is also clear that the role demands robust challenge and she will not shy away
from questioning and, when the evidence calls for it, pushing back or driving forward for the benefit
of the Island. Transparency is a foundational principle for Deputy Burford, as evidenced in her
manifesto and in her previous service as Scrutiny President. She understands that there will always
be situations requiring confidentiality, but equally information should not be withheld for
3850 convenience. In Government mistakes sometimes occur and she believes in fronting up to them.
Even if there is a financial cost, acknowledging errors, correcting course, and communicating openly
with Islanders builds trust; a commodity as valuable as any balance sheet surface.

Policy & Resources is not an Island unto itself; its effectiveness is also determined by how well it
engages, consults and collaborates with not just the principal Committees, whose regulation, policy
3855 making and service delivery shape daily life for Islanders, but also with the smaller Committees and
indeed those Members who do not have a Committee seat. She is seeking the support of this
Assembly to permit her to play a part in the provision by Policy & Resources of credible leadership,
practical decision-making, and confident representation. She brings experience, resilience, and a
direct approach and she is ready to take on the work ahead.

3860 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, ma'am.

It is an honour to stand before you today to speak about Deputy Gollop as candidate for the Policy & Resources Committee, our senior Committee in charge of guiding our Island's future. The P&R co-ordinates policy, leads strategic planning, manages the States' budget, and other resources, oversees external relations and addresses constitutional matters; nothing that you did not already know. To serve effectively on P&R they must understand how Government works from the inside, engage confidently with external partners, and balance competing priorities with prudence. They need to inspire trust, guide debates, and ensure that every pound spend delivers the maximum benefit to our community.

Deputy Gollop embodies these qualities in bucketloads. As one of Guernsey's longest-serving Deputies – in fact, he is – he carries institutional memory and deep familiarity with our structure of Government. He has served on P&R before and his questions in plenary sessions, 64 alone in one term – I am not entirely sure that is a good thing – demonstrate his diligence, thoroughness and willingness to hold every Committee to account. He is no one's master – or servant, rather.

He has championed causes that go to the heart of P&R's work. He highlighted the urgency of our housing crisis when he warned that homes had become well beyond most people's incomes. He has argued passionately for culture, heritage and the arts, reminding us that social wellbeing, economic growth and mental health all flourish when we invest in our creative life.

Diversity of perspective is not just a nice phrase; it is essential to sound decision making. Deputy Gollop has spoken openly about being diagnosed with autism, and shown us that true diversity embraces lived experiences and unconventional viewpoints. He does not march in lockstep with any party or any previous party and their manifesto; he brings independent thought, fearless intellect, a genuine curiosity to every debate. Deputy Gollop will never be part of any Government cult.

Where Deputy Gollop differs from candidates is that diversity of thought, and it really is that significant. He does not have a little red book of what he should and should not say. He is the true intellect in the States who thinks deeply on what is good for the Island, and often I disagree with him. The choice is between candidates that is more of the same, or someone that can insert true challenge. That is the decision for you today.

Throughout his career he has earned the trust of colleagues and the people of Guernsey. He has never hidden in the corridors of power; he is open, he is genuine, he is guided by principle rather than ambition. Those of us who have known him since our school days can attest to his kindness, his integrity and his refusal to engage in darkness or intrigue.

As we choose those who will shape the Island's destiny on P&R we face a choice between more of the same or true leadership, between safe conformity and constructive challenge. Deputy Gollop offers strategic insight, understanding, collaborative strength, empathy – that is important – and a commitment to transparency. He adds depth to our deliberations and ensures that every voice, every need and every opportunity is heard.

I ask you to join me in supporting Deputy Gollop's candidacy for P&R today. Together he can build a more resilient, forward-looking Guernsey that values accountability, embraces diversity and plans wisely for generations to come. He simply will not follow the party line. He is the candidate for P&R.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, you have 10 minutes to speak.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much.

I did not really recognise myself with some of Deputy Inder's comments. *(Laughter)* I came over as too outstanding and cavalier and everything else. But I decided comparative to the last moment and did not go through the so-called interview process to stand, partly because – had I known my very able alternative candidate, the selection of P&R, was unwell that would have perhaps put things into a different light.

But I was concerned really about the process, to a degree because, for example, in July we actually did have competition for the Home Department, I remember, but most of the Committees

went through uncontested – including Policy & Resources – which was strange. Now, I know there is an argument that maybe that is a more collegiate way of doing things and Committees can in the context of interviews do board setting. But we all knew – the question asked more often than anything else in the last month was who will fill the vacant P&R seat.

I thought that many of the candidates – we heard three, four, five names – were all outstanding, and I thought, ‘Not really much point’ and to a certain extent I am happy where I am. I am appreciating Home and, weirdly enough, I am actually doing some work with P&R, whether it be in the corporate, child or GST steering tax. But I thought, ‘We really should have a bit of competition.’ Unfortunately I am the only person speaking as a candidate today but that is how it goes.

I feel that although this is a new States with much greater emphasis on communication, co-operation and collaboration, I think there is also a role for a disrupter, for somebody who looks at things differently, who will take a different stand. I will not go into at great length really my background; I think people know I have been a Member for 28 years. I have sat on numerous Committees from Social Security to Employment, been President of Legislation at times, President of the Planning Authority. I sat on Environment, briefly on Education, Sport & Culture, Heritage, Scrutiny for eight years, and many others.

I was on Policy & Resources in the last term. Deputy Collins said today he gets dumped from the school committee; well, effectively the election dumped me from Policy & Resources and I have kind of accepted that philosophically, particularly – as Deputy de Sausmarez has identified – Deputy de Sausmarez, Deputy Falla, Deputy St Pier, and also Deputy Burford did extremely well in the election, and I did not particularly. But maybe I should have pushed more when I did have 11,000 votes. But there you go; that was in a previous era.

I am standing today really because the combination of events and developments has really given us a reset opportunity. I salute a lot of what this Policy & Resources Committee have done in resetting the way they work, but I think it could go further. I think in the 19 months I served on the former Policy & Resources Committee we achieved a lot. We tried to balance the books; there was a suggestion on tax which did not play. We did succeed I think in moving forward the Leale’s Yard, we did succeed in making a decision on reforming our IT contracts. We did make progress in terms of staffing, eventually, housing. I think we brought about reasonable pay awards and I was involved with that, although I am not sure I would really want to go back to those pay negotiations because I think that is one of the areas that needs to be reconsidered.

I think oversight boards involving more Members of the States, rather than P&R, would really work in areas like infrastructure, estate management, property management, and IT. I do not think we quite realise what we have got with Policy & Resources. We have in a sense – and maybe some Members want this – we have already got a semi-executive model, which works well in some ways but not in others. That is not a criticism of any past or present Members or any officers, past or present. But we are trying in the one top Committee to combine the United Kingdom Foreign Office, the United Kingdom Ministry of Justice to a certain extent, the United Kingdom Treasury, the civil servant, the role of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the Prime Minister. So it covers a huge range.

One issue I found is a problem in a previous Committee was there was too much emphasis on external affairs, and that robbed the Island – I think that is changing but it robbed us of all the work we needed to do here. I am heartened to hear there will be more emphasis on social and environmental policy because that is an area I would like to get into and develop more. I think we need to have more successful long-term employment relations, which might mean on the one hand negotiating tougher contractual arrangements, and on the other hand looking at health insurance for public sector workers, for example. We need a refit.

I think the education debate today showed strongly that we actually need to devolve and delegate some functions of Policy & Resources to other parts of the public sector, because although there are efficiencies in centralisation, that also can lead to bureaucracy. As I say, I would like to see more Members – not necessarily those in Policy & Resources – involved with political oversight committees in many of these areas. Indeed my personal view is Policy & Resources would be better if it had seven Members rather than five, because the workload on Policy & Resources is enormous,

3970 whereas on other Committees I have sat in we have the relative luxury of half an hour or an hour on each topic. Policy & Resources are like a topic every 10 minutes, 700 pages every week. That is actually too much.

Many times in the meetings we would have to focus on projects going over budget or being reorganised, or policies, or emergencies, and we did not have enough time to really think ahead. I am very much keen that we move forward frankly with GST-Plus but we need to do that I suspect in conjunction with Corporate Tax reform, but also at funding early years. One of the things that I think differentiates me from some possible candidates, although not necessarily my opponent today, is I believe very much we should be supporting middle Guernsey. I look across the water and see the huge tax allowances of Jersey and what they are doing for nursery education.

3975 I think that we support those at the bottom and we support those at the top, and we definitely need to build popularity – and I take my ideas from the left, from the right, from the greens, all kinds of things, and so I would not put myself as partisan. I think what we have to do is not only what is right but what is popular. I think we need to focus on really important matters and I am sure this will be achieved in this term anyway, but we really need a stronger focus on working with Economic Development. I have actually spent two and a half days this week going to business conferences. I am not an expert in any of it but it is very interesting looking at captive insurance, at artificial intelligence, at resilience, training organisations today, retail, the energy budget, and sustainability.

I think we need those ideas and a partnership working with the public sector. I do think that we need a Policy & Resources who is able to use resources to deliver more housing and work not only with the new Housing Department but make sure that the project management and the land and all these sites we have bought but are not using yet, can actually be activated. If there is not enough political members on P&R to do that they need to bring in other Members, and maybe even non-States' Members.

3985 I look back on my time at Policy & Resources with a degree of pride and achievement, but also with a degree of failure because I saw things we did not do and how the Committee is in structure dysfunctional –

The Deputy Bailiff: Ten seconds left, Deputy Gollop.

4000 **Deputy Gollop:** So I will hope you will consider me as a candidate, as a choice to be made.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

This is a secret ballot so His Majesty's Sherrif will circulate with the voting envelope. Can I suggest, to optimise efficiency, I am going to put a motion to the House that we move the Schedule for Future Business so that we can deal with it now and not wait for the outcome of the election. I am going to put that as an *aux voix* motion. Those who support dealing with the Schedule now before the outcome of the election, please say *pour*. Those against.

4010 *Members voted Pour.*

The Deputy Bailiff: There we are, excellent. Has everybody handed in their slip, who is voting? Is that everybody? Thank you.

States' Greffier.

Billet d'État XIII

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

5. Schedule for Future States' Business – Proposition carried

4015 **The States' Greffier:** Article 5, the Policy & Resources Committee, Schedule for future States' business.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

4020 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** I have nothing to add to this. It is short and to the point.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anybody wish to speak in debate? No. In that case we will put that to the vote. That is on SEV.

States' Greffier will you open the voting please?

4025 *There was a recorded vote.*

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 2

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	Goy, David	Burford, Yvonne
Bury, Tina			Leadbeater, Marc	Le Tocq, Jonathan
Cameron, Andy			St Pier, Gavin	
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Ozanne, Jayne				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rochester, Sally				
Rylatt, Tom				
Sloan, Andy				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

4030

The Deputy Bailiff: The voting was unanimous for all those people who were in the Chamber at the time of the vote: pour 35 and 3 Members had left the Chamber at the time of the vote, so I declare the Proposition passed.

**Election of a Member of the Policy & Resources Committee –
Deputy Burford elected as a member**

4035

The Deputy Bailiff: So now we just wait for the outcome of the vote and then, depending on what the outcome is, we will know whether we are in a position to announce who has won or whether we need to go to a second round.

4040

Ladies and gentlemen, I have had confirmation from His Majesty's Sherrif, and it has also been countersigned by His Majesty's Deputy Greffier, that the votes were as follows: Deputy Burford 20, Deputy Gollop 14. There was one spoilt paper and one blank paper. I, therefore, declare Yvonne Burford is now a member of the Policy & Resources Committee.

Thank you very much, everybody. *(Applause)*

States' Greffier, that brings us to the end of the day and the end of business for this States' meeting. Would you kindly close the meeting?

4045

The Assembly adjourned at 5.09 p.m.