OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION
OF THE
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Tuesday, 23rd June 2026

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

Volume 14, No. 11

ISSN 2049-8284

Published by the States' Greffier, The Royal Court House, St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ.

Present:

Sir R. J. McMahon, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

H. Pullum (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

C. P. A Blin
Y. Burford
T. L. Bury
A. K. Cameron
H. L. Camp
G. M. Collins
R. P. Curgenven
H. L. de Sausmarez
D. F. Dorrity
S. J. Falla
A. Gabriel
J. A. B. Gollop
L. T. Goy
M. A. J. Helyar
R. M. Humphreys
N. R. Inder
B. R. Kay-Mouat
A. Kazantseva-Miller
R. Le Brun
M. Malik
A. D. S. Matthews
L. J. McKenna
P. S. N. Montague
A. J. Niles
G. A. Oswald
J. M. Ozanne OBE
C. N. K. Parkinson
T. M. Rylatt
A. S. Sloan
G. A. St Pier
J. D. Strachan
L. C. Van Katwyk
S. P. J. Vermeulen
S. Williams

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives E. Hill and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*indisposé*) ; Deputy S. T. Hansmann Rouxel (*relevée à 9h 59*) ; Deputy M. S. Laine (*relevé à 10h 49*) ; Deputy S. R. Rochester (*absent de l'Île*)

Business transacted

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS
The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XI of 2026. 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 Tuesday, 23rd June, 2026 at 9.30 a.m. to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État, which have been submitted for debate.

Billet d'État XI

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. The States of Guernsey Group Consolidated Financial Statements 2025 – Proposition Carried

Article 1.
The States are asked to decide:-
1. Whether they are of the opinion to agree with the Policy & Resources Committee's approval of the States of Guernsey Group Consolidated Financial Statements for the year ending 31 December 2025.

The States' Greffier: Article 1. The Policy & Resources Committee, The States of Guernsey Group Consolidated Financial Statements 2025.

The Bailiff: Good morning, Members of the States. We are having some unseasonably warm weather at the moment, so those who wish to do so can remove outer garments.

I am going to invite Deputy Parkinson to open the debate on the financial statements. Deputy Parkinson, please.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

In 2012, I introduced a policy letter recommending the States should adopt International Public Sector Accounting Standards, IPSAS, and the propositions were carried. It is therefore somewhat poetic that I find myself today presenting one of the first ever sets of IPSAS-compliant accounts to the Assembly. Getting our accounts to this standard has required an enormous amount of work, and I wish to pay tribute to our staff, not just in Treasury, but also in the Trading Assets and all the other parts of the States who have made this possible.

The quality of the numbers has improved immeasurably. When I was Treasury Minister in 2012, the accounts did not even include a balance sheet. One of the reasons for this was that we did not know what all our assets and liabilities were. When I asked to see a list of all the properties owned by the States, I was told that that could not be provided because it did not exist.

Members and the public have full information on our financial position, and the main problem is making the accounts understandable to lay people who do not work with accounts every day. This is very much a fault on the right side. However, in response to the Scrutiny Committee's Letter of Comment, we will ensure that in next year's accounts the Treasurer's Report contains more of a plain language explainer. We also intend to introduce a forward-looking 'Chairman's Report', like the Chairman's Report you would see in the accounts of a public company. All we can be sure of is that the accounts will continually improve and expand.

Before presenting the accounts, I wanted to give an update on the 2026 financial performance to date and the latest forecast position. As at the end of April 2026, the year-to-date position shows a revenue surplus of £15.9 million, which is £1.1 million adverse to budget. So basically, we are pretty much on track. This reflects total revenue underperformance of £4.3 million, partially offset by favourable cost variances of £3.2 million. The operating surplus is £7.3 million, broadly in line with expectations,. and only £0.3 million adverse to budget. This is supported by stronger performance in trading active entities and lower non-capital projects spent.

However, the overall position is impacted by weaker than planned investment returns, which were 39% behind budget, the primary driver being the conflict in Iran which resulted in a small net deficit of £66,000.

The key drivers of the year-to-date variance include customs duties income, which is significantly underperforming, with a £3.8 million adverse variance against budget, reflecting volatility in import volumes, particularly in tobacco. Net committee expenditure is £2.6 million favourable overall. Within this, notable positions include Health & Social Care, which is £1 million favourable, although this masks £1.2 million of adverse pressure in off-Island acute care. Economic Development is £0.6 million favourable, driven largely by lower staffing and phasing of programme costs. Corporate Services is £0.4 million favourable overall, although Digital & Technology remains £1.1 million adverse driven by contract spend. Policy & Resources, my own Committee, is £1.1 million adverse primarily due to timing of funding for the tax reform programme and the continuing support of the Revenue Service. If the Revenue Service was a school, it would be in special measures.

Looking forward, the forecast indicates some deterioration over the remainder of the year. The forecast projects a full year revenue surplus of £14 million, which is just over £4 million adverse to budget, driven by cost pressures of £4.5 million. Those are primarily in Health & Social Care, £2.4 million, Policy & Resources, £0.4 million, and Corporate Services, £1 million. Health & Social Care, experiencing ongoing pressures in off-Island acute care, expected to drive a £3.4 million adverse position, albeit mitigated by expected funding transfers and savings elsewhere.

In Corporate Services, Digital & Technology is forecast to remain a key pressure, with overspends in excess of £1 million, and Policy & Resources is forecast to be £0.4 million adverse after anticipated budget transfers with residual pressures linked to the Revenue Service recovery plan.

Overall, while the year-to-date position shows relative stability, driven by cost control, the forecast highlights emerging cost pressures and revenue volatility, particularly in customs duties.

Turning now to the financial statements for 2025. These financial statements provide a comprehensive and independently audited view of the Island's public finances, covering both the core Government and the wider group of entities under States' control. In terms of the headline position, the financial statements report a strong overall financial performance in 2025. The core States' position, that is the day-to-day finances of Government, recorded an operating surplus of £45 million compared with a deficit in 2024 of £44 million.

Including investment movements and non-cash items, the overall core surplus rises to £113 million. Across the wider States' Group, the total surplus for 2025 was £106 million compared to £21 million in 2024. This represents a marked improvement on the prior year.

The key drivers for the 2025 position were, first of all, we accrued for the first year of Pillar Two revenue, which is estimated at £39 million; we will not start to collect the cash until the middle of next year. Alongside this, a significant proportion of the improvement was driven by one-off tax receipts, particularly from the banking sector, amounting to approximately £34 million, which related to adjustments from prior years, and investment valuation gains of around £119 million reflected market movements rather than cash income. These factors have a substantial impact on the reported surplus but cannot be relied upon to recur in future years.

When we adjust for these one-off and non-cash items, a different picture emerges. We have a funding gap estimated at about £50 million. The exclusion of investment gains may be controversial. It accords with the IMF definition of fiscal balance, but the circumstances of the States of Guernsey are very unusual. We have £4 billion of net assets, including financial investments of about £1.7 billion. Most countries have public debt in many cases roughly equal to their GDP, and gains on financial investments are trivial in their accounts.

Some countries do have substantial financial investments, sometimes held in a sovereign wealth fund. Norway is an example of one. It has some of the largest pools of financial investments in the world, roughly $2 trillion. But these are held in their state pension funds. Therefore, the income from these investments does not show up in the accounts of the state.

I want to further consider the appropriate treatment of our financial income in the year ahead. On public services and costs, looking at some of the detail in the accounts, Members will note that staffing levels in core Government increased modestly in 2025 by about 144 full-time equivalents, reflecting planned recruitment and increased service demand, particularly in areas such as health, home affairs, digital services, and human resources.

It should be noted that there are still over 300 roles less than in our 2025 budget. In some cases, agency staff have been replaced by full-time staff, which saves us money. So the addition of 144 full-time staff is not necessarily bad news.

Looking forward, while the 2025 financial statements show the continued strength of the Island's finances, we all know that our public finances are coming under pressure from demographic change, potentially technological change, and possibly climate change. There are uncertainties around the potential revenue from Pillar Two, which I believe will likely be greater, at least in the short term, than the current forecast. In the longer term, these may erode, as the fiscal advantages of doing business offshore diminish for large multinational enterprises.

There is the possibility, eventually, of new revenue streams from, for example, renewable energy sources, but these factors are for another debate next month. Our task this month is to approve the 2025 accounts, and they are pretty much what they are.

I have received no notice of any questions, but I will endeavour to answer any questions which arise in debate. It is likely that I will have to respond to any technical questions by offering a follow-up answer in writing because we have not had the chance to prepare for them. But I will do my best to assist.

In conclusion, sir, I ask Members to agree with the Policy & Resources Committee's approval of these financial statements.

The Bailiff: Well, it looks like there is no debate.
Deputy Strachan.

Deputy Strachan: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank the Deputy for his introduction and also agree that I would like to thank the Treasury team that worked hard to put these accounts and the States' Investment Board putting these together.

I would like to address the treatment of our financial assets in both the account statement and the States' Investment Board Annual Report. I am pleased that Deputy Parkinson mentioned the concept of a sovereign wealth fund, as this is exactly what I would suggest we need to consider for a new holistic approach to these assets, as this would support local economic development.

We have a range of assets that are drivers of the success of Guernsey and the people who live here. Some of these assets are not reflected in these accounting statements, but I would argue they are essential. These include our people, which we need to ensure are healthy and educated, the businesses they work for, and our natural resources, which provide so much toward our well-being and our tourism economy.

However, these accounts have valued other assets, such as our physical infrastructure, tourism attractions, museum collections, others which we try to put a value on, albeit imperfectly, as well as our investable financial assets.

I would like to focus on this final category and discuss how they can impact all of the other assets and provide a central opportunity for growth. In particular, how can we be structuring this in a better way to benefit more from these opportunities? It is my belief that we would better understand and manage these investable assets if we did structure them as a sovereign wealth fund.

The advantages to this would be many. Firstly, increased clarity. Unlike the confusion and caveats expressed between the accounts and the calculation of the funding gap and whether or not this gap includes unrealised investment returns, which I would agree cannot be relied on in future years but do have a significant return, a sovereign wealth fund approach would view all of our cash, equity, bond holdings together with both realised and unrealised investment returns and place them against correctly calculated liabilities. This would be a more holistic way of viewing our investable assets net of liabilities and would better inform our decisions.

Indeed, clear transparency and better reporting on our sovereign assets would address some of the concerns expressed by the Scrutiny Committee in their report on the accounts. It would clarify for Islanders what our assets are and what commitments we have against them. It would clarify what percentage of our general reserves are genuinely available, what outflows have been made and are planned in the future and what are available for investing in growth.

Such a fund would also improve the risk-adjusted return of our assets by focusing on the net assets and ensure the long-term nature of our liabilities, such as scale and maturity, are appropriately managed and that key risks, such as the overall foreign exchange exposure, is properly managed. A sovereign wealth fund structure would increase focus and nimbleness. Furthermore, the clear identification of such a fund would considerably increase Guernsey's international financial credibility.

Finally, an important benefit to Guernsey of creating a sovereign wealth fund would be to support the local economy, and it is here I would like to focus. Currently, we send 95% of our investments off Island and do not seem to appreciate nor measure the impact it would have to invest more here. I would like to see this changed. I would like to turn our attention to the overall approach to local fund managers. Put simply, our local fund managers and local investment opportunities have been hampered by the 2022 policies which were put in place by P&R, which halved the investment that we do locally.

As background, prior to 2022 the non-social security pool of assets, which amounted to about £2 billion, committed to supporting local fund managers by investing via selected successful local fund managers who had substance in Guernsey by having a local office, employing Guernsey residents and having true decision-makers here in Guernsey. This local manager pool targeted a 20% maximum to local managers, which ensured that up to £400 million of States' assets was invested by local fund managers into international equities and bonds as well as a small proportion into locally-focused investment in innovation and local property. In fact, there were enough local fund managers who were deemed excellent enough to warrant this investment, and the investment in local fund managers was near the 20% target. As an estimated 0.5% for fund manager fees, this total annual fee income, paid to local fund managers, was around £2 million.

In 2022, the asset management of the State's investments was restructured. This new and large portfolio comprised the total of our States of Guernsey currency assets, now called the General Investment Portfolio, and the Public Servants Pension Scheme Portfolio, which are invested to ensure we can meet our long-term commitments to social security, civil servants, pensions, long-term insurance, as well as our general reserves.

When the new SIB was set up and a US-based investment consultant was appointed in 2022, the policy for local fund managers was changed. Instead of the previous maximum 20% invested in this pool, the policy was changed to a:

minimum of 10% of non-pension assets with local managers where suitable opportunities exist.

This change in policy would seemingly not have required a change in the overall allocation to local fund managers within the pre-2022 general reserve pool, as 20% could have been achieved with this new 10% minimum policy.

But in reality, the exposure to this part of the portfolio seems to have been cut to 10%, though it is not possible to determine this from the SIB report. Assuming the funds have only 10% of the non-pension assets, which would be approximately £170 million, which are charged an estimated 0.5% fund manager fee, then the approximate annual fee paid to local fund managers has reduced from £2 million to only £850,000.

As you can see, this decision by the SIB and P&R represents a loss of approximately £1.15 million in fee income to the local economy, yet the SIB and Head of Resources have confirmed that there was no calculation of economic multiplier effect of reducing this amount of local income. This loss of support has multiple impacts.

First, the loss of fee income flows through to salaries and hence Income Tax. Second, and perhaps more importantly, it is a clear kitemark which can be used by these fund managers successful enough to be selected by the States of Guernsey, and that can attract further investment. Finally, larger funds under management give investment managers more leverage when negotiating fees for underlying fund purchases. In other words, this has a significant impact on our local fund management industry. Moreover, this would also seem to go against the current Committee *for* Economic Development of finance sector strategy.

It is worth asking why this policy change has been made and whether it is in Guernsey's best interests. The general performance of local fund managers, properly mandated, continues to be reasonable on a risk-adjusted basis over the medium and long term. They continue to attract client investments and, indeed, one fund manager attracted an international acquisition. This should not be surprising as these fund managers are investing in many of the same international equities and bonds that off-Island investment managers select.

Furthermore, they often have head offices elsewhere, which contribute to investment strategy. Indeed, they sometimes use off-Island funds within their portfolios. Local managers showcase the successful international finance industry we have on this Island. However, the local fund managers, anecdotally, have said they have not been told of any reason for the reduction in their portfolio and have been concerned at the interface with the offshore investment consultant.

So you might ask, would this move create additional costs? The answer is no. The contract for the directors and for the consultant is fixed. Raising allocation to local fund managers would in most cases just be a gradual shift in the size of the portfolio with an occasional new fund manager selected, which is business as usual.

The possibilities for support of our local economy do not end here. Let us consider the current state of the Guernsey Investment Fund. It was intended to be fully independent under its board, operating with committed capital. What has evolved is the involvement of the civil servant, P&R, and the SIB at a granular level, thus blurring areas of responsibility. The solution is to let these funds become fully independent to ensure value for money being the central driver, and to use the ability to be flexible and nimble and allow them to react to local opportunities more efficiently.

Finally, this proposal allows Guernsey to follow the money to support local initiatives. If local businesses have good ideas to raise funding, a Guernsey sovereign wealth fund could decide to follow other investors or support loan guarantees where others are committed to invest. Our rival international finance centres are very active in using their sovereign wealth funds to do just that.

Luxembourg lends money to new fund managers for working capital; the Qatar Investment Authority supports venture capital funds who generate commercial returns and create a positive impact for Qatar's venture capital ecosystem; and Temasek in Singapore has seeded new investment platforms.

Locally, could our recently launched fund foundry better encourage new fund managers to locate here if we had a similar offer? Or if we commit to a wind farm, would some infrastructure investment from our own sovereign wealth fund help get it built? It would certainly help us to manage the financial gains from such a project better, which, as Deputy Parkinson mentioned, is exactly what Norway has done, as it has helped much of the wealth derived from their oil and gas fields for long-term investments for the good of the country. Indeed, such a structure would ensure these gains were explicitly used for the good of Guernsey; funding growth rather than absorbed in general government expenses.

To date, our approach to investments has been Treasury and SIB led, and I am not certain that this has been advantageous. I suggest P&R should task our Civil Service to look at this option and the new commitment of our CEO to restructure the senior Civil Service leaders is encouraging. Surely this is time to get an experienced finance lead who can look at our current approach holistically and consider the benefits of a Guernsey sovereign wealth fund structure and the benefits to the local economy this would provide.

In setting these proposals out, I wanted to confirm that I have no direct conflict of interest in any local fund manager, nor indirectly via my company, IAM Advisory, or my husband. However, I do have a passionate interest in our financial assets being managed well and made to work for the people of Guernsey. These assets are a key part of the economic engine of the Island. This topic on how the assets are to be structured and managed is at least as important as the debate over our tax structure.

Unfortunately, as we can read in this and previous SIB Annual Reports, we are repeatedly missing our market and real return benchmarks. The market benchmarks are not difficult to meet. The disappointing results, given strong markets, should raise significant alarm bells as to how we are structuring and instructing our fund managers, because 2023, 2024 and 2025 all underperformed the benchmark cumulatively by 5% or 6%, or in plain numbers, well in excess of £200 million.

It is essential for Guernsey to improve this situation as we have lost more money in recent investment underperformance than we have in the MyGov IT debacle. This return matters greatly for those assets that are not in our accounts. They are essential for us to support our Islanders and their wellbeing and skills and for our natural environment.

In closing, I have the following question for Deputy Parkinson. Would he, in his response, please agree to commit P&R to review the structure under which we manage our financial assets, including analysing the sovereign wealth fund structure and committing a higher percentage to our local fund manager pool, thereby supporting higher local economic growth, higher local tax take, and increase the strength of our local fund management industry. Ideally, this review would be completed in six months. I, for one, would be more than happy to help with such a project.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel, is it your wish to be relevéed?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.
Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Yes, sorry, I did not intend to speak today, but just in response really to what we have just heard. I think it is only fair to state that Economic Development has commenced a piece of work which involves members of P&R looking into investment structures, including the potential of sovereign wealth structures. I think it is only correct to rest assured that all of these things are being actively looked at as part of the Economic Development Mandate.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you.

Only very briefly, Deputy Parkinson said in his opening speech that if the Revenue Service were a school it would be under special measures. Special measures for a school means the school is failing, it lacks leadership, and interventions often mean leadership changes, increased monitoring and staffing overhauls. That is quite an indictment on the Revenue Service, and P&R are responsible for the Revenue Service. Next month, the same Committee will bring forward its tax plan.

To requote Deputy Parkinson, 'If the Revenue Service were a school it would be under special measures'. Revenue Services will be key to Policy & Resources's delivery of its tax plans. So the question to Deputy Parkinson is: what confidence does he have really in its tax plans if he is now signalling that he believes the Revenue Service should be under special measures?

The Bailiff: Deputy Sloan.

Deputy Sloan: Thank you, sir.

Yes, and can I also thank my colleague, Deputy Strachan, for her contribution and remind her there is actually an open, ongoing review by the Scrutiny Management Committee of the States' Investment Board governance, and she is free to provide a submission as her erstwhile husband has already done so.

The purpose of scrutiny is not to tell the Assembly what to think, it is to ask the questions, or it is a purpose to ask the questions that the members of the public would ask if they had the opportunity. That was the approach taken by the Public Accounts Sub-Committee when we examined the States' accounts. We did not approach the hearing as auditors, we did not approach it seeking to challenge IPSAS, we approached it as Deputies and as taxpayers trying to understand what the accounts were actually telling us. In doing so we encountered three moments which, for me, perfectly illustrated why Scrutiny concluded that the accounts may be technically robust, they are not always readily understandable.

The first concern, investment gains; already mentioned this morning. Members will recall, if they watched, that we discussed the investment portfolio and the contribution that investment gains had made to the reported surplus. At one point we established that assets had been sold during the year and that proceeds realised exceeded the amount of the unrealised gains being discussed. To most ordinary people, if an asset has been sold and the proceeds received, then the gain has been realised. That seems a fairly straightforward proposition.

However, we then found ourselves in a discussion in which gains arising from a portfolio from which the assets had been sold remained somehow unrealised. I confess that at times I felt that I had wandered into a meeting of the Mad Hatter's Tea Party. Words appeared to mean something different depending on which part of the discussion we were having. When discussing the surplus, the gains were highly relevant. When discussing the funding gap, the gains became largely irrelevant. When assets were sold, the gains remained somehow unrealised.

I am not suggesting the accounting treatment is incorrect; far from it. But my point is much simpler. If a Committee of Deputies sitting for several hours with senior finance professionals struggle to follow the distinction, what chance does an ordinary member of the public have?

The second moment came when we discussed capital expenditure. Again, if you are watching, you may recall that the Public Account Sub-Committee was trying to identify how much had actually been spent on capital projects during the year. We searched, we turned pages, we asked questions.

Eventually, we were directed not to a headline figure, not to a summary table, but a note to the balance sheet buried deep within the accounts and, if I recall correctly, it was on page 77.

When we observed that this was not immediately obvious, the response we received was essentially, 'An accountant would know where to look', QED. Or, for Deputy Falla, since he tells me that he likes Latin, sir, *quod erat demonstrandum*. That was the moment the Committee's concern crystallised, because that is precisely the point. The States' accounts are not produced for accountants. They are produced for Deputies, they are produced for taxpayers, they are produced for members of the public who wish to understand how their money has been spent and what financial position their Government is in. If the answer to the question, 'Where is the capital expenditure?' is, 'An accountant would know where to look', then we have rather proved Scrutiny's case.

The third moment came when we discussed the funding gap. The Committee was told, or Scrutiny was told, that the capital investment of around 2% of GDP is one of the reasons why the States faces a structural funding gap going forward. Yet in 2025, the States appears to have spent broadly that on capital expenditure, and the accounts still report a headline surplus of £106 million; a figure we were specifically directed to focus on at the beginning of this panel.

The obvious question is this: if that level of capital spending was achieved in 2025, and if 2025 is therefore in some sense representative of the States' underlying financial position, why does the same level of capital spending become a cause of a funding gap going forward? The answer we received was, in effect, 'Ah, one figure is forward-looking, the other is a snapshot'. I am not sure that is even technically correct, but it is certainly not an answer that helps the ordinary reader understand the financial position.

The public are entitled to ask a simpler question. Are we living within our means or not and, if we are not, by how much are we not? If the answer depends on taking the accounts, removing some items, adding back others, excluding gains, adjusting for capital, and then referring to a separate policy letter, then the accounts themselves are not answering the question that matters the most. That is why the issue is so important.

At the very time the Assembly is being asked to consider major tax reforms, the single most important financial question facing the Island is whether there is an underlying structural funding gap, and if so, how large it really is. That, sir, is the variable of interest. That is the figure which ultimately drives the debate about taxation, spending, borrowing, reserves and long-term fiscal sustainability. Yet the Committee's experience was that this underlying position is not readily apparent from the accounts themselves. Instead, readers are directed to alternative measures, adjustments, exclusions and narrative explanations provided elsewhere.

With respect, that should not be necessary. The purpose of public accounts is not simply to report numbers, it is not to meet international standards, it is to explain the financial position to the organisation that owns it. In this case, that means the people of Guernsey.

Some say that the modern accounting framework is more sophisticated than the old cash-based accounts, and that may be so, but sophistication is not the same as understanding. Somewhere along the journey, towards technical precision, we must not lose sight of the basic questions that the public wants answered: how much money came in, how much money went out, how much cash do we need, how much tax do we need to ask people to pay, and, most importantly, are we living within our means? It should not require a lengthy public hearing, a series of accounting adjustments and reference to the Treasurer's preferred narrative before a reader can understand the States' fiscal position.

This is not a criticism of the officers who prepared the accounts. It is not a criticism of the auditors. It is a criticism of a reporting framework that appears increasingly capable of producing technical accuracy without necessarily producing public understanding. It is the most important financial question facing this Island and it cannot be readily answered in the States' accounts, and it represents a failure of communication and accountability regardless of how technically accurate those accounts may be. That is why Scrutiny brought forward its Letter of Comment.

I will vote to accept these accounts, which I will do so begrudgingly. But before I finish, I want to highlight a couple of points. First, I welcome P&R's acknowledgment that governance arrangements may need reviewing, as was discussed during the hearing. Time was the auditors were appointed by the Public Accounts Committee, an arrangement somehow lost during recent history, and the lack of check and balance sits uncomfortably with me. I ponder whether such changes have been entirely accidental, noting how similar check and balance governance arrangements for the fiscal framework have also been lost.

Second, we were appreciative that it was agreed that the Public Accounts Sub-Committee would have access to the auditors ahead of the accounts next year. Finally, I welcome the news this morning that P&R have accepted our suggestion that a plain English summary will be published alongside the accounts going forward.

Those are three small steps towards better public accountability, and that is what these accounts must ultimately serve.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

A couple of slightly esoteric points. Deputy Strachan mentioned a change in policy in 2022. There was no change in policy, there was a change in the investment manager and the allocations that were made by the investment manager. There was no change in policy and, as far as I am aware, some local managers are still used.

I just wanted to make a point, and I am not expecting a technical answer from Deputy Parkinson, it is something that concerned me when we were in the process of creating the IPSAS accounts, is the consolidation of certain of the entities and whether they meet the test of control.

From my perspective, on page 36, the Guernsey Housing Association's assets are rolled into the accounts and consolidated within them, and I personally do not believe they should be. It does not meet the test. It is a standalone charity, a limited by guarantee company, it is not possible for that company, even if it wanted to, to distribute its assets to the States in any form. But net assets of £111 million are consolidated in the States' accounts, as is, importantly, depreciation on a capital asset of £6.6 million, which would show up as a loss in our accounts even though it is not actually really a loss of ours. It is a loss of the Guernsey Housing Association's relative to its own assets.

I just ask Deputy Parkinson, given that we have had some change of personnel in Treasury in particular, whether they would revisit the control test in respect of IPSAS – I think it is 35 of the Rules – in terms of control of our subsidiaries, all of them, including particularly the Guernsey Housing Association.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Williams.

Deputy Williams: I would like to say that I turn on a few accounts on the accounts. There are a host of areas to raise but one in particular is our apparent inability to reduce the States' employee headcount, which is featured in the account, the salary bill and hence our ability to control our spending.

Mindful that we are next month about to ask the public of Guernsey to pay more tax overall, it is a reasonable, legitimate public expectation that all States' Committees and all senior civil servants rein in their spending and staff numbers to show the public that we are doing what we can to save money and only spend it where it is absolutely essential. We need to be questioning all the nice-to-have wish list projects and job roles.

The relevance of my point to these accounts is the increase in the group of full-time equivalent staff numbers by 189 compared to 2024 on page 14, now totalling 6,775 staff in 2025. This far exceeds all the people employed by our major earner, the finance industry, who according to the

States' facts and figures employed 5,848 people in 2024. That is our latest data point in the 2025 publication.

We need to be showing restraint, but we are not. Our group pay bill went up by 5% in 2025, whereas inflation was 3.4%. We took on 30 people in human resources alone. We all need to be questioning our spending as we do not have the money and, according to Treasury staff, we are fast spending our reserves, running out in five years' time. We just need to get a bit real about this.

We all need to be making some tough decisions on savings to gain public support. We are a small Island, and hence we cannot afford to provide some nice-to-have services. It is not easy, but we have to do it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I want to echo, in a way, Deputy Williams's point, because I know in some areas of the States – the fire service would be one, perhaps States Works – there have in real terms been reductions, so somebody else is taking our share; and maybe it is human resources, I do not know, or forensic accountants.

I thought that Deputy Sloan's Scrutiny review of the accounts was actually pretty useful, and would agree with his points. What came across to me was not only the confusion between the group accounts and the core accounts and the capital accounts and so on, but that the current Policy & Resources, and to be fair the one I was on, did not seem too bothered that there was not much in the way of political oversight of a political audit committee.

I have always been a believer really, not only in the Public Accounts Committee returning, which in a way it has now, but also maybe an audit commission. I think it suggests an issue that I would want to take up more broadly, that bearing in mind we only have five members of Policy & Resources, we used to have 11 on the Policy Council plus three at Treasury and Resources, or seven on Advisory and Finance back in the day. I think those five are potentially overworked and an audit sub-committee perhaps involving more members or members from other Committees would be useful, as well as perhaps people from the private sector.

I liked Deputy Strachan's analysis of the need for more local investment and a sovereign fund. Only yesterday I was at the innovation conference that was held, which was very interesting, and one person afterwards said that an innovation fund for Guernsey would be a way of moving away from a welfare state and supplying resources for entrepreneurship and innovation and what might be, in the future post-AI, more of a universal basic income approach.

I think we could learn a lot from what Norway does. It may explain why Norway has never joined the European Union, because they do not fancy other countries getting their hands on their bounty. But maybe one day, if Deputy Blin is leading us, which he already does in a sense, we will have more money coming in from offshore energy, which will only add to that.

I do agree with the general point Deputy Camp and Deputy Strachan made, that investments on Island benefit our economy and our skillset.

Going back to this business of staff numbers, what I spotted was an incredible inflation busting 24% increase in one sector of pay. I got blamed a little bit, although it was a collective decision that the previous Policy & Resources – maybe this one will do better, if that is the right word – gave too much away to the employees. But of course I take the view that some people in the public sector are actually under-rewarded and you have to have the right package, which is not necessarily pay. Perhaps we focus too much on pay and not enough on benefits, like, say, health benefit or whatever. Clearly there are anomalies with housing benefit that are paid to some key workers and not others.

Whatever kind of tax package we come up with, we are not going to get very far if we keep on expanding our workforce unless we all move to a bigger state philosophy. Because whether we have GST at 3% or 5% or some other mixture, clearly, if the public sector is growing, then there are issues. Deputy Parkinson, in a smooth kind of way, said it was only 144 – we had a slightly different figure earlier – but it is only a slight increase. But that is still an increase. We were promised at one time a decrease of 200 a year, which was never really realisable. But this is going upwards, and probably is not what a private sector firm would do.

It would be interesting to look at the economics as to whether reducing agency staff and increasing employees, particularly in health, works because workers from outside who work in health get extra benefits and, in any case, they are potentially beneficiaries of a pension and the whole package of being in the States, which agency workers are not.

That is not really my main point. My main point is if you look at the category in the report – I have not got the page in front of me – of employees, I think it was earning between £115,000 and £140,000, it had gone up by 24%. Admittedly, not all of the categories had gone up and one or two had gone down, but what we have seen, instead of an RPI increase of, say, 4% or 5%, or even 10%, it is 24%.

We were told last year that the figure was misleading, because what we were doing with reforming the accounts and changing them was we were including lots of people who worked for non-core utilities, commercialised entities and so on, and therefore the numbers had increased. I suppose I accept that answer, but one cannot accept that answer every year because that is when the logic ends.

Clearly, we are seeing, whether it is through job inflation, promotion, job appraisal, annual increments, I do not know. But we are seeing an increase yet again, not just in staff count but particularly senior staff count. I have always believed that the single strongest reason why we are likely to increase taxation for middle Guernsey, or whatever people want to call it, is we are increasing the number of senior officers. In many cases, that is unavoidable, given the increased complexity of society, the regulatory battle, and so on, but we have to be candid and straightforward with that.

I think that we also need, as Deputy Sloan has pointed out, a greater sense that we are communicating this to the public. It is very hard, I would argue, for even Policy & Resources members, even those who are trained in high finance or accountancy, to fully understand how States' accounts work and, as they are changing every year, that is perhaps an even greater challenge.

I take the point on board that these accounts are not particularly transparent in identifying savings or capital expenditure or infrastructural development. I think that is an area that we need to build further on as well. It is impossible to completely distance the set of accounts from the wider issues of tax planning and reform.

As I used to say, and I have learnt, to my cost, investments can go down as well as up. The fact that we may have unrealised or even realised investments in the accounts, perhaps caused by a Trump bump or some other world factor, does not necessarily mean that we will be better off next year or the year after. I think we need greater clarification really on the costs of organisations and what they cost.

It was interesting Economic Development probably last term and this made savings; other Committees including Policy & Resources less so. On the perhaps astute but pointed comment of Deputy Parkinson that if the Revenue Service was a school they might be in special measures. I would argue that it is a widespread conception or misconception of the public that, as Deputy de Sausmarez wrote in her quote on the accounts, she said you cannot tell from investments whether it is actually cash because that is a different entity.

But many of the public believe that we are shorter of cash than we should be because there are allegedly numerous people who have not paid fully their tax due to delays at the Revenue Service. I have always been assured that is a misconception because that modelling is done within the process. But nevertheless, from a Scrutiny perspective, it must make a difference to our cashflow and our short-term liability and certain other indices. It would be very useful to see if there are, in the end, differences between what we estimate as revenue from the customer who pays the Revenue Service and the result when, and hopefully as we are promised by the Chief Executive this time next year, we see real fruits of leadership at the Revenue Service.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ozanne.

Deputy Ozanne: Thank you, sir.

I, too, was not planning to speak today but I would like to make three points, if I may. The first actually is to pick up on what Deputy Strachan has shared with us about her concerns about underperformance of around £200 million of Investment Board. That is a figure that should make us all, or it certainly made me stop and think, and, in the light of the Agilisys, it pales into insignificance. I do hope that we will have some explanation as to the concerns that Deputy Strachan has raised as to why we have underperformed so poorly.

We within Employment & Social Security have met with the Investment Board recently, and it is interesting to understand how that system works. But I must admit, I was concerned that an independent board, which is there to make independent decisions, has the States' Treasurer having a vote on it. That to me is not independence, particularly if they are overseeing pensions. So I would like to understand why that is part of the process that we have within the Investment Board.

My second point is to back up Deputy Sloan's concerns about the presentation of these accounts for the general public. Much has been done on social media and with infographics, which the public can perhaps buy into. But in the accounts themselves, the main two pictures are on page 10 and 11. They are helpful, colourful charts about how our income is generated and how it is spent.

But our two largest expenditure, our pay of around £330 million, is one of the huge blocks, and our second expenditure – pensions and benefits – are lumped into one. That is an area I know that many on the Island are very concerned about, and I do hope that in future we will learn and look at how we split that £309 million so people understand the different types of benefits that we give, but particularly the difference between pensions and support.

My final concern is around the Seized Assets Fund, which is appendix 9. Members may or may not know that there is around £10.5 million sitting in that fund, which is available, I understand, to P&R with the Committee *for* Home Affairs – Deputy Vermeulen is smiling at me – to do great work within the criminal justice system. I am keen to see that money invested in a system that dearly and sorely needs work, as indeed does our prison. But I am unclear, as I indeed know many within the public are unclear, how that money can get allocated and how people can apply, if they may, for funds if they believe they have a project that should be considered.

So I too would like to understand more about how the seized funds is available for good initiatives, because there are so many, particularly when it comes to looking at domestic abuse, violence against women and girls, and other social issues that we have in our society, which I think that fund could urgently be put towards.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenven.

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

Just a very brief point, if I may. I would just like to offer my support to Deputy Williams's analysis and your conclusions, and in part Deputy Gollop's observations, and also highlight the fact that in note 60 of the accounts named 'Senior Employees' Remuneration' we see that 25% more civil servants are now in the pay bracket of between £115,000 and £139,999 than in 2004 in comparison to last year, i.e. there has been a 25% increase in just one year for this pay bracket alone.

I wonder, therefore, if the Policy & Resources Committee would commit to looking at, say, maybe a hiring freeze or other similar alternatives.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

There has been much talk about our investments, and I think I heard the Treasurer say that the problem was the social, economic, geopolitical challenges faced out there. But I understand that Jersey's investments, and they do not have a sovereign wealth fund, but I understand that their investments have outperformed our investments with the same geopolitical challenges. So maybe we can learn from this in going forward. I am more interested in the rolling video of what happens next, after we receive this snapshot in the accounts, and I think that has to be looked at.

Sir, you will remember I have been very concerned about Aurigny and its losses and, in particular, the number of wet leases. I was a bit astounded when reading through the 335 pages of accounts to read that it had:

> … continued to face additional costs including the use of leased aircraft and the rapid introduction of new routes following airline failures.

It then says:

> Despite this, its financial position improved compared to 2024.

So I raced, sir, to page 33 and was looking desperately for the improvement in the figures. I have heard that we have gone, or I have learnt, that we have gone from in 2024 a net deficit of £4.8 million to in 2025 a net deficit of £11.2 million. They are not that opaque, these accounts. I know people want shorter accounts, but, if these are to help us moving forward, I would like to understand more, and I would like an itemisation of what we are spending on those wet leases.

Why it should concern us is that technically the air operating certificate for Aurigny is dependent on the company being solvent, and at the moment there is no sign of that, so perhaps we need to be sorting this out a little bit quicker than what we are. I see that prices have gone up 6%, but it is still making a big loss. That is quite a loss in our accounts. We need to tighten up and we need to make efficiencies, I believe.

Those are the points that I raise on these accounts. I can accept them, they are unlikely to change, but they are not that opaque when it comes to Aurigny's figures.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

Often my daughter decides to get me up at 3 a.m. or 4 a.m. or 5 a.m. and over the last few weeks it has been really handy having this set of accounts next to me, because I often refer to page 54. I look at our movement in reserves and, as we know, sir, it has now crept into £4 billion. So it reminds me that you can go to school today because Guernsey is not broke. We often, I feel, are beating ourselves up that we are not in a good position. But it has been highlighted some countries would be envious of our position on our reserves.

I know we are about to head into a tax debate about what are we going to do, and I do not really want to drift into that. But when I look, often as I do, having worked in finance for a very long time, and certainly looking at charities' accounts, I often turn to their balance sheet – for us, that is page 56 – and look how healthy it is. Look how healthy it is. I am quite pleased about that, because I know, being on the Committee *for* Housing, we definitely are keen to spend lots of money building lots of houses. So I am definitely keen we explore the options of certainly borrowing some or finding some money to do that and able to help increase affordable homes.

I take the point on board from Deputy Helyar, he does make a very valid point about the GHA, and we are obviously having conversations about that, about actually how we all operate. For me, if they want to be totally independent and totally private, they are quite welcome to pay Tax on Real Property (TRP) and Document Duty, that would certainly help raise some extra cash but, in realistic terms, they are part of the agreement.

But I am really keen to explore that because I think the relationship is not quite working as well as it could be. We have said to them they can build as much as they want, and I know over the recent years they can only do so much, and they have got to the point where they are comfortable. We obviously saw an article recently talking about where they are, but we know the indicator that we need 700 homes. Anyway, I am drifting.

Personally, I think it has been a great set of accounts. I think I have read it twice looking for things. Obviously, as colleagues have said, there are lots of things in here that are concerning; definitely the increase in some expenditure. For me, I do think savings – we have not had enough time to look for savings, in my personal opinion. Especially on ESS, as we said before – I have said before – the combined budget and that spend is £300 million, £400 million, we need more time to find whether we can cut some of that. Anyway, that is not for today.

I really just wanted to echo the fact that we should be proud that our reserves have gone into, the first time, £4 billion. That is for me a positive sign. Guernsey is healthy and we need to talk ourselves up. When I left this Chamber in 2016 the economy was growing and we need to strengthen that message that we are open for business, we are going to resolve this tax strategy, and let us open our doors and move forward, grow the economy with bringing more taxes, that will help everybody.

Anyway, I have said enough, sir.

The Bailiff: As nobody else is rising to speak, I will invite Deputy Parkinson to reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Parkinson: Deputy Strachan started us on matters to do with the investments of the States and various other speakers followed with similar points. I will address that collection of speeches in one go. Yes, the structure of our investments does need some thought and that is something we will be looking into. I have only recently joined the States' Investment Board and I am also, like Deputy Strachan, interested in the whole concept of sovereign wealth funds. So we do need to have a think about the structure of it.

On the question of employment of local fund managers, obviously, where that does not impact on performance, or preferably improves performance, that would be a very good thing. But we have a quasi-independent board. I hear what Deputy Ozanne said about the States' Treasurer being a member of it; that is something else we might want to think about. But the idea really is to have that portion of our assets managed professionally by people who do that sort of thing for a living all the time.

On P&R we do have people who have worked with investment managers in the fund sector and so on, and there are, of course, other Members of the States who have worked in that sector, but we basically tried to set up an independent panel of experts to take on day-to-day management of that fund, and it is our job to keep an eye on them and make sure that they are doing a decent job. But, as I say, I have only just recently joined the States' Investment Board myself, along with Deputy Andy Niles, and I can assure you we are taking a great interest in what goes on there.

Deputy Strachan asked specific questions about whether I could promise that P&R would do various things, and obviously I cannot commit P&R on the floor of the Assembly, but we will take on board her comments and we will respond in due course, if we may.

Deputy Inder talked first of the Members to speak about Revenue Services. When I said if they were a school they would be in special measures, we are talking about a service which is behind in terms of issuing assessments to the tune of about 20,000 assessments. Huge steps are being taken under the Chief Executive to put that right. The Revenue Service has new leadership and it is receiving massive external support, which is costing us money, which we see in these accounts and which you have heard about in the forecast for 2026.

The aim is that it will be back on its feet and up to date with assessments and repayments and all the other stuff by the end of next year. But this is a big hole and it is going to take time to sort it out. It was later – I cannot remember who was raising the question about, does this mean we are losing money? Who was that? Anyway, it does not matter. No, broadly speaking – Deputy Gollop, okay. Broadly speaking, it does not. Most people pay tax under the ETI scheme and they pay tax monthly as they earn. There could be unders and overs but, broadly speaking, the tax they pay will be the amount they owe.

The rest of us pay tax on estimated assessments where final assessments have not been issued. The estimated assessments could be under or over but, looking at the big picture, we would expect that the unders and overs would cancel out, more or less, so that for the States, the Treasury position, we are probably not much out of pocket. That is no consolation to individual taxpayers who are waiting for their assessments or their repayments or to have their affairs dealt with. But from the States' point of view, we do not think there is a big pot of uncollected tax out there. When we catch up with the final assessments, we will have a much clearer idea of that. But, at the moment, there is no reason to think that the balance is going to be hugely one way or the other.

Deputy Sloan raised a number of questions that arose out of the Scrutiny Management Committee's open hearing on the accounts; the distinction between unrealised and realised gains seems to cause some confusion. Essentially, to me, there is no real economic difference. If you have a share which has gone up in value, so that at 31st December 2025 it is revalued, you will have a new value which may produce an unrealised gain. But you could, if you wished, do what we call a bed and breakfast, i.e. sell the share and buy it back again on 31st December. If you did that, the unrealised gain, which you were going to report, would become a realised gain. But nothing in substance would have changed. You would end up at the end of that process with exactly the same share, with the same value minus transaction costs.

The point is that there would be no sensible reason to do it, because all you would do is incur transaction costs for the sake of saying, 'Oh, we had an unrealised gain. We have now got a realised gain'. It actually makes no economic difference. I do not think people should get too hung up over that distinction.

Deputy Sloan also mentioned that, as in many sets of accounts, capital expenditure shows up as additions to fixed assets; I think it is in note 17 to the accounts or something like that. We do take on board the point that members of the public, Members of the States might be particularly interested to know how much are we investing in capital assets. So we need to highlight that fact and bring it forward into the Treasurer's Report next year so that it is there at the front of the accounts.

He talked also, as though he found it difficult to understand, about the adjustments to the accounts to arrive at the funding gap. The truth is, these accounts, the 2025 accounts, include, for example, £34 million of tax paid by banks in respect of past years. These were one-off payments to the States of Guernsey in respect of past tax liabilities. That is a one-off. We know that is not going to happen again in 2026.

So if you want to know what the long-term position of the States is, you have to make adjustments for things which are either one-off, i.e. non-recurring expenditure, and you also make adjustments like you add back depreciation, which is a non-cash adjustment in the accounts, and you add on the target level of capital investment, so there is an adjustment there.

These are matters for the debate next month, really, but Members do just need to understand that the 2025 accounts is not the static position. That is not how it will always be. To get to what it is going to look like going forward we need to make some adjustments to the 2025 position. Hopefully those will be clear when we discuss them next month.

Deputy Helyar asked why the Guernsey Housing Association had to be consolidated, and the answer is because we control it. This question has been examined time and again, not only internally but also by the external auditors. The rules under which the Guernsey Housing Association operate basically mean that the States of Guernsey controls it. It is not so much about owning it, although at the end of the day the States of Guernsey does have step-in rights and so on, the basis of consolidation is essentially control. It has been looked at, and I am afraid the result is not what the Guernsey Housing Association might wish.

Deputy Williams, I think was the first to raise the increase in staff numbers. I think actually the total increase of 144 is pretty creditable. First of all, I mentioned in my opening speech that some of those are replacement of agency staff by full-time employees, which saves us money. But, for example, 21 of them were insourced from Agilisys. We bring in staff where we need to, and in some cases it is not like there is an extra person sitting at the desk. It is the same person, but they are now full-time instead of being agency.

Deputy Gollop, yes, the public payroll is increasing but actually I think not wildly out of control. Clearly in an economy where lots of people in the private sector are not receiving pay rises or not receiving pay rises above inflation, the States' payroll structure is undoubtedly pretty burdensome because basically it is an upward ratchet system.

I think Deputy Curgenven's point I can bring in here. The increasing numbers in the higher paid brackets does not indicate, generally speaking, more people being employed in those higher brackets, it means that people we employ got pay rises.

Deputy Ozanne, her concern is about the performance of the investment portfolio. I hope I have addressed that. As for the fact that pensions and benefits are lumped together in the accounts, that is something we could try and add more clarity around next year.

The seized assets fund, it is quite difficult. First of all, when we seize assets as a result typically of a tip-off from a foreign law enforcement agency, we often have an obligation to share the proceeds with the agency that provided the information. So some of it just gets paid off to agencies outside the Island. The rest of it can be used under our rules for fighting crime and stuff like that. There is a process to apply for funds out of the Seized Asset Fund, but I think there is a misconception that this is a pot of money that we could use for anything. We could buy a new X-ray machine: no, under our rules, the money has to be used for fighting crime.

Deputy Vermeulen, yes, Aurigny are still losing money. I believe the trading loss actually in 2025 was smaller than the trading loss in 2024. I am not sure where the numbers he quoted came from, but perhaps those were the liabilities of Aurigny. I believe that the numbers he was quoting may have been the liabilities.

Finally, I suppose, Deputy Collins; yes, I totally agree with him. Guernsey is not broke. In fact, Guernsey has a pretty robust financial position, and we can all be very glad of that. That is the result of years of economic prosperity and generally sensible States controlling expenditure. That does not mean we do not have a problem. That is something we will have to address next month. But it is not a matter of – we are not in crisis. The Island should not be downcast or despondent about our financial situation; Guernsey is in pretty good shape. That is what the 2025 accounts say.

I would ask Members to please support them.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laine, is it your wish to be relevé?

Deputy Laine: Yes, please, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single proposition and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	None	None	Le Brun, Ross
Burford, Yvonne				Leadbeater, Marc
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Van Katwyk, Lee
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				

de Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dorrity, David
Falla, Steve
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Goy, David
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
Rylatt, Tom
Sloan, Andy
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

The Bailiff: In respect of the single Proposition there voted in favour 36 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 4 Members were absent at the vote, and therefore I will declare the proposition carried.

That concludes the business for this special meeting; I hope tomorrow goes as swiftly.

Deputy Van Katwyk: *[Inaudible 10:51:40]*

The Bailiff: What do you want to do about it, Deputy Van Katwyk?

Deputy Van Katwyk: *[Inaudible 10.41.50] (Laughter)*

The Bailiff: The idea that I could fix anything technological is probably a bit of a false hope. I think in those circumstances, nothing can be done. Sorry, what was that?

Deputy Van Katwyk: Just for a matter of record, sir, I would have voted pour.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I wonder if, for the sake of Deputy Van Katwyk being on the record properly, that we might be able to request a revote on this one single issue.

The Bailiff: Under Rule 26B(2):

Any Member may challenge the accuracy of the vote that has just been taken.

There will therefore be a second division on the single proposition. Greffier, can you get that one back and we will run it all again? I will invite the Greffier to open the voting for the second time of asking.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 38, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 2

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

The Bailiff: On this occasion the voting was as follows, there voted in favour of 38 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, but there are 2 Members who are absent at the vote, and therefore I will declare the Proposition duly carried and we will now close the meeting, please, Greffier.

Thank you very much. We have a chance to shine tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 10.55 a.m.