

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 12th JULY 2022

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS..... 5

1. Appointment of the Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee..... 5

1.1 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:	5
1.1.1 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	7
1.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	7
1.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	7
1.1.4 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	8
1.1.5 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	8
1.1.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	9
1.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:	9
1.1.8 Deputy I. Gardiner:	9
1.1.9 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	10
1.1.10 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	10
1.1.11 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	10
1.2 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	11
1.2.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	13
1.2.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	13
1.2.3 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:	13
1.2.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:	14
1.2.5 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	14
1.2.6 Deputy R.J. Ward:	14
1.2.7 Deputy L.J. Farnham:	15
1.2.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	15
1.2.9 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	16
1.2.10 Deputy I. Gardiner:	16
1.2.11 Deputy I. Gardiner:	16
1.2.12 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	16
1.2.13 Deputy M. Tadier:	17
1.2.14 Deputy M. Tadier:	17
1.2.15 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	17

2. Appointment of the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee..... 19

2.1 Deputy L. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	19
2.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:	20
2.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	20
2.1.3 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	21
2.1.4 Deputy M. Andrews of St. Helier North:.....	21
2.1.5 Deputy M. Andrews:.....	21
2.1.6 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:	21

2.1.7 Deputy M. Scott of St. Brelade:.....	22
2.1.8 Deputy E. Millar of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	22
3. Appointment of the Chair of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel	22
3.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	23
3.1.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	25
3.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	25
3.1.3 Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	26
3.1.4 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:.....	26
3.1.5 Deputy I.J. Gorst:.....	26
3.2 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:.....	27
3.2.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	28
3.2.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	28
3.2.3 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:.....	28
3.2.4 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:.....	28
3.2.5 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	29
4. Appointment of the Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel	30
4.1 Deputy R. Kovacs of St. Saviour:.....	30
4.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	32
4.1.2 Deputy H. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	32
4.1.3 Deputy M. Andrews:.....	33
4.1.4 The Connétable of St. Mary:.....	33
4.2 Deputy M. Scott:.....	34
4.2.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	35
5. Appointment of Chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel	37
5.1 Deputy C. Curtis of St. Helier Central:.....	37
5.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:.....	39
5.1.2 Deputy H. Jeune:.....	39
5.1.3 Deputy L. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	39
5.1.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	40
6. Appointment of Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel.....	40
6.1 Deputy R. Ward:.....	42
6.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	44
6.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	44
6.1.3 Deputy L. Stephenson:.....	44
6.1.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	45
6.1.5 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	45
6.1.6 Deputy L. Stephenson:.....	46
6.2 Deputy S.G. Luce:.....	46
6.2.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	48
6.2.2 Deputy J. Renouf:.....	48
6.2.3 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	49
6.2.4 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	49
6.2.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	49
6.2.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	50
6.2.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	50

6.2.8 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	50
6.2.9 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	50
6.2.10 The Connétable of St. Mary:	51
6.2.11 Deputy R. Kovacs:	51
6.2.12 Deputy M. Scott:	51
6.2.13 Deputy M. Scott:	52

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	53
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT	53

7. Appointment of Chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel..... 54

7.1 Deputy G.P. Southern St. Helier Central:	54
7.1.1 Deputy L. Stephenson:.....	56
7.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	56
7.1.3 Deputy M. Andrews:.....	56
7.1.4 Deputy B. Ward:	56
7.1.5 Deputy B. Ward:	56
7.1.6 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	57
7.1.7 The Connétable of St. Brelade:.....	57
7.1.8 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	57
7.1.9 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	57
7.1.10 Deputy M. Tadier:	58
7.1.11 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	58
7.1.12 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	58
7.1.13 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	58
7.1.14 Deputy A. Howell:	59
7.1.15 Deputy R. Kovacs:	59
7.1.16 Deputy M. Tadier:	59

8. Appointment of Chair of the Planning Committee 60

8.1 The Connétable of Trinity:	60
8.1.1 Deputy A. Curtis St. Clement:	62
8.1.2 Deputy A. Curtis:	62
8.1.3 Deputy A. Curtis:	62
8.1.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	63
8.1.5 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	63
8.1.6 Deputy A. Howell:	63
8.1.7 Deputy M. Scott:.....	63
8.1.8 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	64
8.1.9 Deputy A. Curtis:	64
8.1.10 Deputy B. Ward:	64
8.1.11 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:.....	65
8.1.12 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:.....	65
8.1.13 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	65
8.2 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	66
8.2.1 Deputy A. Curtis:	67
8.2.2 Deputy A. Curtis:	68
8.2.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	68
8.2.4 Deputy A. Howell:	69
8.2.5 Deputy M. Scott:.....	69
8.2.6 Deputy A. Curtis:.....	69

8.2.7 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	70
8.2.8 Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin:	70
8.2.9 Deputy M. Scott:	70
8.2.10 Deputy M. Scott:	71
8.2.11 Deputy A. Curtis:	71
8.2.12 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	71
8.2.13 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:	71
8.2.14 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:	72
8.2.15 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:	72

ADJOURNMENT	74
--------------------------	-----------

[9:32]

The Roll was called and the Greffier of the States led the Assembly in Prayer.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The proposition adopted yesterday in relation to removal of jackets remains in effect until the weather conditions moderate.

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS

1. Appointment of the Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move to the Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee under Standing Order 118. I invite Members to nominate a Chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee).

Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

Could I nominate Deputy Alves?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? [**Seconded**] Are there any other nominations?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:

I would like to nominate the Constable of St. Martin.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? [**Seconded**] Are there any other nominations for the Chair of P.P.C.? No. Accordingly, in accordance with the procedure that applied yesterday in relation to Ministers, candidates will speak for up to 10 minutes and then have 20 minutes of questions with the Greffier ringing a bell when the time is up. In accordance with the procedure yesterday, I now invite the Connétable of St. Martin to withdraw from the Chamber. She will be escorted to a quiet room with a member of the States Greffe staff. I invite Deputy Alves to address the Assembly for up to 10 minutes.

1.1 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:

In the last term I served as Vice-Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee for the first few years and when the Chair was made a Minister I was successfully elected as Chair by this Assembly for the last 15 months. During my time on P.P.C. I worked on numerous projects and served on a variety of sub-committees. The main project I worked on was implementing the C.P.A. (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) election observers' recommendations from their 2018 report. This was probably the most controversial thing I worked on, not only for the public but also with Members in this Assembly. Although it was frustrating at times when we did not always get the results we were hoping for, it was extremely important to me that we took the time to listen to the public, negotiate with Members, and undertake research when putting together the various proposals for electoral reform. I was particularly pleased and proud that we were able to achieve a majority support for real change after decades of very little change that made a positive impact to this Assembly and our voters. I do recognise that this is still a controversial area with some members of the public having aired their contempt at losing the Island-wide vote. Whatever happens, it is important that we remember that the Assembly agreed that fair representation and equality in voting weight and power across the whole population should be the basis for any reform of the composition and election of the States. It is also important to keep in mind the recommendations from the 2018 report with regards to simplifying the system, and I look forward to seeing the full report from this year's C.P.A. B.I.M.R. (British Islands and Mediterranean Region) election observers' mission. An area that is particularly close to my heart is addressing the lack of political education and awareness

in our Island and as a result I set up a sub-committee to address the lack of political education in schools and the wider community. In the last term I was able to receive official approval from the Curriculum Council to trial a new scheme of work on Jersey politics in schools but unfortunately due to COVID was unable to get into schools to implement this trial. This is something I would be keen to pursue regardless of whether I am elected as Chair or not. It is also crucial that we continue to reach out to all areas of the community and work with Government to implement the recommendations in the Island Identity report published by Deputy Labey, particularly those in chapter 2, which I contributed to, and I thank the Deputy for allowing me and inviting me on to this policy board. Another area which was started but unfortunately not completed, was the automatic voter registration and digital voter register system. This needs to be given priority. The fact that voters were once again turned away from polling stations as they were not at the right one or were told that they were not registered in time to vote for this election is appalling. It is my view that having an automatic voter registration and digital voter register database could revolutionise the way we do things for elections and not only addresses some of the initial issues highlighted in the E.O.M. (election observers' mission) preliminary statement but it also streamlines the work done by the Parishes, who do a fantastic job of running the elections, and it would increase efficiency. However, in order for this to become a reality there needs to be a universal identity computer system in Government, which also communicates with Parishes. At the moment the Government has a number of different systems across all departments which means that each individual on this Island has their identity recorded in different ways from department to department. I was pleased to hear the Chief Minister's comments regarding voters' rights during the Chief Minister election last week. So, I hope the Government will support this work as not only will it benefit the public as voters but having a universal database will also have applications across all departments, increasing productivity, improving the quality of data held by Government and long-term savings. In addition to my work on P.P.C., I undertook some professional development and successfully completed the C.P.A. election observers' programme and the Professional Development Certificate in Parliamentary Governance run by McGill University. Both these courses have given me a good understanding of best practice for democratic legislators and an insight into areas that we need to work on as a parliamentary body. As a result of my work on P.P.C. and completing these courses, I was invited to give a lecture in September to the new cohort at McGill University as a first for the university, who had never invited a past participant back to do this. This highlighted to me the importance of sharing best practice and also sharing methods to achieve positive change with colleagues around the world. I would like to look at how we can find a way of doing this on a more regular and formal basis. There have been some massive improvements in the support resources available to States Members and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the States Greffe Department who have been and continue to be invaluable to us. But I think Members would agree that there is still more work to be done, specifically around dealing with constituents' queries, communications and professional development. At the end of last term, a quick review of the C.P.A. recommended benchmarks for democratic legislators was done with a small sub-committee, and a report was published which shows areas in which we are and are not compliant with. I would like to see us address these areas where we are not fully compliant sooner rather than later. When I was elected Chair in the last term it was important to me that my newly formed committee included representatives from all sectors of the Assembly. I had representation from each category of States Member, including two Constables, and with the emergence of new parties and movements, I feel it is vital more now than ever that everyone feels represented and heard on P.P.C. P.P.C. is required to work across all roles of the Assembly and is here to support and assist Members but also uphold conduct, rules and improvement in our governance. I have shown my ability to work through contentious issues such as the electoral changes and improvements to rules that govern us as a body. In addition, machinery of government changes that may need to be made will require a Chair to work consistently, fairly and appropriately with Government to achieve the best outcomes for the public we serve.

[9:45]

Even during some of the most difficult times I have always endeavoured to support and assist Members as much as possible regardless of our politics. I hope I have shown I am able to work with all Members, that I am approachable, adaptable and determined to achieve best outcomes for our Assembly, Members and the public. It was a pleasure to serve on P.P.C. in the last term and it would be a privilege to serve again as P.P.C. Chair for this next term. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Alves. The first question for Deputy Alves is from the Connétable of St. Lawrence.

1.1.1 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

From previously being able to vote for their Constable for 10 Senators, and for 2 Deputies, a total of 13 elected representatives, electoral reform slashed the choice for St. Lawrence parishioners to being able to vote for only 5 Members of this Assembly. How would the Deputy attempt to convince the electorate of St. Lawrence that they have not been disenfranchised?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I thank the Connétable for her question. I think there needs to be a body of work around what the current voting system means. Although I can understand that obviously the quantity of votes that a member of the public from St. Lawrence can vote for has decreased, the voting power of each vote is much more equally balanced than it was before. I do not think it is fair that one person who lives on one side of a boundary of a Parish, their vote had a lot bigger weighting than somebody who lives on the other side. During our electoral reform roadshows that we did, when we first brought the proposition last term, we received a letter from a parishioner in St. Clement who said they did not feel like they wanted to vote anymore - this was before the changes - because they knew that the weight of their vote was not as equal as somebody else in another Parish. I can understand people's frustrations regarding the number of votes that they can cast but I think it is really important that people understand that this is about equality and that their vote is weighted the same, regardless of where they live.

1.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

The roadshow in St. Lawrence made it clear to the representatives of P.P.C. when they held it that they did not want the changes to take place. How does the Deputy feel she can justify ignoring the will of the parishioners of St. Lawrence and, may I add, other Parishes in which the roadshow attended?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

We did do a whole body of work as well, where we did focus groups and surveys. Ultimately, we were working on the recommendations from the E.O.M. report. Sometimes this Assembly has done things that are often very unpopular with the public but are for the greater good. For example, I was not in the Assembly at the time but when G.S.T. (goods and services tax) came to the Assembly I remember that there were very long petitions that had been created against it, and yet this Assembly still implemented it. As difficult as it is, we do have to think of the greater good and this is about achieving balance and equality.

1.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The candidate did touch on it in her opening speech but would she comment on the value that she puts as P.P.C. Chair on outreach and also, in particular, outreach with minority communities, bearing in mind that she is a bilingual Member of this Assembly in the 2 majority languages of the Island? Does she think that, in particular, is an advantage for any Chair of P.P.C.?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I thank the Deputy for his question. I did touch on it in my speech, and I think it is a really important piece of work that we need to pursue. Unfortunately, I hate using this as an excuse, but it has been a major issue. COVID has really got in the way of us doing more outreach work in the last term. With the Diversity Forum however, myself and Deputy Doublet, who was the Chair of the Diversity Forum, did do an event in St. Helier Parish Hall, which was quite successful, which invited some people from the minority communities to come along and have a chat, and learn about how the Assembly works and what they can do to stand for election. I would like to see a lot more events like that. My initial ideas were to get out into events that are run throughout the year. For example, we have a very successful Portuguese food fair and it would be really good if vote.je, for example, had a gazebo there where they were able to disseminate information, talk to people, make people aware of their voting rights because it is something that even in this election people were still surprised they only require 2 years' residency to vote. To answer the second part of the Deputy's question, whether I think it is an advantage to have someone who is from a minority community themselves as Chair, it is important to have a diverse committee, much like we have in our Assembly, and whether that would be me as Chair or me as a member, whatever happens, I think it is important to have that representation on the committee.

1.1.4 Deputy M. Tadier:

In terms of public engagement, does the current Chair believe that part of the problem is that when the public have seen year after year people getting returned to an Assembly unopposed and they have not had local elections in their area it is understandable of course that they will have therefore an affinity with the Island-wide mandate? But does she think that it is important at this election, which has seen a great diversity with the Deputies' benches, more women than ever - the majority - that we do not throw the baby out with the bathwater and that we allow the system to really engage with the public on that level?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Yes, I would 100 per cent agree with what the Deputy has said there. I think COVID provided its challenges in that although we were able to get electoral change through the Assembly, we were not necessarily able to get the information out to the public with enough time. This was highlighted obviously as well on election day. It was also stated in the preliminary statement where there were still some teething problems with regards to where people were unsure where they were meant to be voting on the day. I think that this is all very new. Obviously, we have not really had an opportunity to get out there and do a lot of outreach work. The Greffe did a fantastic job in the very short space of time that they had but I do think we need to give it a chance and some more time to let things bed in.

1.1.5 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

My question is about the Diversity Forum. Would the candidate re-establish this as a sub-committee of P.P.C.? What would she do to continue the work towards making our Assembly more inclusive? I would like her to address gender and disability but also any other issues within her answer please.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Yes, I would expect the Diversity Forum to be a standing forum now going forward. I think there is still a lot of work again that we need to do outreach-wise. There is also a lot of work that we need to do even with regard to disability and making things accessible for people. One example is that on election day there was not necessarily material that was available for those who are visually impaired. There also was not, for example, signs - I am sorry the word escapes me; is it braille - for people who cannot see and read with their fingers. Ultimately, we need to do a whole engagement programme

and reach out to organisations as well and get their feedback on what they think we should be doing to reach out and increase diversity.

1.1.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Just to clarify the question. So, a Diversity Forum of course is working on the Assembly as a Parliament rather than the wider issues, so perhaps the candidate could just elaborate further on how, as a Parliament with the current Members that we have, we could be more inclusive in terms of gender and disability? But also, as well in terms of being a family-friendly Parliament and a carer-friendly Parliament.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I thank the Deputy for her question. I think there are probably things in Standing Orders that need to be looked at again to ensure that our Assembly is as family friendly as possible. A lot of the time was spent last year on debating whether we should be sitting late, for example. This not only put those who have caring responsibilities in a difficult situation, it also frustrated the public. So I think we need to look at Standing Orders again and how we can tighten that up to ensure that we are as inclusive and accommodating as possible.

1.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

The Deputy mentioned in her speech that we attended together the course on Parliamentary Governance at McGill University. What is the Deputy planning to do to encourage more Members to take the course and make up their professional education?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I am sure as the Deputy knows, obviously I do not have the power to make anything compulsory for Members to attend. The particular course that I mentioned in my speech, I know that the Deputy also did with me. I think it would be really useful to work with the C.P.A. to be able to have courses like that on a much more regular basis. That particular course was only open to those who were newly elected in the last 2 years and there were parts of that course that I think would be really useful to Members regardless of where they are in their political careers. So, I think it would be a case of reaching out to the C.P.A. and improving the communication to Members as to exactly what is available and maybe dedicate specific professional development time during the weeks when we are not in the States Assembly where Members can sign up for courses.

1.1.8 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Continuing professional development is an integral part of any organisation. Is the Deputy planning to create a programme for the States Members to work on their continuing professional development?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I think it would be difficult to put together a programme that would suit every single Member because every Member has a different area of specialism, for example, or a different area of interest, although I hope that the new Members found the induction programme useful because that has changed a lot from when I was elected last term, with the help of the Greffe who were very responsive in that. I think there is definitely scope to ensure there is a resource or an area where Members are aware of exactly what courses are available to them, but I think implementing a programme as such would be difficult, also with the fact that Members have their time stretched in all different directions with different responsibilities. So, I think having a concrete programme would make it less accessible to Members. I think it would be more useful just to make Members aware of all the courses that are available and Members can sign up as and when.

1.1.9 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Much is discussed about equality of voting. Would the Deputy be supportive of an Island-wide vote for all?

[10:00]

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I was asked this during the election campaign on various occasions. I will say that as a party and personally we have always advocated one type of States Member. Now, whether that is all Senators or all Deputies I think would not really matter, to be honest. For me, I just do not want to go backwards to the 3 categories. I think the last report that we had and reports before, and even the referendum because the changes that have just been implemented were basically the implementation of the result of the referendum ... I would not want to go backwards to 3 categories. One of the things that was highlighted in that report from 2018 was that our system was complicated and cumbersome. Those were the exact words that were used and I think going backwards and having 3 categories is not going to make it any simpler.

1.1.10 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

My apologies, I did not mean going back to 3 categories. What I mean is an Island-wide vote for all because the public, quite clearly, want the ability to vote for whoever they want to vote for. What I am asking is an Island-wide vote for all.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Can I just clarify? When you say Island-wide vote for all, is that including the Constables or not including the Constables?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

I would be happy for her to give her view on either way, whether that includes the Constables or removes the Constables, but I think from the perspective of the voters, equality for them was being able to choose out of the 49 of us who they wanted to vote for.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I thank the Deputy for her question. I think that whatever changes we do now we need to make sure that we do research, that we go out to the public, that we bring the public with us. I am open to change as long as we keep the equality of voting. The Deputy is right, having an Island-wide only mandate would do that. My concern would still be around the Constables and the weighting of their votes in the Assembly. However, if it is the will of the public then so be it. I think Members have to remember that this committee is not just me. I am simply the spokesperson for the Members on the committee. Last term there were a number of times where I did not necessarily agree with what I was proposing but I did it nonetheless because that was the majority support within the committee.

1.1.11 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Many Islanders will feel that, as States Members, we are grossly overpaid and grossly underworked, but many of us know that the reality is quite different. My question is - and this is a difficult issue and I think we have avoided this for too long - does she think that the levels of pay for States Members are appropriate and are they attracting or allowing for the very best members of our society to stand and serve in this Assembly? As an addendum to that question, does she believe that there should be different levels of pay depending on the roles carried out by Members? If the answer to either of those questions is yes, would she undertake for the P.P.C. to work on this as a matter of urgency? I know it is not popular, it is never popular when we discuss these issues, but the reality is I think we have to face up to those difficult questions and not back off from making changes to ensure this Assembly can facilitate Members from all of society.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

I thank the Deputy for this I think very important question. He is absolutely right, it is not an easy subject. I personally will say that I did take a pay cut when I stood for this role and I know that there are also other Members that have done the same. I do not believe that the current remuneration is appropriate and is attracting the very best to stand. However, I do realise that there is quite a gap in the public knowledge and perception of what it is that we do. I will be honest, from the outside before I became a States Member I did not really understand the level of work that it involves. Obviously before I stood I found out and I spoke with my party, but I think there is a body of work that needs to be done there. Just to touch on the different levels, I think it is very difficult to justify paying people different levels because the different roles come with different levels of support. I think whatever happens, the new remuneration thing that we have in place where we do not have the remuneration body anymore, we have a rolling reviewer or board that will be set up every year, I am hoping they will be a lot more open to looking at this properly and also maybe doing some outreach work as well to the public or to help us to do that outreach work to the public to really make the public aware of the work that this role entails.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Alves. That completes the period of questions for you. I am now going to invite you to leave the meeting and, I think as you know, you are going to join a separate one and be sort of notionally locked in a room, in a virtual room with a member of the Greffe staff.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Thank you, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I invite the Connétable of St. Martin to return to the Chamber.

1.2 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

I am running for Chair of P.P.C. because I believe that I have the skills, drive and commitment to successfully enhance the States Assembly and deliver a more democratic and politically engaged Island. To address the elephant in the room, it has been pointed out to me that I am a Constable going for P.P.C. Well, yes, I am. I am a Constable and I am proud of the position and I am a very progressive Constable. My interest in P.P.C. is clearly demonstrated through my past membership of the committee and my successful propositions on campaign finance reform and the introduction of the “none of the above candidates” ballot option at contested elections, which I believe has successfully demonstrated itself a worthwhile and competitive innovation. Furthermore, I believe that this ballot option represents my skill for fresh thinking and my willingness to consider new ideas to solve longstanding problems. We have a clear vision of the work programme for the new P.P.C. and I am eager to get this underway as soon as possible. However, there are also some areas that I believe we can go further on in order to meet the challenges ahead. We need to continue to address both the recommendations of the previous Assembly’s Democratic Accountability and Governance Sub-Committee, which was very ably led by former Senator Vallois, and the findings of the upcoming report on the electoral observers’ mission. Work on the corporate parenting action plan will need to begin and remote participation will require further consideration. Likewise, we have the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association benchmarks, which will need to be addressed over the coming term. We will also need to establish an independent panel on States Members that will appoint a reviewer who will themselves review the amount of remuneration and allowances payable to a States Member. The new P.P.C. has 2 critical areas to address around standards, the first a recruitment of the new Commissioner for Standards to replace Paul Kernaghan, who will be leaving his role in February 2023 after almost 6 years of outstanding service. I look forward to collaborating with our sister Island of Guernsey in delivering a joint recruitment exercise on this in the autumn. In

tandem, I believe it is vital that the new P.P.C. responds to the work of the Diversity Forum and begins work on drafting a behaviour code for Members, which I believe will be absolutely essential for the development and promotion of an inclusive and well-run Assembly. I am determined to deliver this by the end of our term of office and I believe that it is of fundamental importance that it is able to address the needs and concerns of Members and provides necessary safeguards against their abuse. It is for this reason that I believe that it is vital that we continue with a Diversity Forum sub-committee during this Assembly in order to promote greater diversity, inclusivity and engagement with and from Islanders and I would welcome Members to register their interest in joining the forum should I be elected as Chair. The Island has elected 35 independents and 14 members of 4 different political parties. It is clear from the number of candidates who stood as party members that it may not always be the case that the Island selects a majority independent Assembly. Therefore, it is absolutely critical that this P.P.C. addresses the work undertaken by the committee responsible for researching how Standing Orders might respond to the formation of political parties and addresses any remaining concerns around funding and administration. I want to ensure that this Assembly gives no preference to parties nor to independents but instead provides an equal playing field without loopholes or deficits. Those who are familiar with me know that I am fiercely independent and will not be swayed by partisan or anti-partisan sympathies. I believe in fairness and equality and now a collective mandate from the public, and this is why I believe that I am in an excellent position to deliver as Chair of P.P.C. I am determined to see the delivery of proper office space for Members during this term. The Members from the previous Assembly will know how important this is and the new Members might be surprised and frustrated by the lack of facilities. I will work hard with the new committee and the Government of Jersey to achieve this. An amendment to last year's Government Plan has committed us to a feasibility study of 4 identified sites for this work and it is imperative that the committee begins work on this as soon as possible. I also intend to work with the Government, Constables and other key stakeholders to provide working space for Members in their districts and Parishes, a challenge that I believe we can quickly resolve. It is of fundamental importance that we review the strengths and weaknesses of our new electoral system and consider its alternative. This, of course, includes Deputy Gorst's proposition on restoring the Senatorial mandate. The new system has delivered welcome change in the composition of the Assembly but failed in increasing voter turnout. Many people have voiced frustration at the loss of the Island-wide mandate and the differing number of votes an individual may have depending on where they are registered. I do not want to immediately commit to any revised system due to the lingering questions over its composition, voting system and other related concerns. Instead, we need to give Islanders the opportunity and the agency to discuss, consider and shape Jersey's electoral system in a way that guarantees a genuine solution that satisfies Islanders, international standards and our commitment to diversity and inclusion. For those who are interested in my views on the recall mechanism discussed in P.P.C.'s legacy report, I believe that this may be the best place to develop it for the Assembly to consider later on in its term. I believe it is fundamentally vital that P.P.C. is able to take Islanders on this journey and give them the chance to provide input and ideas along the way. We need to actively show the public that electoral reform and the rest of the Assembly's work is not something that happens behind the scenes but is in fact an active, continuously evolving opportunity that they have the power to implement. It is for this reason that I do not wish to rule out any potential mechanisms or options through which we can deliver this.

[10:15]

This opportunity for further engagement extends to our need to address turnout. Turnout at last month's election remains lower than we should ever feel comfortable with. It is for this reason that I want us to do more with the Youth Parliament and Youth Assembly alongside other initiatives to strengthen the engagement of children and young people in working with elected Members in shaping the future of the Island, while looking at other opportunities from across the board to deliver greater public participation and deliberation for all ages and communities in Jersey. For the past 2 years the

States Greffe has organised a democracy week and I believe that P.P.C. must do more to support its organisation and the opportunities it provides. As we saw with the success of the Corn Riots Festival, there are incredible possibilities available for us to develop the Island's democratic culture and engagement and we need to use our talents, our connections and our resources to make our democracy as fun and as engaging as possible for everybody in Jersey. To conclude, P.P.C. has its work cut out but I believe that by working together in an inclusive and holistic way that prizes innovation and new ideas, while guaranteeing Islanders the opportunity to help shape this work, we can successfully deliver not just a fairer, more equal and more dynamic Assembly but a more engaged, more democratic and more exciting future for Jersey.

1.2.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

This Assembly is the most diverse and representative that Jersey has ever had. Does the candidate regard this as merely a coincidence or does she regard it as a consequence of having a fairer and more balanced voting system than Jersey has ever had as well?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am delighted that we have such a diverse Assembly that is much more reflective of the Island as a whole and I would say that, yes, it has a lot to do with the reforms that we put in place.

1.2.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am pleased with that answer. I share the candidate's view there. Would she, therefore, agree that having taken this step in having a fairer, simpler and more balanced voting system, that in exploring any potential options we should not seek to throw the baby out with the bathwater and make sure that if there is to be any change in future that it is absolutely the type of change that moves us forward and not simply go backwards to the system that was essentially imposed on the Island by the British Home Office in 1947 and which, let us be honest, nobody really liked?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Actually quite a few people did like it but, no, I concur with the Deputy. We have moved forward. I do not think there is any place for retrograde steps. I said in my speech that I want to have a conversation with the public and everyone else. I think that we just need to tweak. There are some tweaks that we need to the system. Some people did feel a bit disenfranchised, if you are in an area where you have 3 votes and someone else has 5 votes, that they see that there is more voting equity in the Assembly but, as I hopefully pointed out really well, I am somebody who would not want to go back for the sake of it. I think we have to move forward. I think there is a lot we can do to engage with the public on this and do the right thing, because it is fantastic. If I can say this, the first day that we sat to say goodbye to the Governor, having sat in the Assembly before, it was just amazing for me as a woman to look around and see so many women in here. **[Approbation]** I am not going backwards.

1.2.3 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:

Does the candidate find it a problem that the presence of the Constables in the States Assembly can produce extremely unfair results, such as a vote about a matter of extreme importance for St. Helier, which is lost by one vote and the Constable of St. Mary, for example, will be exercising the rights of 1,800 voters and the Constable of St. Helier exercising the rights of approximately 18,000 voters and, therefore, the voters of St. Mary can be said to have had a lot more influence over that decision than the voters of St. Helier? How can that be resolved? It is a problem we have now and it is going to persist until it is resolved.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It is something that we need to do some work on, but then all the districts were not completely fair. Some of them had 1,000 more voters than other districts, so what are we going to do? Are we going

to split up the Island into tiny little individual areas? We can look at that. I think Constables are essential for the well-being of the Island and a lot of the Constables do a huge amount of work. I do a huge amount of constituency work and I have put in 5 propositions, so I do just as much work as a Deputy would. That is something that we really do have to look at. I am not a genius; I do not have the answer to that right away but, yes, we will look at voter inequity.

1.2.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I would also like to know whether the candidate feels that “none of the above” was a useful addition to the voting this time round and whether that, particularly as it affected Constable candidates, is something that she would seek to keep going with?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I think from the feedback I have had it was a success. It was obviously a very new innovation and will need some tweaking before the next election but it got everybody out. On nomination night I did become a Constable-elect, like I did 4 years ago, which was a complete shock to me. We all went out, we all got voted, we all are in here with a mandate. I know it was more difficult in some of the areas but I do think that in 4 years’ time I would like to see that all the Constables have opposition, and that is not ... I honestly think that. I think that is good for democracy and I think that we have brought the Constables forward with N.O.T.A. (none of the above), that we are more relevant, more seen in the public’s eye and more people will realise that they can go for the position. I know I brought it and I am not usually one to praise myself but I think it was a great success.

1.2.5 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

Can I ask a question in regard to “none of the above”? Given that “none of the above” was not a campaign, or it was not in most areas, does the Constable think that there may be a consideration of “none of the above” having to reach a percentage in order to be influential, seeing as you have got somebody standing canvassing and knocking on every door but “none of the above” cannot knock on any doors. Do you foresee a future where a percentage is agreed upon by P.P.C. when “none of the above” would be effective rather than just a straight majority?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

That is a good point to have made. I had not thought of that. As I said, N.O.T.A. this time was not perfect. It was a new innovation. It did bring people out to vote and it is something that, as I said, I am very open to looking at because I do think that N.O.T.A. was not perfect at all but it was a step in the right direction, so I would look at that.

1.2.6 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I genuinely do not know my opinion on this so I am genuinely interested in the candidate’s opinion. Would part of that be the introduction of compulsory voting so that if “none of the above” is there, there will have to be a genuine decision by all voters registered? What does the candidate think of that sort of concept to increase turnout?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I know that in Australia there is compulsory voting. We have such poor voter turnout, and especially in St. Helier it is appalling. Whoever has P.P.C. this year, we really have to work on getting more people out to vote. I think that something we could really look at is compulsory voting. For example, I will have my Rates Assembly on Thursday night. We will probably have about 60 people. I know that at St. Helier’s Rates Assembly last week I think there were 17 members of the public and 7 Deputies there. There is something that we really do need to do to engage and, as I said, I want to try and get out more events to reach everybody in whatever culture you are, whatever you are, to really engage people in democracy. I am somebody who has been very heavily involved in politics since I was about 11 years old and so to me it is second nature, but I want that interest and that

excitement about democracy and voting to be shared by everybody, so I would do everything in my power to achieve this.

1.2.7 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Does the Connétable believe that the package, the remuneration on offer to States Members is sufficient to attract or indeed enable all members of our society to stand and be represented in this Assembly? As an addendum to that question, does she also believe that there should be different levels of pay for States Members depending on the role they are elected to perform by this Assembly? If the answer to any of those questions is yes, would she undertake to deal with that as an important issue on the new agenda for P.P.C.? I know it is never a popular issue to deal with, looking at how we are compensated for doing this job, but I believe it is an urgent one if we are to attract and enable all members of our community to have the option of serving in this Assembly.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I thank the Deputy for that question. I addressed part of that in my speech when I said that if I had P.P.C. I would be getting an independent reviewer to look at States Members' remuneration. It has been mentioned to me in the copy room yesterday would I look at tiered pay for States Members. What worries me is the perception that you could have more pay if you are Chief Minister or you are a Minister but I think that rules out the fact that if you are a Scrutiny Chair you have just as much work to do if you are fulfilling the role properly. So, yes, I am more than open to look at this and if Members want P.P.C. to do that, I am very open to undertaking that piece of work but, as I said, we are looking to get an independent reviewer to look at States pay because it is very important. We do not want to miss out on really good candidates because of the pay.

1.2.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

The candidate has already indicated that she would re-establish the Diversity Forum. Could she elaborate on this and explain what work she would do to carry on with the progress that we have made in terms of the Assembly, once they are in here, being more inclusive? Would she touch on gender and disability, please, so the Assembly once we are here, not the wider world but as a Parliament, being more inclusive?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I was on the Diversity sub-committee and it was a successful sub-committee. We need to make this building, if we can, more accessible. I have a good rapport with Vic Tanner Davy and Liberate and they went round and did an audit on all the Parish Halls and public halls about accessibility. I want to make sure that nobody is singled out because of any differences whatsoever, so I think that comes down into another part of the work here to make sure that everyone is treated equally. I am not quite sure exactly what you want me to answer on this one or what you are looking for. It sounds really generic but it is.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Through the Chair, Connétable.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry. We would be looking at more accessibility, more support for people if they need support. I also think the fact that we would hopefully quickly get some rooms for States Members or offices in Parishes or districts would also help a lot with inclusion because at the moment we are fractured. There is nowhere for anybody to work. If we can all come in together and work in offices that are central and near to Broad Street or near to the Greffe, I think that is a great step forward.

[10:30]

1.2.9 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Two further areas in terms of does the candidate think we could be more inclusive as an Assembly in terms of being a family-friendly Assembly and being carer friendly, what would the candidate do to improve those areas?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, I absolutely want it to be more family friendly. I think last time we did pass that if you were late for roll call you could cite parental issues, which we had never had before, so we can do further on that. I know that there are a lot of people in the Assembly now with young children. If I get the Chairmanship of this, I will then seek to work with everybody with young children or people who are carers to find out how we can make the Assembly more family friendly. We do have a diverse Assembly in here. We do not want to discriminate against anybody and we do not want to discriminate people if they have young children or caring responsibilities or anything like that, so I would do my best.

1.2.10 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Continuing professional development is an integral part of any organisation. What plans would the candidate propose to include continuing professional development for the States Members?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

That is a wide question because if you become Chair of the committee then you can look at what we need to be trained in and what we need to do. That would be something that I would look at as a priority, that if we have gaps in whatever area - it is such a wide question - yes, I would look at continuing training for the Assembly but I would have to know exactly what continuing training we needed to have. I would not want to spend good money on getting trainers in just for the sake of having trainers, just to have said that we had done some training. We would want to know exactly what we want to have training in and then I would look to facilitating that but at the moment ... I do not know if the Deputy has anything in mind that she wants training in.

1.2.11 Deputy I. Gardiner:

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Academy is offering a Parliamentary Governance course. How would the candidate encourage Members to take this course to learn about parliament and governance?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Firstly, I would encourage Members to become members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. It is an amazing association to be a member of. They offer the most fantastic courses and opportunities. So obviously if I am Chair of P.P.C. I would speak with the Chair of ... well, I hopefully will be a member of the C.P.A., I am aiming to be a member of that. I will know when the courses are and then I can independently send out the courses to every single States Member to see whether they would like to take part in it.

1.2.12 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

What is the Constable's view on Island-wide voting for all? There has been much discussion about the equality of voting and there seems to be some idea that we should bring back Senators. However, the question I am asking is Island-wide voting for all.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I stood outside my public hall for most of the day on election day and I would say that probably 80 per cent of voters wanted Island-wide voting or they wanted the Senators back. This is something

that I have said that we will look at but we will look at with the public. I am not quite sure how we would do it. I am not thinking of a referendum. I am just saying that somehow, I will find a way that we will engage with the public. Maybe it will be going round to public halls, Parish halls, town halls, but we will do it in a much more proactive way than happened before. I think we need to have a big conversation because I think some people feel disenfranchised because of the Senators but they do not really understand how we have moved forward. There is a huge swell of interest in having Island-wide voting. I am not averse to it at all, but it is something that we really have to work on and find out if that is the way that we have to move forward.

1.2.13 Deputy M. Tadier:

The candidate talked about voter equity in terms of the number of votes. Does she agree that one solution is to give everybody one vote? In fact, this was a recommendation in 2013 by Dr. Andrew Renwick where he said it would be clearly advantageous to introduce alternative voting in single-member constituencies and that there should be a single vote system for multiple seats in the Deputies elections. Does she understand that logic and would she look into that?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I had a chat with my son about that and, yes, it is something I would look at.

1.2.14 Deputy M. Tadier:

Does she recognise that it is a problem when you potentially have people getting elected who do not have the confidence of more than 50 per cent of those who have voted? That does happen in our area. It happened to me. I think I got 47 per cent of those who voted but I still got elected and that does not necessarily bode well in having a mandate.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, I will look at that and I can stand here and say as somebody who got 95 per cent of my vote, honestly, I would look into that.

1.2.15 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

The candidate was a member of the former P.P.C. Will she explain why they did not introduce electronic voting for the last election?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, I can do that. I was only a member of P.P.C. for the last year, but a company had been commissioned to look at electronic voting and, in a nutshell, they let us down really badly. So we do need to have another look at this again. It was not from the want of P.P.C. to have it done; it was just that we were let down by the company.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. That includes the period of questions. I now ask Deputy Alves to re-join the meeting and we will wait for that to occur. Thank you, Deputy Alves. You are back?

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you. I wanted to make sure you are here. Now both candidates have spoken and answered questions. We now move to the vote and there are 2 candidates so we will use the electronic voting in the Chamber. Any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Alves should press the *pour* button, any Member wishing to vote for the Connétable of St. Martin should press the *contre* button. Members retain the option of abstaining, for which they can press the relevant button. In respect of those

joining us remotely, they can either vote pour or contre in the way I have just described or identify the name of the candidate that they wish to vote for. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the outcome of the election is that Deputy Alves received 21 votes, the Connétable of St. Martin received 28 votes, and accordingly the Connétable has been elected Chair of P.P.C. **[Approbation]**

Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central: 21		Connétable of St. Martin: 28		Abstain: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy M. Tadier		Connétable of Trinity		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Connétable of St. Martin		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy I. Gardiner		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy J. Renouf		Deputy C.F. Labey		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy K.F. Morel		
Deputy H.L. Jeune		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Deputy M.E. Millar		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy R.S. Kovacs		Deputy I.J. Gorst		
Deputy B. Ward		Deputy L.J. Farnham		
Deputy K.M. Wilson		Deputy K.L. Moore		
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy M.B. Andrews		Deputy D.J. Warr		
		Deputy H.M. Miles		
		Deputy M.R. Scott		
		Deputy R.E. Binet		
		Deputy A. Howell		
		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
		Deputy A.F. Curtis		

2. Appointment of the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee

The Deputy Bailiff:

In accordance with Standing Order 119, the Assembly is due to appoint a new Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. I invite Members to make nominations for the Chair of this committee.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I would like to nominate Deputy Feltham as a candidate for the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee? Accordingly, I invite Deputy Feltham to speak for up to 10 minutes and then after to take some questions for up to 20 minutes.

2.1 Deputy L. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

I would like to begin by thanking Deputy Gardiner for proposing me and for the work that she has done in her time as Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. **[Approbation]** She and her team have left a comprehensive legacy report. I promise that I will continue the work with as much dedication and diligence as she has shown during her tenure. I am pleased to be nominated for the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee as I have had a long-held commitment to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the public sector. The key difference between the P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee) and other areas of Scrutiny is that it looks at the public administration and policy implementation rather than scrutinising the policy itself. As an experienced public servant and having worked in the public sector locally and in Australia, I understand the operational mechanisms within the public service. During my career I have managed diverse teams, been a member of national working groups and worked with colleagues from all tiers of government. As Chair of P.A.C., this insight will enable me to be effective from the start. I worked for the State Government of Western Australia for 10 years. During that time, I managed a team responsible for developing and delivering regional arts and cultural policy over the geographically large state, supporting the development of the creative industries, delivering arts and cultural inclusion programmes and managing funding contracts with organisations in receipt of public funding. I was also part of a senior management team, acting at director level and overseeing significant contract negotiations and relationships with funded organisations, local government, other state government departments, regional development commissions and federal government agencies. I always made sure that we had measures in place to ensure that public funds were being spent for the proper purposes, key performance indicators were in place and that those in receipt of funding were required to report on how the money was spent and the subsequent outcome for the community.

[10:45]

During that time, I was fortunate to work closely with public sector leaders pioneering the delivery of public value-based policy frameworks before they were commonplace. This gave me experience in producing public value-based policy and developing suitable measures to assess delivery and its effect on the community. This experience will be particularly valuable in the role of Chair of P.A.C. Over the past few years the need to hold the C.E.O. (chief executive officer) and other senior officers to account has been drawn sharply into focus. As a union leader, I have had first-hand experience of the impact of target operating models on departments as well as questioning the directors general and S.E.B. (States Employment Board) representatives about their effect on staff and service delivery. I have never shied away from challenging those in power and I am always willing to ask tough questions even when I have been at a lower pay grade than the person I am questioning. The knowledge I have gained through my union role means that I have an overview of the operational model of all government departments, enabling me to be efficient and effective in P.A.C. In both

Australia and Jersey, I have been involved in implementing project management frameworks. I am also a certified PRINCE2 practitioner. This means I have practical knowledge of how government projects are implemented on the ground and what best practice looks like. As I have practical knowledge, this will ensure that I will remain pragmatic in my approach when making my analysis. No matter what our political ideology is, we all seem to agree on the need to ensure that public funds are being spent in the way that it was intended by the Assembly and that extravagance and wasteful spending should be eradicated. We all must ensure that sound financial practices and decision-making processes are applied throughout our public administration. I would also like to acknowledge the work done by the Comptroller and Auditor General and I would look forward to forming a positive working relationship with her and her office. In my public service career I have always placed a high value on the audit process and the opportunity it allows departments to gain an objective and impartial insight into their operations. As Chair of P.A.C., I would ensure that the recommendations of the C.A.G. (Comptroller and Auditor General) are well understood and acted upon. I am sure that we all want our public sector to continuously improve its service delivery. As Chair of P.A.C., one of my priorities will be to follow up on recommendations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General and ensure that directors general are implementing actions to address them. An essential first step for the new Chair will be to establish the committee. I would take an inclusive approach to build a team that has the breadth of experience required to fulfil the duties of the committee. The opportunity to join the committee as a lay member must be well-publicised so that we can attract the best candidates. As I mentioned earlier, I thank the outgoing committee for their legacy report and the invaluable advice contained within it for the incoming committee and its suggestions for follow-up work. This will be the starting reference point I will use to devise a work plan with the new committee. I ask the States Assembly to support me so that we can work together to ensure that our public services are being delivered in the most efficient and effective way possible.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Feltham. Towards the end of your speech there was some ping-pong from my left. Was it you, Connétable of St. Martin? In that case, you will make the usual contribution of £10.

2.1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I congratulate the Deputy on the role. Can I ask a practical question on how the Deputy will go about recruiting lay members? It may be an opportunity for her to advertise the role publicly as well because I know they are a really important part of the Public Accounts Committee.

Deputy L. Feltham:

Yes, and I know it was also very important to Deputy Gardiner that the role was advertised as well. I think it is important that it is advertised broadly and potentially we need to do some kind of public meeting where people can come and find out about it. Lots of us did surgeries and invited people to come and speak with us during the election campaign. I think it is really important that people get an opportunity to learn first-hand about the role and we encourage inclusive and diverse and well-qualified people to sit on the committee.

2.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

The role of P.A.C. is to review public spending after it has been spent, that is after the horse has bolted in some instances. Does the candidate believe that there is a role for P.A.C. to review public spending as it is being spent rather than following the expenditure?

Deputy L. Feltham:

That is an interesting and thoughtful comment. It is not something that I put any thought to while I was preparing for this but I think it is something that potentially we could look at as a committee and then maybe bring to the Assembly as a potential change. I think the important thing is what we do

is we look towards continuous improvement all the time. Several of the previous recommendations ... and I know Deputy Gardiner was concerned with this as well in her previous role where the recommendations have not been taken on board by departments. So I would really like to focus initially on learning from the past and ensuring that those recommendations get taken forward and then potentially what we could do is look and see if we can look towards P.A.C. looking at future spending, but of course that is also for the Assembly to do when we look at the Government Plan and debate that.

2.1.3 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Did I hear the Deputy commit to a review of the remit of P.A.C., which I would like her to give to the Assembly, please?

Deputy L. Feltham:

Obviously, it is a democratic committee, but I will commit to taking your suggestion to the committee so that we can make a decision within that committee as to whether to bring that forward.

2.1.4 Deputy M. Andrews of St. Helier North:

In relation to the quantitative data in the previous years, would the candidate be willing to go back in terms of reviewing the accounts and also looking at what had transpired in terms of whether there have been any regular patterns in terms of fiscal expenditure that has maybe been quite erratic?

Deputy L. Feltham:

Yes, I think that looking for patterns and things that have happened in the past is really important. One thing that does concern me is whether the current key performance indicators and the key performance indicators that have been used in the past are the correct ones. That is something that I would seek to potentially work with Ministers to look at closely, because we are at the start now of a new government term and now is the point in time that we need to make sure that we are going to be collecting the right data that we can look at and review and ensure that we are able to account for the work that we have been doing.

2.1.5 Deputy M. Andrews:

In relation to any issues that the candidate has picked up, is there anything that the candidate has identified as of yet?

Deputy L. Feltham:

One thing that does concern me about budgeting and reporting financially within Government is the rather broad heads of expenditure, which could potentially cover up slush funds or where efficiencies potentially have not been met. One other area would be looking at efficiencies. We have been told by the previous Government that they did make efficiencies. That is something that I want to delve into to see whether in fact that has been done.

2.1.6 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:

On the doorstep - and I am sure I am not alone in this - a great deal of venom was expressed about the employment of consultants over various projects, especially that of the Public Health Committee. Would the candidate agree that perhaps there might be some reason why we need to control the use of consultants and can her committee endeavour to do that?

Deputy L. Feltham:

Yes, that is something that I have heard myself and, yes, it is something that I would be particularly keen for the committee to look at, the value for money that we are getting out of consultants and indeed whether we would get value from the work currently being undertaken by consultants by employing people as full-time public servants. The other thing that is related to that that people got

angry about is the employment of people from outside Jersey. So I think another thing that we need to look at is the use of employment licences within the States of Jersey and whether in fact they are being used inappropriately when we could be having local people in certain positions.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are there any further questions for Deputy Feltham? If not, then I confirm that she has been appointed as Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. **[Approbation]**

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Sir, I believe Deputy Scott in the chat wanted to ask a question.

The Deputy Bailiff:

In that case I should give her a chance to do so because you have been in the back of the queue quite a lot. Do you mind, Deputy, if you will accept it? Yes, Deputy Scott.

2.1.7 Deputy M. Scott of St. Brelade:

Thank you, Sir. I just would like to ask the Deputy this following question: the P.A.C. has produced reports in the last few years but nothing in the way of propositions. Is it time for the committee to produce some propositions to improve public spending?

Deputy L. Feltham:

Yes, that is something that I have been thinking about over the past few days. There may well be, if the committee sees things that need to be acted on, suitable propositions that it could bring to the Assembly.

2.1.8 Deputy E. Millar of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

What would the Deputy do to ensure that government procurement systems do result in value for money for the taxpayer?

Deputy L. Feltham:

Obviously, the work programme of the committee is very much determined by the work plan of the Comptroller and Auditor General. But if it was something that we needed to look at in particular we could look at adding procurement to the work plan for the committee. I need to sit down with the committee when it is appointed to decide and democratically decide what that work plan will entail. But I am quite happy to have further conversations with the Deputy about her concerns about procurement.

3. Appointment of the Chair of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you very much for taking those questions. We now move on to the appointment of the Chairs of the 5 Scrutiny Panels. Before we commence with the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel it may be worth reminding Members of the contents of the notes on the Order Paper, which provides that: "Ministers and Assistant Ministers are not eligible for appointment to these positions. For each panel, the relevant Ministers are prevented from either nominating candidates or taking part in the final vote. The corresponding Ministers for each panel are as follows." In respect of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel neither the Chief Minister nor the Minister for Treasury and Resources may nominate or vote. In relation to Economic and International Affairs, the affected Ministers are the Chief Minister, the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, the Minister for External Relations and Financial Services and the Minister for International Development. In respect of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel, the affected Ministers are the Minister

for Children and Education and the Minister for Home Affairs. In respect of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel, the affected Ministers are the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Housing and Communities and the Minister for Infrastructure. In respect of Health and Social Security, the affected Ministers are the Minister for Health and Social Services and the Minister for Social Security.

[11:00]

All Ministers are, nevertheless, able to take part in the questioning of each candidate. The procedure for the appointment of each panel Chair is otherwise identical to the procedure that we adopted for the Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee. We now move to the selection of the Chair for the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel under Standing Order 120. Are there any nominations for Chair of this panel? Deputy Coles.

Deputy T. Coles of St. Helier South:

I would like to nominate Deputy Sam Mézec for the Chair of this Scrutiny Panel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you. Is that nomination seconded? [**Seconded**] Are there any other nominations?

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

Yes, Sir, I would like to propose the Constable of St. Brelade.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? [**Seconded**] Are there any other nominations? There is a point of order, Deputy Scott; it has been withdrawn. Yes, so there are 2 nominations. The first Member nominated was Deputy Mézec and so I invite the Connétable of St. Brelade to withdraw.

3.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Can I start by acknowledging and thanking the previous Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel for the very diligent work that they did throughout the previous term of office? You can see in their legacy report the sheer volume of achievements they had in terms of reports and successful amendments brought to this Assembly and of course the Chair of that panel, who has since gone on to greater things. I make no comment of course on whether this is now the established pathway towards Chief Minister, I will leave that for others, certainly given the previous Chair as well. I am running for this role because I am an experienced scrutineer. I have not served on this panel before but I want to take on the challenge and ensure that this panel can fulfil its role in our government system, holding the Chief Minister and Minister for Treasury and Resources to account and ensuring that government policies are justified and being carried out correctly. I served in Scrutiny for the whole of the 2014 to 2018 term and in the final year of the previous term. I have served as the vice-Chair of the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel, a member of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel, a member of several review panels and I was the first Chair of the Care of Children in Jersey Review Panel. That last panel was set up in the aftermath of the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry to monitor progress made in implementing their recommendations. It was principally the Chief Minister who we scrutinised there, so I do have direct experience there, which will be relevant for the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. I know how to do scrutiny. Scrutiny is not and should never be an exercise in politically partisan point-scoring and its approach should not be adversarial. It is meant to be independent, objective and evidence-based to act as a critical friend of the Government. Its workload would include monitoring business-as-usual workstreams, comprehensive reviews when a big piece of work comes up and sometimes having to be reactive when something comes up which takes us by surprise. I am familiar with the different approaches which are necessary, depending on what type of work you are doing. I have experience at working constructively with Ministers in the early stages of their policy development, raising concerns as we go along so that they can be

incorporated and considered. I have experience at having to work with Ministers to timetable in a big piece of work when a very hefty piece of legislation comes forward. I have experience of having to urgently put together a review when a big problem has been uncovered that cannot be left unchallenged. Those instances are not fun but they are necessary and Scrutiny must be nimble and bold when it has to be. Some key examples that I have been involved in include leading the review which led to the establishment of the Independent Prison Board of Visitors, helping influence the Government's response to the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry report and chairing the review of the Criminal Procedures Law, which was a massive piece of legislative scrutiny and included bringing several successful amendments to enhance it. Sir, if you were not in that Chair I might be tempted to ask you for a reference on that piece of work. I have Chaired many Scrutiny hearings with a diverse range of witnesses, from senior Ministers and even a sitting Bailiff, to interested parties who we were not holding to account but who we were trying to get useful information from. There is a mix of approaches you have to take in hearings. I hope that my approach to Scrutiny is enhanced by the fact that I have also served on the other side of the Scrutiny table, as a Minister who at one point was scrutinised by 3 panels. The quarterly hearings felt like they were more than quarterly in those days. I hope that all of that shows that I am a safe pair of hands for this role. In terms of the big pieces of work I anticipate the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel needing to do in the short term are examining the mini-Budget, which we are told is on its way, and of course the Common Strategic Policy and Government Plan. Those alone will certainly keep us very busy indeed. But on top of that there are legacy issues which we may want to follow up on. The last ordinary report from the previous Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel was on the co-funded payroll scheme, issues which I am sure Members are familiar with. The previous Minister for Treasury and Resources rejected every recommendation that was made in that report. If the new Council of Ministers is perhaps more open-minded on this then we may wish to follow up constructively with them on that and make sure that everything is on track. There will also be the next phase of the implementation of independent taxation, which I know Members will be very keen to see carried out properly and ensuring that it meets the interests of our constituents and does not push people into hardship. There is also the ongoing review on stamp duty, including some changes which were proposed by the previous panel and adopted by the Assembly that we may wish to ensure is carried out effectively. As well as that there are proposals that have been made by successfully elected Ministers, which will come under our remit if they are pursued. We know that the Chief Minister has made some commitments which will likely hit the agenda quite quickly in terms of improving Government accountability and establishing the public services ombudsman, establishing this body and making sure that it is fit for purpose is something that will very much be in the public interest and the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel will want to ensure that we get it right. I would be keen to pursue some briefings on that very quickly to establish how we can play our part in that work. Lastly, one final area I want to cover in my opening remarks on this is public engagement. In the previous term of office the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel and all other panels undertook a very impressive amount of work, particularly in response to the pandemic where they had to work extremely quickly and under a lot of pressure, given everything that was happening at that time. But the lockdown and everything that followed had a big impact on how we, as politicians, engage directly with the public and for a long time face-to-face contact was severely restricted. Now things are much more open I hope that we can try to be as inclusive with the public as possible again. In my first term on Scrutiny, we deliberately went out of our way to try to make our work accessible when there was likely to be potential public interest in the subjects that we were looking at. An example of this was a review we did in the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel on nursery places, where we held public meetings and public hearings at times and places where those who had child-caring responsibilities would be more likely to attend. I am very keen that a Scrutiny Panel that I am involved in starts thinking about this kind of thing early on to make sure that we can be accessible and help improve public engagement and an understanding of what Scrutiny does so that we can benefit from the experiences and the views that the public can put forward to us. Of course, that will involve working

with other Scrutiny Panel Chairs and the Greffe's public engagement team to explore more ways that we can do that kind of thing. I hope I have made clear my experience in Scrutiny before, the fact that I am a safe pair of hands and the fact that there is a very substantial amount of work that this panel will have to be getting on with very quickly. I have done this kind of thing before and I would relish the opportunity to be able to do it for this term of office.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Mézec. The first question for the Deputy is from the Connétable of St. Lawrence.

3.1.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

The candidate tells us: "I know how to do Scrutiny" and I will not argue with that. What we do know though is that very often it is the case that the voice of Scrutiny goes unheeded in this Assembly. How would the candidate move on from knowing how to do scrutiny to knowing how to ensure positive outcomes from the work of Scrutiny?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I think there are 2 elements to that I would want to cover in my answer. The first is that the work of the previous P.P.C. sub-committee on democratic accountability, which I was a member of, spoke about some of the things that needed to be done to enhance Scrutiny's ability to do its work and that spoke about things like a recommendation tracker, that kind of thing. Whoever makes up the next Scrutiny Liaison Committee I think will want to pursue that and I am hoping that the incumbent Chief Minister will be open-minded to those discussions, bearing in mind previous comments that she has made, so that is something that we certainly need to look at. Different pieces of work will require different approaches but one thing I tried to do when I was involved in Scrutiny, particularly in the first term of office, is to work openly and honestly with your Minister at an early stage. If you can anticipate that a piece of work that is ongoing does have some legitimate concerns with it or that there are some tweaks that could be made to improve it, if you start that early on by being constructive and open, then Ministers do not have to get defensive, potentially, when there is a greater risk of that happening the later on you leave that kind of thing. My view is that if you want to have an impact in those early stages, being open and honest with the Ministers you work with, is the way to do that. Of course, that is not always possible, sometimes you encounter issues later on or sometimes there is just genuine disagreement about what the best way forward is. Ministers are not always right. I have not always agreed with every recommendation that a Scrutiny Panel has come up with. But if you are bringing forward your amendments or your recommendations in your reports, so long as you try to be objective and evidence-based and make the strongest case that you can, I hope that in this new Assembly we will have an approach that is more open to what Scrutiny says.

3.1.2 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Would the candidate see himself as being a critical friend, which is the term that we have used and it is applied to Scrutiny, or would he be taking the view that he is the leader of a political party and required to follow the wishes of that party, which presumably is the reason he was elected?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

It is a very good question and one that we will undoubtedly explore over the years to come. What is the line between what is your party business and even if you are not a member of a party but you have got political convictions one way or another? I have had the benefit since the start of my political career of the mentorship from Deputy Southern, who was around when Scrutiny was first put together, and he has very strongly taught me that when you are doing Scrutiny you take your political hat off and you put your Scrutiny hat on. You are objective and evidence-based and it is not a platform for political point-scoring. Members I am sure may think that I am someone who enjoys that kind of political stuff, and believe me I do, but there is a time and place for it and Scrutiny is not it.

3.1.3 Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Just following on from the Connétable of St. Lawrence, during the last Government the candidate, who was also Chair of Reform Jersey, announced that they would be the official opposition to the Government. I wonder if he could give the Assembly an undertaking that there will be no such announcement because of course he is seeking this particular role.

[11:15]

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am seeking the role but I have not got it yet, so I am not going to give an undertaking that does not take into account what this Assembly may or may not decide in the next few moments. What is absolutely the case is that if you are somebody who is heavily involving yourself in big political debates that are based on your manifesto commitments and not based on Scrutiny work, a line has to be drawn somewhere. I know how to draw that line. I would ask Members, including the Member who has just questioned me, to look at my record in Scrutiny. I was the Chair of the Care of Children Review Panel that scrutinised him as Chief Minister in those days and I would hope that the Deputy would acknowledge that I did so upholding the purpose of what Scrutiny stands for and I did not let my politics creep into that work. I am confident to stand on my record of that and I would do so within this 4-year term, absolutely. It would be very clear when I am acting in support of my manifesto and when I am acting in support of the work of Scrutiny.

3.1.4 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

Following up the questions from the Constable of St. Lawrence and indeed from Deputy Gorst, I wonder if the candidate would be able to assure the Assembly if he were to be elected as Chair of the Scrutiny Panel that he would seek to ensure that on the panel itself there is a balance of political views so that the work of Scrutiny is not unduly affected by the political affiliations of the Chairman.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Absolutely 100 per cent and that is one of the safeguards that is kind of inbuilt into the Scrutiny process is that you are the Chair of a committee, you are not its political leader, you are not its dictator, you work with your committee members and you reach your decisions for what work you will do and how you will do it together. I believe that you can have a stronger Scrutiny Panel by having a cross-section of the different political wings of this Assembly represented on them. I think I have got history in doing that, where previously I have been on committees that I have Chaired with Members with very different political views to myself. I remember one where I Chaired a committee that for a time had the then Senator Sarah Ferguson on it and the then Deputy Jackie Hilton, so of course we had all the political persuasions represented on that and me of course representing the moderate centrist wing there. You do get a better type of Scrutiny when you are politically inclusive. People who have political persuasions that I do not understand or relate to may well see things differently to me and have questions that they will ask that will be perfectly legitimate, that simply would not have occurred to me, so you get stronger scrutiny when you are more inclusive.

3.1.5 Deputy I.J. Gorst:

The candidate is right, I have worked productively with him in the past and he and I do not share the same political position. But I do wonder whether the candidate could confirm to the Assembly, unlike others, that he stood on a manifesto which proactively sought to raise tax, and he discussed that when he was standing to be Chief Minister, and at the same time would like to see Government spending increased.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

To be honest, that is a question to the leader of a political party, it is not a question to the candidate for a Chair of a Scrutiny Panel. I have my views about how our tax system could be improved and

some of those views are inspired by my political values and what I believe is fair and right, as opposed to a deep analysis of the facts and how systems work. It is not the job of Scrutiny to come up with its own manifesto and to impose it on the Assembly and to use that as a pathway for achieving that; that is for other avenues in politics. What our job will be to do is to scrutinise what comes from the Government, some of which will be tax stuff, and it is to work out if it is doing what it is meant to be doing. Because you can have Governments that attempt to do the right thing but are clumsy and Scrutiny's job will be to find out when they are being clumsy and try and push them in the right direction or to analyse whether that policy is right in the first instance. But that will not be done from a politically partisan point of view and the safeguard in that will be that we will have a diverse panel that will not be absolutely committed to the same manifesto principles that I was.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you. Are there any further questions for Deputy Mézec? If not, then this period of questions comes to an end. I invite Deputy Mézec to withdraw from the Chamber and the Connétable of St. Brelade to return.

3.2 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

The Corporate Services Panel is one of 5 Scrutiny Panels with responsibility for reviewing government policy, for reviewing new laws and changes to existing laws, for reviewing the work and expenditure of Government and to consider matters of public importance. The role of Scrutiny is evidential and not really intended as a political tool to attack Government. It has to be collaborative to work properly and to provide the best value to the public who elect us. That is not to say that there is anything wrong with robust challenge where policy may be considered unsound or in need of improvement. I believe that Scrutiny has replaced an element of the committee system and that it provides a panel of members who all have an opportunity to contribute to policy formulation, as opposed to Ministers who can make autocratic decisions, unless of course they find themselves challenged by a Scrutiny Panel. I have sat on Economic Development panels between 2005 and 2008 when it was Chaired by Deputy Southern. It could be, but I cannot say for certain, that he taught me much about Scrutiny, what works and what does not. I, subsequently, between 2008 and 2011 held the office of Minister for Transport and Technical Services where the affiliated Scrutiny Panel was Chaired by the then Deputy of St. John, Philip Rondel, ably supported by Deputy Daniel Wimberley, who many will recall as being a thorough and well-researched Member of this Assembly. We did not always agree but the panel made a significant contribution to the work of the department which I was heading at the time. I have for the last 4 years Chaired the Housing, Environment and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel and have had the advantage of having the support of 5 brilliant members and superb support staff during that period. That panel's legacy report, S.R.15/2022, outlines the areas that will need further work during the coming States term. Scrutiny has matured and I believe that all States Members need to spend some time on it, not only so that they can understand the process but also to make the point that the days of autocratic decisions by Ministers is a thing of the past. I would make the point now that if elected I would expect to be challenging the Chief Minister and the Minister for Treasury and Resources regularly. While my name is put forward for Chair of the Corporate Services Panel, the role is that of a facilitator for the panel and this is very much a team effort with all members having the ability to contribute so that pertinent reviews and succinct comments can be made to enable Members here to make properly informed decisions when the time comes. I believe that it is appropriate for Connétables to involve themselves in Scrutiny work, in that a Ministerial role is not always considered compatible, given obligations to Parish work. My Parish Procureurs do attempt to rein me in by making that point but, personally, I think that Scrutiny is a perfect mechanism for Parishes to link with States work. While the former Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel's legacy report, S.R.10/2022, outlines several areas for further discussion, I await policy to emerge in due course from the Chief Minister and the Minister for Treasury and Resources which the future panel would consider during its term of office. The Chief Minister has Chaired this

panel herself over the last term and provided much robust challenge to her now predecessor in office. I see no reason why her example should not be emulated. Deputy Gorst, the Minister for Treasury and Resources, has managed to evade a Scrutiny role during his political career so far but as a seasoned Member he has learned that it is better to work with Scrutiny rather than against them. In conclusion, I thank Members for their attention and take this opportunity to open an invitation to any Members who may wish to be on the panel in the event that I should be elected.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. Are there questions for the Connétable of St. Brelade?

3.2.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

How would the candidate attempt to ensure that the voice of Scrutiny is paid more heed in the Assembly than has been the case so far?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I thank the Connétable and I think it is important for the Scrutiny Panel Chair and members to push their reports forward, to push their comments forward and to ensure that comments do come to this Assembly in good time for Members to be able to consider them in depth and vote appropriately.

3.2.2 Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I ask the candidate how he would try to ensure diversity on the panel, as the Assembly has a more diverse reflection of our society?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I invite all Members who feel they can contribute to the panel and would prefer a diverse mix out of choice; that has been the case during the last period. We were very well represented in my former panel by Deputy Gardiner and the Connétable of St. Saviour, who both made significant contributions to the panel's work, so I would follow that same pattern.

3.2.3 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:

From the candidate's previous experience, not only as Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Panel last time but, therefore, on what is now called the Scrutiny Liaison Committee, does he accept that over the period of the last administration there has been a greater degree of input and cross-exchange between the various Scrutiny Panels? If he were elected would he continue that forward by consulting with the other Chairs of the panels to ensure that a rounded challenge is made to the various Ministers when required?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I do, I am a great believer in open communication and utilising the combined voice of Scrutiny to put forward a message to either the Chief Minister or the Assembly in general. I think it is essential and is a tool we have not perhaps utilised as much as we might.

3.2.4 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:

If the candidate is successful, what is the first piece of work that he would like to undertake and why?

[11:30]

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I suspect the first piece of work the panel would be undertaking is the Government Plan, which will hit our desks pretty quickly in the next few months, and that is a considerable amount of work which will take some time for the panel to consider and has a fairly finite timeline, so I think that will be the first.

3.2.5 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Is there anything in particular in that Government Plan that the candidate would like to focus on?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, the question of taxation I think is very high in people's minds, given that the latest circumstance is affecting people's pockets significantly. There is a shortage of money in the pockets of the general public and we must, as a Government, respond to that in a focused way and a practical way to enable these current difficult times to be mitigated by, I think, taxation.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you. Are there any other questions for the Connétable of St. Brelade? If not, then that brings the period of questions to an end and I invite Deputy Mézec to return to the Chamber. As both candidates have spoken and answered questions, we now move to the vote. Any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Mézec should press the pour button when the voting opens and any Member wishing to vote for the Connétable of St. Brelade should press the contre button. Members retain the ability to abstain by pressing that one and in relation to those attending on the link they may either vote pour or contre in the way I have described or identify the name of the candidate for whom they wish to cast their vote. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The outcome is very close and I can announce that the number of votes cast for Deputy Mézec is 23 and cast for the Connétable of St. Brelade 22. **[Approbation]**

Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South: 23		Connétable of St. Brelade: 22		Abstain: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy C.F. Labey		Connétable of Trinity		
Deputy M. Tadier		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Connétable of St. Martin		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy D.J. Warr		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy J. Renouf		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy K.F. Morel		
Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Deputy R.E. Binet		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy H.L. Jeune		Deputy I. Gardiner		
Deputy M.E. Millar		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy R.S. Kovacs		Deputy H.M. Miles		

Deputy A.F. Curtis		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Deputy B. Ward		Deputy A. Howell		
Deputy K.M. Wilson		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

I announce that Deputy Mézec has been elected Chair of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Can I just take the opportunity to thank those that voted for me and to thank the Constable of St. Brelade? If he wants a conversation about membership of the panel I am certainly open to it.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Could we ask for the votes to be read out, please?

The Greffier of the States:

Those voting for Deputy Mézec: the Connétable of St. Helier, Deputy Southern, Deputy Labey, Deputy Farnham, Deputy Tadier, Deputy Ward, Deputy Mézec, Deputy Coles, Deputy Porée, Deputy Warr, Deputy Renouf, Deputy Catherine Curtis, Deputy Feltham, Deputy Rose Binet, Deputy Jeune, Deputy Kovacs, Deputy Curtis, Deputy Barbara Ward, Deputy Wilson, Deputy Stephenson and Deputy Andrews and in the chat: Deputy Alves and Deputy Millar. Those voting for the Connétable: the Connétables of St. Lawrence, St. Brelade, Trinity, St. Peter, St. Martin, St. John, Grouville, St. Ouen, St. Mary and St. Saviour, Deputy Luce, Deputy Morel, Deputy Le Hagarat, Deputy Ahier, Deputy Gardiner, Deputy Bailhache, Deputy Miles, Deputy Howell, Deputy Tom Binet and Deputy Ferey and in the chat: Deputy Scott and the Connétable of St. Clement.

4. Appointment of the Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel

The Deputy Bailiff:

I move to the selection of the Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel under Standing Order 120 and I invite Members to make nominations for the Chair of this panel.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I would like to propose Deputy Kovacs, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for the Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel?

Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

I would like to nominate Deputy Scott.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for Chair? Thank you. Accordingly, Deputy Scott, I am going to invite you now to leave the chat and to go to a secure Teams meeting with a member of the Greffe staff. When it has been confirmed to me that has occurred, I will invite Deputy Kovacs to address the Assembly.

4.1 Deputy R. Kovacs of St. Saviour:

Firstly, I want to begin by making reference to the work of the previous panel, who in the years of 2018 to 2022 met over 300 times, lodged 23 comment papers, produced 12 reports, made 205 findings, made 86 recommendations, 75 of which were accepted in full or part. I wish to pay tribute to those Members of this Assembly who gave their time and effort to achieve these results. I have spent some time looking at the very varied and broad remit of this panel. I am going into this with my eyes wide open. I believe that there are many interesting areas that could form the basis of future reviews and work plans. In the time allowed it is not possible for me to go into great detail, however I am open to answer any questions Members may have shortly. I have mentioned earlier the very varied and broad remit and I want to highlight each area covered, as I found it useful to find out about each as a new Member and others might find it too. This includes the excellent and valued work of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission and International Development, the work of the Jersey Financial Services and Jersey Finance, oversight of the Channel Islands Financial Ombudsman, oversight of the Civil Aviation director, including air traffic control, Jersey Met Office, airport security, so oversees the weather as well, air travel and ferries, with one or 2 serious issues highlighted recently in the media regarding flights and ferries availability. The Jersey Data Protection and Information Commissioner receives about a £500,000 grant with nearly 7,000 organisations registered. The Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority, which has a fee income of nearly £1 million per year and receives a grant of about £700,000. The Jersey Charity Commission, which now has about 450 charities on the register, over 1,700 citizens serving as governors and the funding for operational costs comes from the dormant bank account fund. The Jersey Gambling Commission is arm's length, however, I have noted that the memorandum of understanding has not yet been signed. The Licensing Law, which needs updating, however, it looks that it has been under review for the last 20 years at least. The Jersey Aircraft Registry has not developed as envisaged and I understand from the legacy report that an auxiliary report remains confidential, perhaps a subject for the panel to look at. The sports strategy, which is linked to Jersey Sports, getting their health and well-being programmes. I believe the panel should monitor the ongoing situation at Fort Regent and its effect on the many sporting clubs and associations, especially the smaller ones. We should promote more sport and event-led tourism to include rugby, netball, football, cricket, et cetera, and many others linked to cultural, heritage, arts promoting music, professional dance and festivals. I know the previous Council of Ministers approved in December 2021 a heritage, arts and culture strategy. The previous panel had the briefing in January 2022 and it is following the 10-years' framework of their stakeholders' engagement. In 2019 Deputy Tadier had the States agreeing to provide 1 per cent of States revenue expenditure on arts, culture and heritage by 2022. Also, work has started on restoration projects at Elizabeth Castle and we know the Opera House needs sorting. The tourist strategy, there has been some delay with this and the previous panel were given a copy, which I did not get the chance to see yet but this is an obvious area of interest as it is a valuable part of our economy and community. The economic framework of the marine environment, the report was due to be published in May 2022. This includes important areas of fishing and licensing. The P.75/2022 was also approved by the Assembly to establish a technology accelerator fund, however, briefing is required here for a future panel. The ongoing progress of this fund will be overseen by Digital Jersey. Financial services legislation and MONEYVAL, the previous panel received regular briefings from the financial services team and, if elected, this will continue. Our financial action taskforce is seeking global standards and MONEYVAL will be assessing Jersey's financial services in 2023 and report on this to look at. The previous panel have indicated more legislation to come and to keep under review, which I agree with. The current cost of living crisis, I consider that the involvement of the Consumer Council is important in this aspect and the previous panel have suggested that this is possibly a review subject for the incoming panel and it is of course very relevant to all of us.

[11:45]

Also, from the former panel's more recent reviews, I have noted 2 important aspects. In the regulation of Jersey Estate Agents the recommendations are that the Minister should move towards a regulated environment that improves the sector for both consumers and estate agents. Regarding seasonal workers and the rural economy, matters highlighted included work permits and visas with associated costs, provision of accommodation, social security payments and the provision and cost of healthcare. These matters are also very real issues for other sectors of the economy, like hospitality and care workers. These issues look like to need a further panel review. Related to COVID-19 and the pandemic, Jersey, along with the rest of the world, had to deal with an unprecedented health crisis, which, sadly, led to the loss of lives and for some lasting health effects. The community in all its shapes and sizes rallied around to help each other survive the worst of COVID. The effects on lives and livelihood, it is still being felt, as everyone tries to build back their lives into something nearer to the previous normal, including of course our children. The Department for the Economy, Jersey Business and other States departments, like Social Security, Treasury and others, were able to target support to individuals and businesses large and small. This was done through a number of assistance packages, including the co-funded payroll scheme, fixed costs support scheme, business disruption loan guarantee scheme and support targeted at visitors' attractions, accommodation and events. I believe a panel may wish to engage with those affected to evaluate the effects. Previously being elected as Deputy, I have studies, work experience and qualifications in financial services, accountancy, management and project management, rural economy, including agribusiness management and administration, the food industry, including a diploma in food identity obtained early on in France, experience of working in the Jersey public sector and running a small business. In my day-to-day life I am actively involved in overseas activities and actively support and promote Jersey and its diverse community, as well as sports, heritage, arts and culture, combined with family values. I am keen to promote the value of scrutiny to our young people through schools and be of service for active and valid engagement. I will be pleased to answer any questions Members may have and, finally, if elected, the panel is open to any non-executive Member of this Assembly based on expertise, for sharing the workload and, hopefully, productive time.

4.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

As a former Minister, I am quite familiar with the work of part of what the successful candidate will be scrutinising. Can I ask what the Deputy thinks is the most pressing issue in that portfolio for Scrutiny, what she and her committee intend to deal with as a highest priority?

Deputy R. Kovacs:

Thank you, Deputy, for that question. I identified 3 areas which are very important to look at; priority I would say. The very pressing cost-of-living crisis that we have I would think requires to look at the economic policies and procedures that were done to see how we can tackle that in the best way. Then the seasonal workers and the rural economy related to the workers' rights and how we can review the last season, have that skills gap covered better. We know also that MONEYYVAL is coming to do an assessment in 2023 and that is a very important priority to look at as well.

4.1.2 Deputy H. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

It was good to hear the Deputy say that her third priority, if she is Chair of the Scrutiny Panel, will be MONEYYVAL, which obviously is the biggest piece of work for the Island and for Scrutiny in the next few years. Please, could the Deputy maybe explain how she will go about leading that panel looking at MONEYYVAL and the process she will take?

Deputy R. Kovacs:

Yes, thank you for the question. I consider a successful assessment, it is crucial to demonstrate compliance with the financial action taskforce and with international standards. The former panel regarded this work as a priority and also commanded that each piece of new legislation is

accompanied by a little briefing from the department as well to understand properly what needs to be done and I will take it from the briefing.

4.1.3 Deputy M. Andrews:

In relation to the state of liberalism within international relations, how important is it that we ensure that we are dealing with all jurisdictions and they are maintaining their records. If the case is, in terms if one was scrutinising a regime, for instance, that is obviously in a state of maybe anarchy, that obviously we are ensuring that all the relevant Ministers are forced against in terms of your role being in Scrutiny?

Deputy R. Kovacs:

I am aware that this panel will scrutinise across 4 areas of Ministry, including the Chief Minister and also the international communication with other jurisdictions is important. In scrutinising it is really good to take into consideration also what other jurisdictions have done well that we could apply better in the policies that are applied by our Ministers and maybe have constructive suggestions based on that. I am not sure if that responds.

4.1.4 The Connétable of St. Mary:

I speak as the former Chairman of the panel for which the candidate is now standing. She mentioned MONEYVAL and I simply wish to draw attention to the fact that I believe that the relationship between this particular panel and some of the Ministers is perhaps more co-operative than that enjoyed by other panels, in regard to both MONEYVAL and External Relations in particular. I very much see the panel as being a critical friend and I do not think in respect of MONEYVAL you would need to, I think the Minister himself will guide you because he is very much alive to the Island's needs to be fully up to date. I simply wish to ask the candidate, will she adopt a very pragmatic and co-operative approach to the Ministers when she deals with those aspects?

Deputy R. Kovacs:

Thank you for the question. Yes, of course and I have even had discussions yesterday with the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture in the idea that I am standing for this Chair. We said that it is very important to have open communication from the start to know what is coming and like that we can have constructive discussions on everything that is proposed ahead of even being implemented.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are there any further questions for Deputy Kovacs? In that case that brings that period of questions to an end. I would invite Deputy Kovacs to withdraw from the Chamber.

Deputy I.J. Gorst:

If I may make an observation, it is intended that Financial Services will move to the Minister for Treasury and Resources and, therefore, in light of we do not know how quickly that move will happen I think it would be inappropriate for me to vote in this election, as well as the former one.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, noted, thank you. Perhaps Deputy Scott could return to the meeting. Yes, Deputy Scott, can you hear me?

Deputy M. Scott:

Yes, I can.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, it is now your turn to address the Assembly for up to 10 minutes.

4.2 Deputy M. Scott:

First of all, I would like to thank all former members of the panel for having produced an excellent body of work. In putting myself forward for the Chair for this panel my aim is to provide constructive existence to the new administration in delivering its stated political outcomes and working with fresh talent and viewpoints to forward such work using my professional team-building skills and to help the panel strategise its scrutiny of policy. Some have described the role of Scrutiny as one of holding Ministers' feet to the fire; I prefer to think of working with Ministers to explore known road blocks, headwinds, pitfalls, risks and potential blind spots that may prevent them from delivering their intended strategic outcomes. Policies will be no more than wish lists without meaningful implementation plans, usually requiring prior needs and gaps analysis to help guide the policy. Another way of putting it is a destination cannot be reached without a clear roadmap or in a broken vehicle. Too often a lack of government resources has frustrated former Ministers' plans. Economic productivity is a key component to providing those resources. The challenges in delivering it are many these days. Unlike most jurisdictions Jersey never fully recovered from the 2008 recession, Treasury's management of government investments have helped to avoid deficits but reserves now are to secure unprecedented government borrowing. The pandemic led to unsustainable government spending, partly to keep afloat businesses that have struggled to be productive. Government policy may need to draw clearer lines between self-funding commercial ventures and government-funded social enterprises. The United Kingdom has provided overseas custom for many local businesses but it now has the lowest growth, highest inflation and fastest deteriorating economy of all G7 economies. Inflation has risen to 8 per cent locally, an increased number of businesses are likely to default on their debts. The world also is in a state of economic transition, driven by technological development. Our finance industry risks losing a third of its job in just over a decade to automation and artificial intelligence. There are opportunities too. The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture will need to develop economic policy that responds to market forces proactively, creatively, yet also prudently. What qualifies me for role of Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Panel and why am I putting myself forward for the role? I am an Oxford law graduate who has practised as an English and then a Jersey lawyer, after working as a corporate tax adviser in a top City of London firm. I had built a successful career out of understanding complex matters in the global finance industry and in reviewing legislation. After moving to the Island 30 years ago I became a partner in leading local law firm, Mourant, and a director of its company and trust administration business. At the time it employed close to 1,000 people worldwide. Much of my work involved advising high-profile international companies in the areas of banking, corporate and trust administration, restructuring and mergers and acquisitions. Skilled staff shortages made me proactive in mentoring and training while running project teams and led to me setting up my own training business with its own staff that helped to serve the local business community in other ways. Before retiring from my partnership, I helped to develop the Island's structured finance and capital markets business and its regulation. I was described as top notch in finance in the independent legal 500 publication and sat on the local independent tax panel tasked to consider the initial O.E.C.D. (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) threat to blacklist the Island's finance industry. I remain mindful of the need for that industry to be well-regulated and of the importance of the MONEYVAL assessment in this respect. I also am aware of the need for the industry to avoid the burden of excessive bureaucracy and red tape. The Island's external relations play an important role not only in the finance industry but in areas such connectivity, supply chain and labour supply, which support other Island industries and are key to the development of future businesses on Island.

[12:00]

The pandemic and Brexit have affected our labour supply. At the same time immigration has an impact on Island resource management that needs to be addressed. Our increased cost of living and

housing costs have further affected our labour supply and the operating costs of business, along with supply chain costs. As a former lawyer, I have a good understanding of the nature of evidence, which is informed by my former work as an independent member of the Public Accounts Committee and of the Island's Statistics Users Group. I expect the Minister of Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, having a background associated with data-led decision-making, to be receptive to the use of data and statistical measurement in policy making and in the setting of targets and performance measures. This methodology has been advocated by the Island's Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to public spending. It will be useful not only in implementing policy but in assessing the performance and contribution to the economy of arm's length bodies funded by Government. There is a global transition to a new economy which the Economic Council's new perspective report refers. A distinction needs to be made between using and updating technology, the cost of which can be unaffordable for some private enterprises, and inventing technology, which generally involves much more investment and specialised assessment to avoid investment loss. Having discussed such matters with local tech experts, I feel reasonably equipped for the task of helping to produce an educated response to the Minister's future proposals regarding the technology accelerator fund. My involvement in work to protect and develop the visitor economy of St. Brelade Bay has informed me of consultants' reports produced in connection with the Island's planning policy that will be relevant to reviewing the tourism strategy. The anticipated retail strategy will need to address the competition posed by online purchasing. It will be interesting to learn how the new Minister intends to resolve the tensions between environmental and commercial objectives in the farming and fishing industries, bearing in mind they compete with businesses subsidised or supported by larger economies. I met with an officer of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission over 2 years ago, who kindly explained some of its investment methodology to me. I am aware of the ethical reasons for the Ministry's separation from external affairs work. The theories promoted in the Our Island identity project may cause tensions with the new economy visions in the Economic Council's report, in which the Minister was also involved, and which the panel can explore with her. I hope the above will satisfy you of my suitability for Chair of the panel. I would appreciate your support for my appointment to this role in which I shall aim to be both constructive and productive.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Scott. The first question comes from Deputy Farnham.

4.2.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

The Deputy gave a comprehensive speech demonstrating a good knowledge of the portfolio she hopes to scrutinise. Can she share with Members what she considers to be the highest 3 priorities in that portfolio that require urgent scrutiny?

Deputy M. Scott:

I have to remind the Deputy that the panel has to respond to the policy that is being produced by the Minister himself. But basically the cost of living is one of the areas that has been explored by the panel already and I would expect the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture to be producing a fresh vision there. We do have the MONEYVAL assessment to explore, which is a very important piece of work. Yes, I do think the tourism strategy is another area that needs to be focused on, given a loss of a tenth of the hotel beds in the last year and the impact on connectivity.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are there any other questions for Deputy Scott? If there are no other questions for Deputy Scott then that completes the questions for you, Deputy. I invite Deputy Kovacs to return to the Chamber. A reminder before we come to the vote that the following are unable to vote in relation to this particular

appointment, namely the Chief Minister, the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, the Minister for External Relations, the Minister for International Development and, for the reasons he identified, Deputy Gorst. As both candidates have spoken and answered questions, we now move to the vote, any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Kovacs should press the *pour* button when the voting opens, any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Scott should press the *contre* button. Members may abstain in the usual way and Members joining remotely can either vote *pour* or *contre* in the way described or identify the name of the candidate for whom they wish to vote. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the number of votes cast for Deputy Kovacs is 19 and those cast for Deputy Scott, 24. Accordingly I can announce that Deputy Scott has been appointed as the Chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel.

Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour: 19		Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade: 24		Abstain: 0
Connétable of Trinity		Connétable of St. Helier		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Connétable of St. Martin		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Connétable of St. John		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy M. Tadier		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy M.R. Le Hagarat		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy I. Gardiner		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		Deputy D.J. Warr		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Deputy H.M. Miles		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée		Deputy J. Renouf		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy R.E. Binet		
Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy M.E. Millar		
Deputy H.L. Jeune		Deputy A. Howell		
Deputy R.S. Kovacs		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
		Deputy B. Ward		
		Deputy K.M. Wilson		
		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		
		Deputy M.B. Andrews		

Deputy M.R. Le Hagarat:

Could we have it both ways, please?

Deputy M. Scott:

I thank the States Assembly for appointing me to this role and I will do my best to perform it diligently and faithfully.

5. Appointment of Chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel

The Deputy Bailiff:

We will now move on to the selection of the Chair of the Children, Young People, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I invite Members to make nominations for the Chair of that panel. Are there any nominations for the Chair of that panel?

Deputy L. Feltham:

I would like to nominate Deputy Catherine Curtis.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? [**Seconded**] Are there any other nominations for the Chair of the Children, Young People, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel? No? Deputy Catherine Curtis, do you wish to address the Assembly?

5.1 Deputy C. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

First of all, I would like to thank Members of the previous panel for excellent work. I still do not know everyone very well so let me give everyone an account of my skills and knowledge. I have knowledge of business, the environment, children, education and health and social services. All of these interest me. As well as bringing up my own children, I have looked after other children too. I was a foster carer for about 5 years. I am familiar with the processes involved in the care of looked-after children and I looked after teenagers and a young child who went up for a very successful adoption. I completed the Solihull training to the highest level. I know from experience how damaging it is when the corporate parent fails in their duty. I have also taken a great interest in general education. My 2 eldest were home-educated for a number of years while we moved abroad and then back to Jersey. I read up on theories of education and even interviewed educationalists. As for universities, I have a First Class Bachelor of Science Honours degree, I also invited Nottingham Trent University and Portsmouth University to work with me on 2 different business projects, so I am familiar in engaging universities and involving them successfully in projects. As for Home Affairs, I will commit to scrutinise thoroughly all new laws and policies; I am adept at examining detail while keeping in mind the bigger picture. For example, I have drafted several patent applications and redrafted them when challenged until they have been successfully granted. Doing this well is a real test of mental agility. I did most of the work myself and once drafted I passed them on to my patent attorneys in order to save time and money. They even offered me a job. I hope that demonstrates I have the ability to gather information, analyse it and respond to it. I am well used to working in a team. This must be clear to everyone that I am a member of a team that works very well together, Reform Jersey. I am very hardworking and for most of my life have worked several jobs at a time, including while running a business. Looking at education first, and starting at the youngest, the recent extension of free nursery hours for 3 to 4 year-olds from 20 to 30 per week has been a success.

[12:15]

The Early Years Policy Development Board recommended that the Government establish a long-term plan to move to a universal education offer for 2 to 3 year-olds. As well as being of benefit to young children, the option of funded nursery care for parents affords them the possibility to get paid work. We all know there is a shortage of staff in Jersey. In 2019 172 children were supported by the

early years inclusion team. We need to continue to develop better integrated support in the early years starting with the reformed nursery education offer. As for schools, the Scrutiny Panel will need to keep a close eye on the education reform programme; 13 per cent of school pupils have special educational needs and around 20 per cent of pupils have a first language other than English. A worrying shortage of teaching staff is developing and the panel will be able to support Deputy Gardiner's aim stated in her speech yesterday to focus on teacher recruitment and retention. Looking at St. Helier specifically, it would be good to get some answers about the St. Helier school estate. Will the old police headquarters be used for primary school expansion? Moving on to post-16 education. I wonder if all States Members are aware that grants for university education are means-tested but not based on household income, which does not make sense. Children from single parent families have grants based on the absent parent's income as well as household income, whether the absent parent contributes anything or not. I know of children who have been placed under extreme anxiety due to this policy. When I discussed this with the past Minister for Children and Education, Scott Wickenden, he explained that the vote to include absent parental income was taken in 2012 but only adopted for the first time this year. That is not putting children first. Another point regarding university education planning is that it is too narrow. When canvassing during the election I met constituents who were barely managing to fund their own open university degrees as mature students and considering giving up. They were not getting sufficient grant support. All this while we have a shortage of teachers and other professionals. Around 1,400 Jersey people each year attend a U.K. (United Kingdom) university. Highlands has around 1,000 students on post-16 full-time courses. It will be of great interest to see the plans for the new Highlands campus and to ensure that it continues to do its good work and it should be possible to offer more degree courses. Currently there are very useful degrees in the Island, like the BA Honours in Social Work. The Digital Skills Academy has an increasing number of apprenticeships, which should ensure opportunities in career development and lifelong learning. Now to look at the Youth Service; should it be a statutory provision? This would protect its funding. As a town resident I have seen for myself the great work done by the Youth Service with teenagers in Millennium Park. There are more than 60,000 contacts each year in the Jersey Youth Service, they do essential work and I would like to know how the development of the North of St. Helier Youth and Community Centre is progressing. I would like to see the development of the Youth Service pilot scheme to focus on children who do not have English as their first language, specifically Portuguese, Polish and Romanian children. I took part in the recent first public meeting of the Jersey Community Partnership. A lot of work has been done following recommendations of the Independent Jersey Care Inquiry and the citizens panel but some recommendations are yet to be implemented and I intend to follow that up. In 2019 there were 89 looked-after children. There is a shortage of foster carers and I am aware that the Children's Service is making great efforts to recruit more. Children's Services recruitment and retention is a real problem, though, it goes against the aims of the service in providing stability to children when their social workers change every 5 minutes. Another concern is that there were 249 episodes of children going missing reported to the police over 12 months. Of these children, looked-after children accounted for 157 episodes. We need to look at why the children are going missing and whether the requirement for foster carers to report them as missing when they are out late is a procedure that is ultimately unhelpful. Scrutiny will need to examine proposals for a replacement facility for residential care for young offenders and work to prevent young people encountering law enforcement when other services would be more appropriate. C.A.M.H.S. (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service) have expanded their services and made some great improvements in the last few years. Sadly, the need for mental health services among the young has increased dramatically so C.A.M.H.S. is in need of more support and funding. Moving on now to matters of Home Affairs. The Scrutiny Panel can look for ways to support the work of the prison service to develop a better, multidisciplinary approach to support offenders. We need a joined-up approach to those misusing drugs and alcohol. I would be good to see a progressive substance use strategy focus on the principle of harm reduction. I was very reassured yesterday to hear Deputy Miles, Minister for Home Affairs,

prioritise resources aimed towards the front line. Scrutiny can support this priority that front line workers are not cut back. We need our police officers, paramedics and firefighters. In fact, if the Jersey Care Model is implemented we will need more highly-trained paramedics. We must ensure that the Domestic Abuse (Jersey) Law 2022 is delivered in a timely manner. Around 15 per cent of all recorded crime is domestic abuse. Great efforts have been made to prevent these crimes and to support reporting with campaigns. There is other forthcoming legislation regarding police complaints and conduct, prejudice and public disorder and unlawful public entertainments, which Scrutiny must review. But, above all, our duty will be to improve government policies, legislation and public services. I am still very new to the States so please forgive me if I do not have all the answers but I do believe I could lead the Scrutiny Panel to be an effective critical friend. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The first question for Deputy Catherine Curtis is from Deputy Farnham.

5.1.1 Deputy L.J. Farnham:

The Deputy will know this because we are sitting in this Assembly today surrounded by fans, and although it might not be in the direct control of the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel ... I will start again, sorry. I know at least one school that is going to be closing today because temperatures in the classrooms are too high. Does she believe that the environment in which we put our children in to learn should be an area of concern for Scrutiny? Does she also agree that schools, whether they are being refurbished or built from new, should at least contain air-conditioning and windows that open and close?

Deputy C. Curtis:

Thank you for the question. I would have thought, and would definitely like to see, that any future plans would include basic requirements like windows that open. Of course, it is very important that children can learn in a relaxed and comfortable atmosphere, even being able to go outside and sit under a tree, things like that, is very helpful in learning and remembering things. Yes, I totally agree, we would see if we can follow that up on the Scrutiny Panel.

5.1.2 Deputy H. Jeune:

I asked this question yesterday to the Minister for Children and Education and I would like to seek the views of the Deputy today. The inclusive education review recommends the Government define inclusive education, so how would the Deputy define inclusive education?

Deputy C. Curtis:

Thank you for the question. Inclusive education to me would mean that everybody can learn, follow up their interests and get to know more about things. There should not be barriers in place, whether that is physical barriers or structural in the way that things are organised. I would also expect that there should be some overarching way to look into this to make sure that there are no barriers to inclusion.

5.1.3 Deputy L. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

I congratulate the Deputy on what I thought was a very excellent speech. You may be new but I think it touched on some very important areas. One of which, I would be interested to know how does she think that Scrutiny can be proactive in helping to improve mental health services for our young people?

Deputy C. Curtis:

Thank you to the Deputy for her comments and the question. Mental health services is just so important, especially now since COVID when a lot of young people have been isolated and not been able to do all the normal things that they do. I think every report we get we can examine thoroughly

to do with mental health services, we can also organise focus groups as necessary but this is something that we will have to follow up. I do understand the importance of it and I know that C.A.M.H.S. already does a lot of good work but there needs to be more counsellors in schools, for example. I do know that in some of the secondary schools there is one counsellor available and when that person is on holiday there is nobody to take their place. There is good work being done but there could be a lot more.

5.1.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Apart from visits arranged for schools to this Chamber, organised by the Greffe, there has been little interaction between schools, Parishes and Government on a political level. What are the candidate's views on that and does she think they ought to be further developed?

Deputy C. Curtis:

Yes, I did think there was a programme of education about the Government going into schools but I will need to look into that more. Clearly there is a disengagement of a lot of the population with our States Assembly so, yes, that is something I would need to look at.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Any further questions? If there are no further questions, that brings the time for questions to an end. I confirm that Deputy Catherine Curtis has been appointed Chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

Deputy C. Curtis:

Could I just say thank you and please do get in touch with me if you are interested in joining the panel?

6. Appointment of Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move on to selection of the Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel. I invite members to make nominations for the Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I would like to nominate Deputy Rob Ward as Chair of this panel, please.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for the Chair of this panel?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I would like to nominate Deputy Luce for the Chair of the panel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for the Chair of this panel? No? Accordingly, I invite Deputy Luce to withdraw from the Chamber.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Can I ask, before I withdraw, whether we will complete the selection before lunch?

The Deputy Bailiff:

I do not know the answer to that question.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

The reason I ask is I have a medical appointment at 2.00 p.m. and I do not know if I can be back here by 2.15 p.m., I could certainly be back here by 2.30 p.m.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, perhaps we will ...

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Is it worth proposing a slightly earlier adjournment for lunch now on the basis that obviously the candidate has to withdraw so it might be awkward to work that out?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I was wondering, testing Members' appetite, we have 2 more positions to elect, whether we continue to work until we complete it and that means finishing at 1.30 p.m. or 2.00 p.m. perhaps. To work straight through until it is done.

[12:30]

The Deputy Bailiff:

I am not sure we can guarantee that. One thing we could do is hear first from Deputy Ward and the questions for him and then break for a slightly extended luncheon adjournment, but it is a matter for Members.

Deputy R. Ward:

I wonder if we just get this one done and if you have to be at a hospital appointment that is absolutely fair enough, it would only take an extra, I do not know how long. I say this and now there will be 20 minutes of questions obviously, but I am happy to continue.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are Members content to sit late during the short adjournment for the purpose of completing this particular Chairship?

Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

May I suggest that maybe we swap and bring one of the other Scrutiny Panels forward and then it would afford both candidates proper time after Deputy Luce comes back from his appointment.

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is another suggestion. Do you make that proposition?

Deputy B. Ward.

Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that proposition seconded? [**Seconded**] Deputy Ward, is there anything you want to say?

Deputy R. Ward:

May I make a proposition that we just continue and finish this one first and have a late lunch, because the late lunch - if we get on with this now - will probably be 1.15 p.m. and I have a lunch appointment but I am happy to miss it because I think this takes priority. I do not know what Deputy Luce thinks, if he agrees, and then we can get on with and then he can reach his appointment, et cetera, et cetera. I would like to make that proposition, please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy Barbara Ward, yours was made first in time, do you wish to continue with that proposition?

Deputy B. Ward:

I am happy to put that to one side and go with the proposition of Deputy Ward.

The Deputy Bailiff:

You are happy to withdraw your proposition?

Deputy B. Ward:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition that Deputy Ward has made that we should simply deal with this particular Chairship and then break for lunch? Accordingly, we will proceed on that basis. Deputy Luce, can I invite you to withdraw.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Thank you, Sir, and I am grateful to Members.

6.1 Deputy R. Ward:

I am standing for the Chairperson role of this panel to continue my hardworking scrutiny in another area of keen interest for me. I bring experience of a very strong work ethic and the ability to analyse, collaborate and produce positive outcomes. First, I will talk about the panel's work so far, and I thank the previous panel for providing a legacy report, which makes this bit both quite easy to do but also it has to be edited down because there is so much in it. A sensible starting place for future work is indeed that legacy report from the previous panel, although the contents and the detail of the mini-Budget and the 100-day plan will have to be taken into consideration. This may require some initial scrutiny. Some areas from the legacy report, just to point out, are the waste strategy, which is very important for a small Island, marine resources, and there has been so much discussion on those things. Obviously, the Carbon Neutral Roadmap, and this is a huge area of work and ongoing. The sustainable travel plans, which I know have been moved forward but there will be more to come with that. I mention it and people might groan but the vehicle testing model that has to be adapted is going to be a really important thing that we decide upon in the Island. The creating better homes policy and its application. Medicinal cannabis, of course there is a huge decision to be made there by Ministers. Public Health and Safety Rented Dwelling Regulations are being developed as well, which are very important from the Minister for the Environment, which have come forward. The perfluoroalkyl substance - I should be able to say that - or P.F.A.S., as you know the contamination and how it is addressed is something that has been ongoing, and also wide-ranging use of Airbnb in Jersey and its impact are areas for future scrutiny. There are more. Indeed, there is a list of forthcoming laws which is very useful in legacy reports and I urge anybody, if you are going on to a Scrutiny Panel, to look back at those legacy reports regardless of the outcome today. It will need careful planning and a work programme that extends throughout the year and includes the Government Plan review, of course - the good old Government Plan review - which we all so much look forward to and indeed the debate itself. Yes, absolutely. I think it is very important that I have experience of planning that workload with officers. I am a very organised person in terms of timescales, I like to prepare and I think I have shown evidence that I prepare extremely thoroughly for every single sitting. The list I have read demonstrates the depth and the breadth of the panel's work and why I have such a keen interest to Chair this work. It is something to get my teeth into and build a team across the Assembly to really produce work of quality and the type of constructive

scrutiny that improves policy and its application. I would like to talk about the process of scrutiny and why it is so vital for good governance. That is not a word we have used yet, I think, in this Assembly and it is such an important word. Scrutiny is a process of gathering data, information, consulting and collating evidence about policy and regulation which is brought by the Ministers. It is not about making policy, although good collaborative scrutiny can bring improvements and that is certainly my experience from the last 4 years. Scrutiny must be a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research using objective approaches to genuinely analyse the impact of regulation and policy. In doing this we play a vital role in the accountability of Government and the transparency of decision-making, together with the Government and the Assembly good scrutiny is a vital ingredient for this good governance. Something we all want and certainly our residents do. Another vital part of the Chairperson role is the relationship with Scrutiny officers. I know that the success of a panel is due to the hard work and professional approach of Scrutiny officers. I have spoken many times in this Assembly to praise their work on reports and comment papers that have assisted this Assembly in decision-making by bringing clarity and focus on the propositions upon which we decide. I will always treat officers and panel members with respect, both in terms of the work they do and the voice they have on the collaborative panel. Inclusion is about the way we act and the behaviours we demonstrate in our working life. I will continue to lead and care for those who work with me, should I be successful today. Briefly I will explain the skills I bring to the role. I have always worked with groups of professionals, as a head of a science department at a secondary school and working with highly qualified and specialists in their own subjects requires collaborative leadership that brings out the individual skills that build a better whole outcome. I tell you now, science teachers can be a very difficult bunch. Also, there a role for Scrutiny of including more voices in the Scrutiny research programme itself. My laptop has just switched off so I will have to remember the figures off the top of my head. One of the things I was very proud of with the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel was the post-16 review we undertook, which went out with 1,925 - I believe the number is - surveys to young people. We managed to receive 73 per cent of replies from young people in years 11 and 12, I think it was 51 per cent in year 10. That was one of the first times that that engagement had happened and it informed our research, it informed our report, and it informed our recommendations and assisted the then Minister in making decisions and recommendations. That to me is full detailed and inclusive scrutiny, which is what we need to do in this Assembly. Certainly, I think around the areas - most of them really - of the carbon neutral roadmap and sustainable transport, we need to have the voices of future generations in our Scrutiny work of that because they will be vital for it. On a personal level, I took the opportunity from the last Assembly to complete a Certificate of Parliamentary Governance with McGill University, something I would recommend to all parliamentarians. Indeed, I delivered the valedictorian speech, although I confess, I had to look up what this was as my only reference point was my children watching "High School Musical", not the best reference point I found out. I am also very supportive of my colleagues on the Scrutiny Panels and will try to ensure that their well-being is considered. We do not talk enough about the well-being of each other in this Assembly, particularly during the times of high pressure. I hope those that have worked with me will agree that I do take time to do that and do genuinely try to make sure people are okay. That is a really important soft skill perhaps - I do not know if that is the correct phrase - within a panel Chair, to look after your panel members. I am trying to keep this speech short but I have gone on a little bit actually. I would like to finish with an example of how Scrutiny work can transcend political differences. In the last Assembly I was Chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel, for some time it was Deputy Guida who was Minister for Home Affairs. I am reminded of a sitting after a rather factitious debate on the topic, I cannot remember what it as about but I can just remember the situation, where Deputy Guida stated that he was an archenemy of Reform. We were in full hero and villain mode at that time and I looked up to the gallery expecting there to be minions, but there were not. I mention this because it may have been in the same sitting, it may have been later in the week or another sitting, on a number of occasions the same Deputy as Minister praised the work of my panel and the constructive way we

assisted to improve legislation. I was very proud of that. Indeed, he did that on a number of occasions, as did other Ministers. This demonstrates how Scrutiny transcends political differences and allows us to move out of our echo chambers of opinion, something that is vital for us all to do. I will finish there and I will ask you to vote for me for the position, and whether I am successful or not, to get involved in this or other Scrutiny Panels, which are both a good start to any parliamentary career and just an enjoyable and positive experience. I thank Members for listening.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Rob Ward. The first question for Deputy Ward comes from Deputy Doublet.

6.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I would like to ask the candidate, given the interest in the environment from children and young people, how would the Deputy ensure that their voices are heard in the work that he is going to do?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank the Deputy for that question. It is something I mentioned in my speech. We have to engage with young people. We were starting a project - I think COVID got in the way of the now Chief Minister - and I believe Deputy Doublet was on a panel where we were looking at exactly that type of engagement. If we cannot get young people involved in the Scrutiny process over things such as climate change, we do not have a chance. I really believe that we can. Also, if you came to the Youth Parliament, and I do attend every Youth Parliament as best I can - I have attended Youth Parliaments - those topics come up. Young people are keen to be involved and we need to get there, but we need to get there at an early age. We must not be fearful of getting into primary schools. I did an Assembly at Springfield School for the entire school with the little ones, where they voted on a proposition and the proposition was: "Is a cat or a dog the best pet?" We had a vote and so on and so forth, but that was the first time they had engaged in our political process. I do not know how young they were, they were tiny, and sitting still is a problem, but I suppose I should not complain about that, but that is the type of thing we need to do at all levels. We must not be fearful and think that young people do not have views because they do. I hope that answers the Deputy's question.

6.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

My supplementary was going to be would the candidate take forward that piece of work that we started, so I am pleased that he will. Will he also be a voice on the Scrutiny Liaison Committee for encouraging other panels to make sure the voice of children is heard in their work?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank again the Deputy. That is exactly where that panel started and I think that the role of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee for that co-ordination has been very good in the last 4 years and it has given us good communication between committees. There are common factors between committees, one of them being that engagement with young people, one of them being engaging areas of our community that we have not engaged before in the Scrutiny process, because what that does, it gives more value to the Scrutiny process. If that is a better process, it gives more value to the legislation that is passed and it gives more value - and we are back to that word again - governance of what we produce in this Assembly.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Deputy Doublet asked almost word for word the exact question that I was going to.

6.1.3 Deputy L. Stephenson:

Will the Deputy commit to ensure that environmental policies that come before him for scrutiny are considered from a point of view of being realistic, deliverable and take into account the experience of families and how will he ensure that happens?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank the Deputy for the question. That is a really good point, absolutely, and I think that is what Scrutiny is about. I would want a panel of Members, if I am successful, from across this Assembly, and I do not say that point about not being an echo chamber lightly. I think I have improved as a politician by avoiding that. If I am honest and I mention it, I think as a party we have improved because of that.

[12:45]

I think it is really important for us to do that. Part of that is hearing those voices, so what is the reality of that for families, and also getting the voice of families in there. That is partly children. I am a parent, I have got 2 children, they are all grown up and so on. I do sometimes think that my daughter is adding to the greenhouse effect on her own, but we will not go into that, and it is important that we engage those groups of people, but yes, absolutely.

6.1.4 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Airbnb accommodation is proving to be very popular and a way for families to earn a few pounds during the summer season, but it falls without the law. What are the candidate's views on making that legal?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank the Constable for the question. First of all, any law would come from the Minister, but second, I think any review into Airbnb needs to do basically the key things that come from scrutiny: what is happening, what is the data, what is the quantitative data? There is qualitative data around that in terms of what these places look like, what access they have got and so on and so forth, then it is what laws exist and what is it that Jersey, as an Island, wants. I think that is something we need to think about very carefully when we look at legislation. I think that is something we have done previously, particularly I believe with Home Affairs: does the legislation fit Jersey as our jurisdiction? We are not the U.K.; we are not France, who we have links with. We are not the U.S.A. (United States of America); we are not other parts of the world. It has to be very distinct to Jersey. Will it work here; how will it work; is it working are the questions. Then all we can do, as I am sure the Constable knows - he is an experienced scrutineer - is make recommendations because that is the role of the panel. I hope that answers your question.

6.1.5 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Clearly a lot of work of Scrutiny is reactive, but I wonder if the candidate would care to comment on what he sees as particular priorities he might want to pursue if he were Chair of the committee.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank the Minister for his question. From the legacy report, the first thing is whatever comes from the mini-Budget and the 100-day plan has to be scrutinised and it will be a quick turnaround. There is an irony there when we have spent so much time talking about time to scrutinise, and I hope that the Scrutiny Liaison Committee, for example, can co-ordinate how that scrutiny will happen. That has to happen so that Scrutiny is involved in anything like that. I have no problem with that idea and I think it is a good idea to do those sorts of things, but that certainly would be a priority first of all. I think we are - a real pun here - along the road of sustainable transport and there were some decisions made in the last Assembly, one of them being, for example, the transfer of £1.4 million into active travel that was agreed, and I hope does not change. I think one of the simple and quick things to do would be to check how that is being utilised fully in the way it was intended to. I think as well there is a need, and perhaps it is not particularly fashionable, to look at the waste strategy on the Island as we look ahead because I think it interlinks with the Parishes and recycling schemes. It certainly interlinks with what we are producing in terms of waste and how we can change our economy - it

goes across other panels - to not be producing so much waste in what we import and what we buy. I think those, at first sight, would be the case, but that would be up to the panel. There has to be an agreement across panel; you have to be working together. Certainly in the panels before other people brought priorities. Indeed, I have no issues with people leading reviews. Deputy Doublet led the review into the COVID recovery and I think it is a really good idea for panels to do that. New Members, if you are on a panel, do not be afraid to lead a review. It might look daunting, but honestly, it is a really good thing to do, so I hope that answers your question.

6.1.6 Deputy L. Stephenson:

I was encouraged by the mention of P.F.A.S. in the Deputy's speech at the beginning. Representing a constituency that has some key areas of pollution in this, it is of interest. What at this stage does the Deputy think such a review should focus on and would it include the extension of mains water and questions around that?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, good question. I would say to the Deputy one of the things I know about P.F.A.S., because I have had people contact me as well, because people move from that area in the Island from our constituencies, the first process was to offer a testing process, a blood test. I believe they were sent off to America and we can look at the effect of that. My concern was always that you will test people and say: "Oh yes, by the way, you have got high levels of P.F.A.S. in your blood" but then what does Government do? That is the next stage I think that we must be looking at in a review: "What have you done to test for this and now what is the next stage?" Because Government needs to have a plan for that. In terms of mains water, I think that is a huge issue in many, many places. I think that might be also part of the waste strategy in terms of how you are going to link people up to both of those things, so yes, it is certainly part of that. I think the P.F.A.S. thing has been and gone in terms of the water supply and is there, and that is the issue we need to deal with now. It may well be that one of the products of that is to increase the amount of mains water, but again, I think I am getting into the territory there of what Ministers will decide upon, but certainly it is a really good opportunity to produce objective quantitative evidence to say: "This is where we are" and when the blood test comes back: "Here you are, Minister, we have produced this and what are you going to do?" which is always a good question from Scrutiny.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If there are no further questions for Deputy Ward, then that brings the time for questions to an end. I will invite Deputy Ward to withdraw from the Chamber. I think you are going to be supervised wherever you go. That is my understanding, anyway. I will invite Deputy Luce to return.

6.2 Deputy S.G. Luce:

Members living in, working in, enjoying and protecting and enhancing our environment here in Jersey, it has never been more important, keeping those brown cows and green fields. This is as important now as it ever was. Improving our environment, whether in land or sea, is vital. Trying to list everything I would wish to scrutinise in the next 4 years is impossible, but clearly the new Island Plan is a massively important document. Whether we amend it or have another new one, we need to make it simpler, shorter, easier to use and, more importantly, understandable. I want to use Scrutiny to help find and deliver more housing sites, but also increase the protection of the green zone; not an easy compromise, but one I want to help achieve. Our Energy Plan 2050 has set us some targets for carbon emissions and with new houses now using much less energy in the near future, we must concentrate on transport and the historic housing stock. I want the Minister to be prioritising electric vehicles. The Government must do so much more to facilitate greater uptake here in Jersey. It is clear to me that the electricity law is seriously outdated. We need a new energy law. Jersey is yet to properly embrace sustainable energy production and this must change. We must have more

solar-powered generation. I will do whatever I can to encourage this. We need a proper commercial experiment looking at ground-source heat. I will press the Minister to do this. Off-shore wind power needs to be seriously looked at and I will do all I can to encourage the Minister in this direction. Climate change mitigation work will continue and must be co-ordinated by the Environment Department. It is vital that we plan for the future. The Minister will need to commit to bold, long-term plans in order to safeguard the Island for future generations. Our access strategy to the countryside needs to start delivering tangible improvements. More resource is needed. Just maintaining our footpath network is not good enough. Part of the rural economy strategy is to use buffer strips. These could double as footpaths, so we have the ability to reduce inorganic input, add to footpaths and increase biodiversity, much needed by pollinators, all in one move. I would hope to persuade the new Minister in this direction. The competitive world of weather forecasting becomes ever more challenging day by day. Our current service is the most visited States internet site in Jersey and is much valued by not just local residents, but by the maritime and aviation community. The Minister must resolve any funding issues and he must also look to find ways not just to continue, but to enhance the service. We will and we must continue to identify, trial and encourage new crops. We have had great success with hemp and tea in the last 3 years, but I will press the Minister to get farmers to continue to diversify and to continue to reduce their inputs. Through the Action for Cleaner Water Group we have achieved much. Nitrate levels in our groundwater and streams are better than they have been for decades, but we cannot be complacent and we need to keep moving. Neither agriculture nor fisheries have been immune to the challenges of Brexit and COVID. One of those challenges is agricultural workers. This issue has to be addressed. Work permits have worked previously very well and could be used again and I want the Minister to understand that, but we also need flexibility to help meet industry demand. Disease spread is a consequence of climate change and an ever-increasing threat. That is why ever-stronger border controls will be essential and we must remain ever-vigilant. Climate change is also hastening the arrival of certain non-native invasive species, most recently the Asian hornet, but more invasives will follow and the Minister must be ready to act. While not yet a significant issue, the Minister must continue to do everything he can to deter fly-tipping. It is socially and environmentally unacceptable and those caught should expect to find themselves prosecuted and I will press the Minister to continue to prioritise this. Drone technology has progressed immensely in recent years and we now have access to drones in the Environment Department and combined with the Internet of Things, the Minister should be using drone technology to make Jersey a better place. We must also continue to reduce air pollution. All sections of Government must work together on this issue. I will press the Minister on air pollution issues around schools and in our capital. I believe that all master-planning should be in the Planning Department, whether that is things like the waterfront masterplan, St. Helier masterplan or the Island masterplan. All these must be co-ordinated. The same goes for public transport, traffic and parking. These issues all link to air quality, congestion and speed of travel and we must have all these subjects under the control of a single entity. I will, if elected, press Ministers to undertake these changes. The Minister should continue to develop a policy for our public realm. I want to do all I can to help with the improving of our capital and the quality of the public amenities inside it, be that green spaces, place spaces, open spaces. We must do better and I want to do all I can to help the Minister carry on working with the Constable of St. Helier to improve further. Finally, I commit to being a critical friend when it comes to our green zone policies. Everything on this Island centres around the beauty of our environment, countryside and our coastline and while some compromises will always have to be made, we reduce the protection for those areas at our peril. Everything I will do and all the policies I will scrutinise regarding fishing should be working towards a sustainable fishery for future generations, with whelps, brown crab and even lobster coming under threat of over-exploitation. I want the Minister to continue to prioritise long-term sustainability and viability over short-term profit. In all decision-making, accurate and current data is key. I want the Minister to make sure the data collection is now an absolute priority for Marine Resources Department especially.

[13:00]

In the same vein, I will encourage the Minister to investigate the possibility of working with major universities to provide marine facilities which agree courses in maritime-related matters. As on land, we must be on our guard for non-native invasive species in our waters. While we may not be in a position to stop invasives, we must have our best plans ready to mitigate their effects. Fishing is probably the most important and complicated part of any portfolio I have held since 2011, balancing the demands of a Brexit trade agreement, fisheries management agreements with the U.K., Guernsey and the impending nature and extent clause of the Brexit T.E.C.A. (Trade and Economic Co-operation Agreement), which will begin very soon, make this area a very serious issue indeed. I would commit to doing whatever I can to create the very best outcome for our local fishing fleet. Our fishermen have historic rights in and around the Channel Islands waters. These must be maintained in perpetuity. I want to continue to say to the Minister and Islanders, do not waste resources. Seven years ago we signed up to a plastic-free coastline campaign, but it is not just plastic, it is food waste, water waste, it is making sure that we do not waste any of our resources. Let us make best use of all our structures and buildings; let us not build new unnecessarily. Let us strive to be a waste-free Island. Finally, housing. We know that we need more housing and that is across every different sector: social housing, affordable housing, sheltered housing and key worker accommodation. We need more of every type, but first we need data, and that work has been committed to by our new Minister. Once we know exactly what we need, then we need a delivery policy and we need it yesterday. This will be an absolute priority for me to press the Minister to move as quickly as he possibly can on these issues. There are plenty of priorities that I want to scrutinise. It is a big ask, but they are all vital: the new Island Plan, climate change, sustainable energy, carbon emissions, electric vehicles, traffic, public realm, waste, housing and the list goes on. I would ask the Assembly to support me to scrutinise all this vital work as a critical friend. This is an immense subject and we all need to work together for the best outcomes for our wonderful environment here in Jersey. Thank you.

6.2.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

I am just being dazzled by the Constable of St. John's lapel badge, and that is why I am slightly blinded. It is at this time of the day, the risks of being in the Chamber. The Deputy gave what I thought was a very good manifesto for the environment, but it seemed to me it would have better suited to somebody standing for that post of Minister. Does he recognise that the job of Scrutiny, as I understand it, is to primarily scrutinise government policy, not to try and put forward one's own policy as to what he thinks the Minister should be doing and pressing him to implement that, or have I misunderstood?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

No, the Deputy has not misunderstood. He may wish to know that this speech was put together at extremely short notice in the last hour and it is an adaptation of a speech I used some years ago. I absolutely agree that it is important that Scrutiny has to scrutinise the policies brought forward by the Minister, but I thought in the address I have just given in 10 minutes it would show where my credentials would lie and the direction I would take if I had the opportunity to press the Minister in any particular direction. The Minister may choose or otherwise to go in any direction he chooses and what policy he comes out with will be those policies that Scrutiny will intend to look at.

6.2.2 Deputy J. Renouf:

The work of Scrutiny is of course largely reactive. There were a lot of priorities in your speech and I wonder if you would hazard an attempt to suggest which your priorities might have been, bearing in mind the spread across not just the environment brief, but across other areas of that Scrutiny Panel.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

My own personal priority, I think we would have to go back to fundamental basics and look at the weather that we have outside today and accept the fact that our climate is changing. The way that we adapt to climate or the way we try to slow down climate change is to reduce carbon emissions, and I think that is something that we need to look at. We are fortunate we have an Island that uses low-carbon energy but we need to do more on using liquid fuel, so that means engines, internal combustion engines, and that also means the heating of our historic housing stock. I think those are 2 priorities, but I also feel that we need to be looking at more security for our energy, which is why I would always urge the Minister to look to offshore wind and also the creation of more solar power on-Island.

6.2.3 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Following on from that answer, in relation to harnessing the power of renewable energy, the 3 main constituents being solar, wind and tidal, what does the candidate believe is the most desirable solution for the Island on a long-term basis which will create the least environmental impact?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

That is a very challenging question because each particular method of creating power mentioned by the Deputy comes with its own environmental impact. Wind power at sea will have an impact on the seabed; it will have an impact on the marine environment; it will have an impact on the ability of our fishermen to fish in those areas; it will also need to be changed after a number of years because the infrastructure will wear out. Solar on land will have an impact on the perception of the public in the countrywide because one may well see these solar farms. Tidal is a particularly interesting one and if we look to the south of the Island to the Rance barrage, we will note there that the technology has not changed for many, many decades. In fact, it is still working perfectly well. If the Island could find a way to harness the same sort of power as the Rance barrage it would be wonderful, but it would also have a major impact on the way the Island looks and the way that Islanders look out to sea. Each technology has its own drawbacks, but I think for me at the moment the cost of producing wind power is reducing all the time and I think we probably need to, if I had my way, follow the French if we need to create a large amount of sustainable energy, follow the French and look to what they have done in their windfarm they are building currently north of the Brittany Coast.

6.2.4 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

A quick supplementary. Does he agree with me that on-Island solar generation and wind generation are the most likely solutions for the long-term sustainability of our Island's energy needs?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I am not sure of the long-term sustainability, but certainly the Deputy is right, inasmuch as we should be doing a lot more to encourage people to produce solar energy and wind energy on-Island. It can be done in ways and not have too much of a perception of the public that the whole Island is covered in turbines or solar panels, but we should be and must do more.

6.2.5 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Would the candidate agree with the creation of a Minister for Energy and, given the size of that portfolio, a separate Scrutiny Panel to follow him?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

It is certainly a Ministry that has been mooted in recent months and it certainly must be worth looking at. I do not know quite how wide a portfolio that Minister would be given. For example, would their remit go into liquid fuel and things like that? Would it impose fuel taxation? It is a subject that

certainly needs addressing and certainly could be considered, but I am not sure at this moment if it is a definite yes or no.

6.2.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Given the interest in environmental issues by children and young people, how would the candidate plan to take their views and their voice into account?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

It is certainly clear to me - and I am sure it is clear to the Deputy and other Members of the Assembly - that the younger generation think very much more carefully about climate change, about recycling and waste, about some of the issues that maybe older people like myself do not consider such a priority. I think that the young generation will find ways of letting us know, whether it is our children or our grandchildren, in my case, or whether it is through the Youth Parliament, whether it is through any of these youth organisations, but I think the message will come clear to Members from young people that they want us to do more when it comes to the environment.

6.2.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

What would the candidate do himself to reach out to young children and amplify their voices?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Certainly, when it comes to writing Scrutiny reviews, the Scrutiny Panel have it at their disposal to undertake research work and ask people to come in for public hearings or submit evidence. Certainly if the issue arose where we felt we needed to consult with younger people, I see no reason why we could not go into schools or write to schools to ask for evidence to be submitted from schoolchildren of all ages, graduates at university, young people in Jersey, put out the word and ask for submissions. I am sure they would be very forthcoming.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Deputy Tadier.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think the Constable of St. Mary wanted to ask a question.

The Deputy Bailiff:

He did, but there is there is plenty of time so I have called you first.

6.2.8 Deputy M. Tadier:

That is fine. It seems to be an area of concern for some in the Assembly that with the Deputy being a member of a political party, could he ensure that his membership of the political party would not influence his Scrutiny work in any adverse way?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I can assure the Deputy. He will know only too well that I am not a member of a particularly large and well-represented party in this Assembly. If the Whip decided that I was saying something out of turn, I am sure I could have a word with myself. **[Laughter]**

6.2.9 Deputy M. Tadier:

As I said, it is not a problem that I have. I think party politics is entirely normal. That is why it exists in most places in the world, but perhaps to push the former Minister and the candidate further, does he think that there is a concern that he might see himself more as a shadow Minister for the Environment than more of a Chair of the panel, given the very good manifesto that he has outlined today in the Assembly?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I would like to feel that I could be seen as a good scrutineer. The Deputy is quite right, I was Minister for the Environment for 3½ years, but I have also chaired the Economic Panel, I have been vice-Chair of the Economic Panel, I have been vice-Chair of the Environment Panel, and most recently served on the Environment Scrutiny Panel in the last session. I would like to think I can do both jobs and I would certainly like to think I can be constructive when it comes to Scrutiny.

6.2.10 The Connétable of St. Mary:

I thank Deputy Tadier for his courtesy in pushing me up the billing, as it were. In his question, the new Minister for the Environment stated that the work of Scrutiny is mainly reactive. Would the candidate agree with that and would he not accept that a large part of the panel's duty is to be proactive where the panel believes that some existing situation needs to be rectified, even if it is not the subject of an immediate proposition?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I am grateful to the Constable, because I too reacted to the word when the Minister used it. It has always been my view that Scrutiny looks at policy and development and moving forward and as such is not necessarily reactive. That is a job very much more for P.A.C. to look backwards at value for money and things that have been done. Yes, I agree with the Constable. While Scrutiny is obviously reactive to the Minister and the policies he puts forward, it is very much about helping or criticising in a friendly way the policies and the directions that the Minister wishes to go in.

6.2.11 Deputy R. Kovacs:

I just want to ask: what is the candidate's view on the marine park in Jersey waters?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Certainly, I have thought a lot about the marine park. It is in my manifesto that I was supporting the marine park coming forward in the next 4 years. I did not support it in the last session because I thought it all came on a little bit too fast because the most important thing here is we need to find ways to work with the fishing community and not against them when it comes to the creation of this park. I am certainly convinced that if you reduce the amount of effort you will increase the amount of environment there, and if we can find ways to get to a point where there is a lot more stock in the sea and the fishermen need to take a lot less of it, that would be a much, much better way to be. The difficulty we have is getting to that position. Asking a fisherman to use a half or a third of the number of fishing pots he uses currently only works when there is an increase in the stock, so that medium-short period of time between now and 5 and 6 years' time when the marine park really starts to come into effect is a time period where the industry will need a lot of support to ensure that we still have some fishermen left in Jersey when the benefits of the marine park are there to be enjoyed.

[13:15]

6.2.12 Deputy M. Scott:

The Deputy mentioned that he felt that the next Island Plan needs to be simpler. Could he please explain whether he is thinking in terms of there being less discretion for planning officers or more?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I have thought that the Island Plan should be a shorter document for some time, and it was encouraging on one hand to see that the recent draft Bridging Island Plan was a less number of pages. However, as Members will have found out, there were so many appendices and additional documents that we had to go to, so that the entirety of the work was considerably larger than we had in previous iterations. I still believe we need a shorter, clearer, more concise and easier to understand plan. I am not sure quite where the Deputy is coming from, but I hate subjectivity, I hate the ability of people

to make decisions just how they feel. I want rules in black and white, I want policies in black and white that are easy to understand, that everybody knows exactly where they are. I do not like uncertainty and changes, so I would say to the Deputy I want a shorter document, one that is easier and I want one that civil servants can use and make decisions on much more quickly.

6.2.13 Deputy M. Scott:

If it is going to be in black and white, would the document not need to be more detailed in order for people to have clarity?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

That is an interesting point and one that would probably need to be discussed with officers, but at the end of the day it is for the Minister to bring it forward and me to scrutinise it if the Minister says that that is the direction he wants to go in. Maybe I will be fortunate enough to have a look and see if we can make it together a better document.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. If there are no further questions for Deputy Luce, then that brings the time for questions to an end. I invite Deputy Rob Ward to return to the Chamber. Both candidates have spoken and answered questions, so we now move to the vote. Any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Rob Ward should press the pour button; any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Luce should press the contre button. Members may abstain in the usual way. As to Members present remotely, they may either indicate their vote by typing pour, contre or indicating the name of the candidate for whom they wish to vote. I now ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. Another close vote, which we are just checking. Yes, I think Deputy Ward, you inadvertently cast a vote. Yes, so we need to disallow your vote. I can announce that Deputy Ward received 21 votes, Deputy Luce received 24 votes. Accordingly, Deputy Luce has been appointed as Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central: 21		Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin: 24		Abstain: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy M. Tadier		Connétable of Trinity		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		Connétable of St. Martin		
Deputy S.M. Ahier		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy K.L. Moore		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Deputy C.F. Labey		
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy K.F. Morel		

Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy I.J. Gorst		
Deputy H.L. Jeune		Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf		
Deputy R.S. Kovacs		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy A.F. Curtis		Deputy H.M. Miles		
Deputy B. Ward		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Deputy K.M. Wilson		Deputy R.E. Binet		
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		Deputy M.E. Millar		
		Deputy A. Howell		
		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
		Deputy M.B. Andrews		

What do you read out first, names first, then we will come to your ...

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

If we have just one candidate for each of the following 2 nominations, it strikes me that we could work through and get this finished. I just wondered if we could have any indications of ... no?

The Deputy Bailiff:

I am not sure we can predict that. I do not think that would be fair.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I will withdraw that, I get the message, Sir.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the adjournment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the adjournment?

Deputy M. Tadier:

What time are we coming back later? Because it is already 1.25 p.m. and we have lunchtime appointments and things to do, some of us.

The Deputy Bailiff:

It is 2.15 p.m. unless someone proposes another time.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I propose we come back at 3.00 p.m.?

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:

Can I make a counter-proposition of 2.30 p.m., please?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are Members content to return at 2.30 p.m.? Those in favour, please show. The Assembly is adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

[13:25]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:32]

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I am sorry, before we begin, could I ask for some guidance? Two of the Ministers have been called away to a situation as Les Quennevais School, Deputy Gardiner and Deputy Binet. They have asked me to let you know. I do not know if they can be excused or ...

7. Appointment of Chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel

The Deputy Bailiff:

That is noted, thank you very much. We now move to appoint a Chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel, I invite Members to make nominations for the Chair of this panel.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Could I please nominate Deputy Geoff Southern?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for the Chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel? Does anyone else wish to make a nomination for the Chair of this panel? No.

7.1 Deputy G.P. Southern St. Helier Central:

I have just got a little piece here that says: "What constitutes good scrutiny?" I have already had 2 recommendations this morning to state that I do know what scrutiny is about. The first factor to look at is the most sensitive. It relies on what can only be described as a sniff test, a sense that something in States policy or actions is wrong. It may be raised by questions, question time, and often is a starting point for Scrutiny. Whatever its source, it begs investigation. We need to examine the history and look at the consequences and see what is revealed based on the evidence presented; always evidence. When I first came to the States 21 years ago and started to deal with those who had problems with the Government, those voters who had problems with the Government, I used to say that of the 3 institutions that existed to offer support to those in poverty, housing, welfare and social security, that you got the best treatment from the Social Security Department. That used to be my rule. Their approach was empathetic, polite and they took their time to explain what was happening. Unfortunately, that is not the case today in many cases - with some exceptions, some very good officers - people approaching Social Security for support get a tick-box approach which is totally inflexible. Some officers have been infused with an attitude that most of their customers are scammers and skivers and that is a shame, but the reality is different. Each individual that goes into the Social Security Department has a problem that they are seeking help to deal with. That is the reality, and so they should be treated with some substantial respect. That starts with the ability to have a face-to-face interview, to have an explanation, because just to say: "It was on the email" or: "Here are the numbers" is not satisfactory at all and cannot be. But as Scrutiny, we have to remember that our role is to be the critical friend on the policy of the Minister and not to rewrite policy, but to improve it. It is not Scrutiny's job to invent alternatives, but merely to hold the Minister to account for his or her actions. This holding to account may most often take the form of a formal public hearing, at which the Minister will present his or her arguments around why they have acted the way they have. It is important to note here that it is the Minister who should be required to account for the actions. The Minister must show an understanding of the policy and not merely defer to the officers present to make the case for them. The number of officers I have seen in some Scrutiny Panels amounts to a football team. They come mob-handed and protect their Minister, very often, so people take the answers and not the Minister. You have got to be careful to make sure that it is the Minister who ends up answering, rather than the officer with all the details. The Minister must have done their homework properly and it is the scrutineers' duty to ensure the right questions are asked and weaknesses are explored. This takes me back to the sniff test mentioned above. Following the sniff that indicates there may be a problem, then the watch word becomes "preparation, preparation,

preparation.” You cannot prepare enough the right questions for a Scrutiny hearing. This often involves reading masses of research reports, maybe from across the world, maybe from the department, informing us what other authorities are proposing on similar topics. The aim of Scrutiny is of course to examine the evidence for any course of action. Party politics plays no part in this. I will repeat that because there is still some confusion around: party politics plays no part in that. You have to learn to put your Scrutiny hat and your party hat on at the right moment. That is the way to do it and that is what I recommend. That takes us on to the art of questioning. The best questions often are the short sharp ones, to use “what, where, when and who” and then that develops into “and why?” and whether the possible changes advocated by Scrutiny should or could or must be applied. There is another fine distinction, the strength with which you have evidence. If you have got it rock solid then you end up making recommendations that say: “You must do this. We have evidence to suggest that that is the way forward” or you might moderate it slightly: “You should do this” or even milder still: “You could do this.” Of course, to the question as to how you publicise what is going on in Scrutiny, the best answer is often not to do recommendations because recommendations are easy to ignore. Turn your recommendation into a proposition and bring the proposition to the panel to argue the toss in a public forum in this Chamber. That is where you can really hold Ministers to account. I turn out to be the longest-serving Deputy in the States and have spent most of my 21 years in this Chamber, in this Assembly, in Scrutiny. I have worked alongside many of those who are not of the same political persuasion but I have always insisted - always - that any panel where I have an input ends up agreeing a form of words, total agreement, or we carry on. When we have got agreement as to the way forward and what we are saying, then fine, we stop. That is again another one of the skills to lose. One of the dangers in Scrutiny is Scrutiny reports are too long. Scrutiny takes time to do. You have got to learn where to stop and say: “Whatever the evidence we have, this, that and the other, that is what we end up with. We stop now, because that evidence is good enough.” As Chair previously of the Health and Social Security Panel, I spent much time analysing the income support scheme from its very beginning in 2007 and I have been involved in several Scrutiny Panel inquiries into its effectiveness at alleviating poverty on the Island. One of the more recent studies the panel has been engaged on is the impact of low wages and high rents on families living in poverty. This combination has caused suffering, as poverty wages cannot meet household costs and hardworking families have to resort to charities and foodbanks. Again, that is a second shaming statement to make. The Minister will soon be involved in the issue of how to replace the minimum wage with a living wage, I believe. She will be further involved in research into the use and abuse of zero-hour contracts and there is an inquiry going on hearing that as we speak. At the same time, she will be expected to explore the extension of the health access scheme to further reduce G.P. (general practitioner) bills for those in poverty or with chronic conditions. I believe these changes could only have been brought about accurately focused on by Scrutiny. Health service expenditure, which is a large pressure on the public purse, will inevitably rise to meet the needs of an ageing but generally healthier population and there are still questions that arise as to how the Jersey Care Model will be funded.

[14:45]

The G.P.s, who are essential in the delivery of primary care, are somewhat sceptical as to what level of funding they will have available. There is much more work to do on that. We are facing serious problems, not only in housing, but in our health service. That calls for a united approach from the Assembly, a thorough as well as co-operative approach, to tackling the crises in the health service and the cost-of-living calls from the most experienced in the health service. May I humbly suggest that this is me, equipped to deliver on these particular issues. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Deputy Stephenson has the first question of Deputy Southern.

7.1.1 Deputy L. Stephenson:

Is the Deputy aware of recent issues with the long-term care scheme and elderly Islanders being asked to top up their fees unexpectedly and comments made by the outgoing Minister for Health and Social Services that contributions may need to rise? Would he be minded to review the Long-Term Care Scheme as part of the panel's work?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Any changes to the Long-Term Care Scheme will require careful consideration because it is a very balanced situation. I have heard, mainly through my wife, of people who have had problems with affording paying for particular care needs and I think it is something that probably after this length of time, 2 years-plus, we need to review.

7.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier:

Are the Chairman and the panel likely to scrutinise income support components, how they are set, whether they keep up with realistic costs of living components, particularly I am thinking of those to do with private rentals?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

I think the good Deputy has been looking at my crib sheet because, yes, that is an issue that we need to examine; the fact that in many cases components on income support have not been upgraded along with the cost of living and have fallen behind. Effectively, to be on income support today you are in a worse position than you were 5 years, 6 years, 10 years ago because your benefit will not go as far.

7.1.3 Deputy M. Andrews:

In relation to transfer payments, there obviously seems to be an over-reliance in terms of Jersey's low wage economy workforce. Will the candidate ensure that the Minister is held to account in terms of making sure that baseline wages are increased, and also to alleviate the extent of fiscal expenditure?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Again, somebody has been after my crib sheet. This is a point politically I have been making for some time. Whether that transfers into actions on the part of the Minister and thereby opens itself up to analysis, then that is a different issue. But, yes, if that opening were to occur and it was useful for us to do a report on that then we could and would do that.

7.1.4 Deputy B. Ward:

Would the Deputy be engaging user groups to provide comment and/or to provide evidence at Scrutiny meetings?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

It is not something I have done greatly in the past but certainly when thinking about how I approach things nowadays I think user groups are very useful. We have had several good conversations with Les Amis and Mind over particular issues and I think that extra involvement is worthwhile.

7.1.5 Deputy B. Ward:

Do you consider though that using user groups is about putting people and health first, it is about giving people a voice at these meetings about their healthcare and about their costs and things like that? Do you consider that?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

The problem there sometimes is that while individually you might have a conversation - a very detailed and intimate conversation - with somebody about their circumstances on a one to one, as

soon as you make that a public event then my experience is that people often tend to withdraw and not expose their situation if they can help it. You have to have that sort of sensitivity. Some people can, some people cannot and some people will not expose themselves in front of more than an individual.

7.1.6 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

When the Chair designate previously served as Vice-Chair of this Scrutiny Panel he led on a piece of work which I believe was called the Living on Low Income review, and that took place in the aftermath of the previous Income Distribution Survey. Now that we have just had a version of an Income Distribution Survey does he consider that it may be worth conducting a similar review?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

It may be, but I will not commit myself further than that because certainly the figures would suggest that poor people have got poorer in the last 9 years since the last survey. Therefore, the Minister should be looking at how she responds to that particular condition. I think the figures speak for themselves that people have got worse off and assistance is needed. The £20 a week that was given by the previous Minister went nowhere near, did not even touch the sides in terms of coping with the rise in prices that we have got at the moment.

7.1.7 The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Would the candidate expand to Members his views on the Jersey Care Model?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

I do not know if it is an expansion, but certainly. Having spoken to G.P.s they have expressed lots of dissatisfaction because they do not know what is going to happen to their funding. We did away with the Health Insurance Fund which paid ... I see a shocked look there. Yes, it is being spent effectively, and we need to look at a major way of regenerating funding for primary care. For example, the doctors will tell you that on average we spend about 5 per cent of our G.D.P. (gross domestic product) on health in Jersey, whereas the O.E.C.D. average is 10 per cent, so we are way behind what we might be doing in order to alleviate poverty. These days that is incredibly important I think.

7.1.8 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Deputy Mézec told us that he knows how to scrutiny. I think Deputy Southern does as well, probably better than anyone else in this Assembly. The Chief Minister has committed to undertaking a review on the hospital. What are the Deputy's views on whether that review should subsequently be scrutinised?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

A review that was done would not be remit, I do not think. That is a different set of issues and I am expecting the Minister for Infrastructure and others to do that review and analyse it. It is for another panel, not mine.

7.1.9 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

My view is that it could potentially impact on the health of the general public in services that are delivered or potentially not delivered, so I think it would, therefore, come under the health scrutiny remit. Does that change the Deputy's view?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Inasmuch as there is a health impact from the development of a particular hospital or the continuation of services I would be very concerned indeed, because that is fundamental to my approach to Government which is: what is Government about? Government is about making sure you have health

services, education services, and that they are paid for by a central pot. That is what we do; that is called Government. I would be keen to maintain that link that says “and we are not cutting services” especially in health.

7.1.10 Deputy M. Tadier:

The Living on Low Income Review from 2016, which I think we served on together if I remember rightly, came up with a recommendation around helping people transition from income support back into the workplace, around about what they could keep in terms of their earnings. It references a question that Deputy Farnham asked yesterday to the Minister for Social Security. I believe the recommendation was that we should look to a fixed sum per annum that people can earn rather than a 20 per cent or 60 per cent disregard to encourage people to get back into the workplace and not be penalised. Would the Chairman think that whether this particular recommendation or generally recommendations that have not been acted upon would be revisited to see if there is any merit in those things?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

While I would hesitate to answer directly because, quite frankly, I do not recall that statement, the general principle that we should review recommendations to see if they ever get taken any action on is absolutely essential. The final part of the Scrutiny process is to check up whether anything changed, anything was done. That is something that is quite difficult to build into your rota, looking at something which appears old hat, but just checking that something was done is essential because that is how you know whether your recommendations or whatever have been acted upon.

7.1.11 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

In the Deputy’s speech he mentioned foodbanks; a situation which I find difficult to stomach. There is no pun intended there at all. But during the early part of the pandemic we managed to get all the foodbanks working together, so how can the foodbanks be encouraged to continue to provide a universal offer?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

I do not know; would the questioner care to elucidate me because I do not have an answer for that.

7.1.12 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I believe it was borne out of necessity and that forced foodbanks to work together, but perhaps if I could frame another question, another part of that essential work during the pandemic was to provide a voucher scheme in the form of digital vouchers and electricity vouchers to make sure that no one lost connectivity to the internet or was disconnected from the electricity supply during the pandemic. Does the Deputy believe that a voucher scheme is a good way of getting essential services straight into people’s pockets?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

I believe it certainly may be in that it is far easier to target such a benefit at the right people. One of the questions that has never been answered around income support is: is income support delivering the right level of income to the right people, or are we missing some people who just do not bother or who have a small level of benefits and, therefore, they say: “It is not worth me applying because the form is quite a daunting thing with its 25 pages to fill in” in terms of acquiring income support?

7.1.13 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

Would Deputy Southern agree that perhaps his panel may be able to look at the spending that has taken place for the Jersey Care Model so far and how the money has been spent and what outcomes have happened?

[15:00]

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Yes, that seems to me appropriate that we could look at what the spend is already and what the predicted spend is. As I mentioned earlier, G.P.s are really quite cynical about what has been on offer so far and I think, yes, it is probably worthwhile going into that area and examining what is happening.

7.1.14 Deputy A. Howell:

I wonder if please Deputy Southern could look into the management costs that have been involved so far. I think they are quite a large amount of money.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

That is certainly a starting point for a question and answer session with the Minister or in this particular Assembly on question time. A starting point is often question time.

7.1.15 Deputy R. Kovacs:

Would the Deputy agree there is a need to review all S.L.A.s (service level agreements) within the Social Security Department in our Customer and Local Services to reflect real expectations for both staff and customers? I think this has not been reviewed since before COVID and the workload and dynamic has changed since, and reviewing it could avoid unnecessary pressure, rushed work and duplication in work in that department.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Again, I am really quite upset by the prospect of S.L.A.s within a particular department, and this is what I called in my speech a tick-box approach. It does not matter what is happening to your clients if you are ticking the right boxes: "Yes, I have got 2 of my 6 clients a job this week." Well, they tried it and they are back now, whatever. Tick the box, that is okay. Whereas in fact what is needed is a more one-to-one approach whereby persuasion - and I hesitate to say it - and not bullying is taking place.

7.1.16 Deputy M. Tadier:

Specifically on the issue of foodbanks, is it within the remit of the panel to be able to look at why foodbanks exist at all in Jersey rather than a mechanism by which they can be the most effective? I presume that it is a joint policy of everyone in this Assembly that we should not need foodbanks in an affluent Island like Jersey, and if it is the case that that is also a Ministerial priority would that be something the panel could look at?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

In principle it is something we could look at, but the basics at the root of it are that if you pay policy wages and rely on income support to top up your business then, yes, you will find those problems and there will be poverty. We will not eliminate it, we will not ameliorate it even sufficiently if we carry on the way we are doing, which is using income support to prop up low wages and high rents.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are there any more questions for Deputy Southern? Accordingly, the question time comes to a close and I can confirm that Deputy Southern has been appointed Chair of the Health and Social Services Scrutiny Panel.

8. Appointment of Chair of the Planning Committee

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now move on to selection of the Chair of the Planning Committee. I remind Members that all Members may nominate and vote but Ministers and Assistant Ministers for the Environment only - so all Ministers and that Assistant Minister - are not eligible for appointment to this position. I invite Members to nominate the Chair of the Planning Committee.

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I would like to propose the Constable of Trinity.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for Chair of the Planning Committee?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Could I nominate Deputy Tadier?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations for Chair of this committee? Accordingly, I invite Deputy Tadier to withdraw from the Chamber.

8.1 The Connétable of Trinity:

I am offering myself as Chair of the Planning Committee again this term. When first elected in 2014 I served as the Vice-Chair of the committee and partway during the last term I was persuaded to re-join the committee by Deputy Labey. Following his appointment as Minister for Housing and Communities I replaced him as the Chair. I retired from my last proper job in 2014 after 46 years in the construction industry. On joining the Assembly, I felt that the Planning Committee was somewhere I could make a useful contribution. Although not essential I do feel it is important that the Chair of the Planning Committee is someone with at least some relevant experience. I have found being a member of this committee often rewarding as it is a role in which we have a hands-on opportunity of perhaps making some people's lives better. That said, being a member of this committee can be difficult and challenging at times with our determinations made in public; having both applicants and objectors present the atmosphere often becomes emotive. I can assure Members who might be considering and hopefully thinking of joining the committee that it is an option which is never going to be a particular vote winner. The process is best described as quasi-judicial and there are protocols and codes of conduct under which the committee operate. I would be the first to admit that we never get it right every time. Sometimes I reflect with the benefit of hindsight and wish we had not approved that one. That said, there are many more occasions when I am content that we did get it right. As a committee we are expected to set aside our own personal agendas and make our determinations based on planning law and the policies of the current Island Plan. It is not our role to decide upon an application based on what we think the planning law should be. If I could quote Deputy Mézec this morning, we are expected to take off our political hat and put on our planning hat. Our judgment comes into play when there are grey areas in the guidance, or on occasions reasonable grounds to apply common sense or exercise a degree of flexibility on the interpretation of policy. Often, we are called upon to review decisions made by the department where the applicant is entitled to seek the committee review in the hope that the committee may take a slightly more pragmatic view. If the planning application process, unlike a by-laws application, was simply a technical process of ticking all the boxes then there would be no point in having a committee. The overarching principle must always be that we are seen to make fair, reasonable determinations in an open forum uninfluenced by other unworthy motives. Committee members do not accept representations other than those which come through the public forum and I have personally often been contacted by phone

or email - and on a small number of occasions by a Member of this Assembly - about a specific application. I always send them away and refuse to accept such representations and direct that person to the Planning website and forward copies of any correspondence received to the department. For the benefit of new Members, I will outline the committee process and procedures. We generally meet once a month. Members receive through the Teams channel in the week prior to committee meeting details of the applications to be determined in the forthcoming meeting. This will include a department report and recommendation, all the reports from statutory consultees, any letters or emails of support or objection, the application itself, drawings and other relevant information. On Tuesday the committee visit all the application sites. It is an important part of the process to see the application in context, how it will fit within its environment, and assess any impact on neighbours or adjoining properties. On these visits we do not accept representations from the applicant or the agents, or objectors. We only receive a brief presentation from the case officer and sometimes, if appropriate, the historic buildings officer. Members who have not been on a site visit will not take part in a determination. On Wednesday we have the opportunity to review or revisit the application document and consider the merits of the application with the benefit of having made the site visit. On Thursday we have the public meeting, normally held at St. Paul's Centre. First, we receive detailed presentation with slides by the case officer. We then hear from anyone wishing to speak against an application and then from anyone wishing to speak in favour. The objective is to provide the committee with any additional information that they might not have appreciated from reading the background papers and undertaking a site visit. As Chair it is sometimes difficult when there is a huge contingent of people who turn up, either for or against, an application. I always try as far as possible to let everyone have their say. Unfortunately, on occasions, due to pressure of time, and to avoid too much repetition, representations are heard at the discretion of the Chair, and I have to sometimes exercise that option. Above all, the aim of the public meeting is to ensure that the applicant and opponents leave either happy or disappointed, but left in doubt they have received at least a fair hearing. As with all States work, membership of the Planning Committee involves a lot of background reading, particularly in the days leading up to the week of the public meeting. Last year we considered 107 applications, 49.5 per cent of which I am advised we approved. There were 27 applications which went to appeal but not necessarily appealing a committee decision. A full committee is made of the Chair plus 9 Members, and I hope that if successful some previous Members will serve again. On the last committee we had several Members who were either Assistant Ministers or had extensive Scrutiny commitments and often excused themselves, leaving us short of Members. It is far from ideal for all concerned when applications are determined by the minimum quorum of 3 Members. Something which often reduces the number of Members able to determine an application are the committee protocols where an application falls within a Parish or district which they represent a Member may not take part in the determination. This is something that will be further exacerbated by the new electoral districts. Previously a Deputy would have represented a single Parish or district. Now we have a situation where some Deputies represent either 2 or 3 Parishes and, therefore, further reduces the number of applications in which they can take part. I hope Members who are considering the Planning Committee will take due account of their other commitments and make themselves available. Committee dates are set annually and published in advance. On occasions the number of applications needing a committee decision will require us to sit for extra days so that we can clear a backlog. This is something that will inevitably happen in September at the start of this next session as the committee have not sat since the beginning of May. I am advised that there are already 30 applications waiting for the new committee, and 16 department reviews. For any new Members there is a requirement for some training and that would be arranged by the department. The existing Members may also benefit from an update on the impact of the recently adopted bridging Island Plan. I would like to see the quantum of representations required to trigger a committee process increased, and representations come from within prescribed geographical areas around the application site. That of course is qualified in cases where a particular application is likely to impact on a large proportion or the entire population, then of course all representations are worthy of consideration. This will

have several benefits, not least to reduce the considerable amount of work required by the department to prepare for the committee hearing, it should speed up the overall process by allowing the department to determine more applications themselves. The Planning Committee decision is of course only one stage in the process. The applicant, or indeed in certain circumstances the objector, has the right to take the committee decision to appeal by an independent planning inspector appointed by the Greffe. The inspector will hear the case again and make a recommendation to the Minister, who is currently the final arbiter. I do not have the answer and I doubt there is a perfect solution to our planning process because it has gone through more iterations over the years than I care to mention. I do, however, remain uncomfortable that the outcome of this entire process is and has always been vested in the decision of one person. Thank you, I will leave it there and answer Members questions.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Connétable. The first question for Connétable of Trinity is from Deputy Alex Curtis.

8.1.1 Deputy A. Curtis St. Clement:

I think the Connétable will know me from the Planning Committee when I was sat on the other side and I might join him - depending on next week - on the side with him if he is elected. But the Connétable will remember that during COVID the committee had to meet remotely and that allowed for the public to join remotely, and will appreciate that it is not easy for people to often take time out of their day to visit and make representation anywhere between 9.30 a.m. and 4.00 p.m. on a Thursday. So, does he support bringing remote public attendance to the Planning Committee, not for COVID, just for accessibility reasons?

[15:15]

The Connétable of Trinity:

I thank the Deputy for the question. It is something that I had not considered. I think it is worthy of further consideration but I would not want to give a commitment at this stage.

8.1.2 Deputy A. Curtis:

People can tell Planning is close to my heart, and good chairing of it is important. Likewise, I think with that useful description we had from the Connétable of the process, those in objection of an application speak first and those in support speak second, and there is that 5-minute guidance from the committee. In this year alone there was an application in which at least 5 or 6 paid representatives of an application spoke in favour, allowing for 30 minutes of content on the supporting proposal of an application. Does the Connétable think that is a fair representation, given any individual stakeholder can only speak for 5?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I have to say that I do try and maintain a fair balance. It is difficult sometimes when applicants or their agents are in full flow to rein them in, but we do our best to make sure that everyone has a fair hearing.

8.1.3 Deputy A. Curtis:

I would like to think hopefully the work of a good Planning Chair is to be able to rein them in. On top of that, with the order of support and objection speaking at the Planning Committee, one thing that often happens with, let us say, well-versed planning agents, is to try and dismantle the arguments placed by objectors who are often legitimately acting in the interests of community in the Island and not profit. The Planning Chair would not normally allow any response or challenge to that because the supporters are speaking second. Does he believe that process is working as well?

The Connétable of Trinity:

The committee process is laid down in the rules that we have followed so far. It is not an open debate. The purpose, as I said in my speech, was that we are only looking to gain any additional information that we will not have already understood from doing the work we have done before we get to the public meeting. Unfortunately, applicants and objectors do want to rehearse their written submissions once again. Really and truly, I just have to do my best. Whether I do the best job, that is up to Members to decide, that is all I can say really; is that I always try and do my best for both parties to see that they have a fair and equal opportunity to speak to the committee.

8.1.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Does the candidate believe that Jersey's coastline is one of our most precious assets and that in as far as is possible every inch of it which is currently publicly accessible for enjoyment by the wider public should remain so?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I agree that the preservation of our coastal national park and the restoration of its landscape character is vitally important to maintaining public access but unfortunately my job as committee member is to apply the policies of the Island Plan, and what my personal preferences are should not feature in that.

8.1.5 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Does this candidate lament the ability of planning rules to be used to take land on our coastline which is currently accessible in one form or another for the wider public to enjoy to instead be taken over for the provision of mansions for the super-wealthy, many of whom do not even live in the Island before occupying them?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I determine every planning application on its individual merits and, as I say, it is not for me as the Chair of the Planning Committee to express my own personal preferences. If I am excused from an application, then I will speak as I feel in favour or against any particular application which falls within my Parish but that is my right to do so because I am excused from the determination of an application.

8.1.6 Deputy A. Howell:

This is really an addition to the question that Deputy Curtis asked. It seems that when I have been to the planning meetings, if you object to a planning you go first and then the applicant always go second, and so the objector never has a chance to answer any of the applicant's questions whereas it does happen the other way around. It just seems to be possibly weighted in favour against the objectors and I just wondered if you have a thought about whether there may be a chance for the objectors to come back in again. I know time is precious.

The Connétable of Trinity:

I thank the Deputy for the question. As I said, really it is the committee's opportunity to learn anything new. We do not really want to have open debate because if we start having a debate in the committee meeting we will never see an end to it. It is really down to each party to prepare their case and put their best shot forward first.

8.1.7 Deputy M. Scott:

What I would like to ask the Connétable is: the Planning Committee has got the ability to make recommendations about planning policy; how many recommendations has he made in terms of changes of planning policy and could that extend to a change in procedures?

The Connétable of Trinity:

Thank you for the question. I do not think that I have ever made any suggestions about changes of planning policy. Sorry, the second part of the question was?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Can you remind us on the second part of your question, Deputy Scott?

Deputy M. Scott:

It was whether that could extend to changes in procedure.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Well, we do basically write our own protocols which we agree at the start of each new committee or annually I think we review them. That is one of the protocols I mentioned that I would like to review, is that at the moment it takes 4 representations against an application to have it brought to committee. That is something which I think is rather unbalanced because we get some of those representations from people who live completely remotely from a small application site and they are probably friends of the applicant and that gets it to the Planning Committee. Whereas if we restricted the geographical area from which representations should come, then I think that would speed up the process because we get clogged down with lots of small applications which really could be settled by the department.

8.1.8 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

In the recently passed bridging Island Plan this Assembly passed an amendment to that to introduce a policy whereby on private developments of homes of more than 50, at least 15 per cent of them have to be reserved as affordable housing. That policy does give some leeway in terms of viability or certain other considerations. Would he, as Chair of the Planning Committee, endeavour to make sure that any disapplication of that policy on the grounds of viability is very rare and that he will push as far as possible to ensure that private developments do include that quota of affordable housing, as this Assembly has suggested they should?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I would agree that I will rigidly enforce the policies of the Island Plan and I cannot answer any different to that.

8.1.9 Deputy A. Curtis:

One last one and I promise I will not make any more. I am alarmed to hear that the idea of removing the ability for public consultation or limiting it is in the candidate's scope or thought. Does he not think that on an Island 9 miles by 5 all of us have a likely expectation that we will enjoy any part of our lovely Island and that we have any right to represent any part of it no matter where we live?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I am afraid, no, I do not. It is a long-held belief of mine that we often get perhaps 70 representations, all exactly the same, from different parts of the Island, exactly the same form of words, and it is from people who will not be directly impacted by a relatively small application, so I think that everything has to be judged on its merits.

8.1.10 Deputy B. Ward:

At the beginning of your speech I would like you to, if you could, clarify what you meant by your "last proper job in 2014". Surely this is a proper job that we are doing. I would like to think so.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Yes, I apologise to the Deputy. It is just a turn of phrase that I used and I can honestly say that my wife will tell you that she sees less of me now that I do not have a proper job.

8.1.11 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I wondered whether the nominee would help me in understanding where the line ends. He said he was very much in favour of upholding the principles of the Island Plan and planning recommendations but I cannot help before coming into this place being reminded of the application in relation to South Hill where there was, as I understand it, an application for housing, as far as the news report was concerned, which was slated for approval by officials and then the Planning Committee, probably for good reasons but I would like to understand it, rejected it. Can I just try and understand exactly where the influence of the planning policy starts and stops because it does not appear to a member of the general public that this is at all satisfactory?

The Connétable of Trinity:

Yes, if I can recall the application, the main objection was to the scale and mass of the proposed development. The top of the development was well above the escarpment behind the South Hill and the committee felt that it was an overdevelopment. It was also one of the concerns, although it was not necessarily a reason for not approving it, that some of the apartments were single-aspect apartments looking basically out at a rock face and they would have got the sunshine at midday on a summer's day and not much else. So, it is down to the committee's view on design but on that particular occasion it was scale and mass. There is a desperate need for housing but that is no reason why the committee should go along with schemes which they do not believe fit the environment. It is right on the gateway of St. Helier and it would have been massive, so we decided to turn it down.

8.1.12 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

If I may just push the Constable. Is he basically saying that the officer has got it wrong in recommending the committee to approve it because I am confused? Either there is a policy that allows an applicant to have a reasonable expectation of providing housing or not. Because I understand that the application, it was not recommended for refusal, it was recommended for approval. So, is he by such statements saying that the planning officials interpreted the Island Plan wrongly?

The Connétable of Trinity:

No. The Deputy is not, I hope, suggesting that the Planning Committee are just a set of nodding dogs because we do have a mind of our own and we do review each application on its merits. As I said, we take off our political hat and put on our planning hat and if we do not believe that a scheme is right for Jersey then we will not approve it.

8.1.13 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

This follows on from the previous question from Deputy Curtis, and I apologise for my ignorance on the rules of how the Planning Committee works. Could the candidate confirm that if he is selected as the Chair of this committee then it becomes an inevitability that his proposal to restrict the ability of people to comment on planning applications will go ahead or does there need to be further work or even approval from this Assembly before that kind of change could be enacted?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I can advise the Deputy that it is part of our own protocols. It is something that the previous committee discussed on a number of occasions on the bus perhaps on a Tuesday when we were doing the site visits and we were hoping to have had that discussion before the end of the last term. But it is something which we did not get around to do so it is a matter which, if I am successful, I would take back to the new committee and we determine those protocols ourselves. It is not a given by me, it would just be a suggestion or a recommendation from me.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are there any further questions for the Connétable? If not, then that brings that period of questioning to an end. I invite the Connétable to withdraw and Deputy Tadier to return to the Chamber.

[15:30]

Yes, Deputy Tadier, do you want to address the Assembly now?

8.2 Deputy M. Tadier:

I hope the fact that this is the last position of the day does not put anyone off from giving me a few minutes of their attention. It might seem like a strange position to go for. I have never served on the Planning Applications Panel before but certainly when it comes to environmental matters, planning matters, they have always featured quite heavily in my manifesto, my personal manifesto in particular. So, I think the first thing to say is I suppose, like other fellow candidates from St. Brelade - and I am really pleased that there are 5 of us in the Assembly specifically representing the Parish of St. Brelade - is to thank the electors for putting their trust in me again for 4 years. I recognise that there is a duty of care, not just to them, but to the whole Island, and not just in the normal cut and thrust of what we might call abstract politics that we often deal with in this Assembly, but to do with the physical environment that we find ourselves in, whether it is the built or natural environment, in our Island. I was particularly impressed by one of the lines that was used by the person who is now the new Minister for the Environment. I had the privilege to run with him and some very good candidates in St. Brelade. He made the point which I thought summed it up very well, that St. Brelade is a microcosm of the Island. I just wish I had thought of that line a few years ago. But he is right for so many reasons because it is such a beautiful part of the Island to live in or to represent and there are many beautiful parts of our Island. I am particularly thinking of the coastline but also some parts of the interior. We have got the Blanches Banques in St. Brelade but other Parishes have great woodland, they have valleys as well as the coastal walks. I have been feeling for quite some time that we all have a job in this Assembly and I certainly cannot sit back and let the destruction of our coastline in particular carry on. We are seeing a tendency, and it has certainly happened in St. Brelade before I was elected for the first time in 2008, that what was put on the headland at Portelet I think so many people, irrespective of where they live in the Island but also tourists, have said to me: "How was that ever allowed to happen?" What is quite clear is that these kind of decisions come down to either somebody or some people, States Members in some cases or officers, to make those kind of decisions. I am also very interested in this idea of black and white that Deputy Luce referred to earlier and thinking while preparing for this, it is probably the same for a lot of us, that there are certainly 2 parts of my brain. I think there is a part of my brain which is mathematical and I like the idea of that black and white, if we can put it that way, that clarity, that binary yes or no: "Am I allowed to build this? Can I have permission if I do these things" Yes or no? "I want to have certain outcomes about how I can develop my property" which I will talk about in a moment. But I think the artistic side of my brain also recognises that subjectivity, things like beauty and design, are also really important. I recognise, certainly from my work as an Assistant Minister at Arts and Culture, that I developed a greater appreciation for the built environment, particularly in town. When we look at the waterfront, for example, we can see that there is no great masterplan there. It was allowed to develop not even organically but in a way that I think Jersey could have done better. But if we look at the interior of St. Helier it is definitely eclectic, it is not to everybody's taste, but you start to realise when you lift your eyes up above a certain point the definite beauty that can exist and that does exist in certain parts of our built environment around the Island. That brings me to the next point about human rights. It might sound like a strange thing to say but for many years I have been interested in human rights, and I am still the Chair of the Jersey Human Rights group in the Island which seeks to bring together people from civil society, as well as politicians if they want to be involved, to discuss these issues. It is probably a fair criticism of those on the left to say that they tend to focus again on the abstract, although the very real, issues to do with discrimination and to do with people's human

rights in terms of how it affects them. But, of course, there is the right to enjoyment of property, which I touched on earlier, and I think this is a really interesting one that I have also started to become more interested in as an individual, if not simply as a politician. It is how do we get that balance between people who have a property that ... and I have seen it of course, I have seen people on both sides of the planning table who I have represented. I cut my teeth, again, going back to where the current Minister for the Environment lives at Petit Port, that was one of my first cases that I represented somebody, and we did have to get amendments put forward. It was a big building that was perfectly fine in our opinion and in the opinion of the residents, which had to be completely excavated, complete destruction then put back in even though it was in a very sensitive area simply because it did not form part of the coastal national park technically. I think those areas do bring into question the human rights aspect, which of course is not an absolute one, it is one which is subjective. Of course, when it comes to the new hospital which may or not be built at Overdale, we know that there are lots of issues to do with people's properties being compulsorily purchased and where the right decisions stand. Of course, the other aspect, again going back to my own constituency but which I think will be relevant in different parts of the Island, is the built environment. How do we make those decisions faced with the fact that we know we need some element of new housing, we need to bring old houses back into use, old homes, all those empty properties which could be put back into use, how are we going to do that in a sensible way? How are we going to get the trade-offs between shops, for example, that may wish to convert into homes and vice versa and to make sure that people have good quality-of-life cohesive communities? These are all questions I think that can be looked at in a slightly different way and I think that is an area in which I would very much like to use the skills that I have acquired over the last 14 years in this Assembly but also just having lived in the Island more generally. Finally, I think if you had have told me 3 or 4 years ago: "You can end up standing for Chair of the P.A.P. (Planning Applications Panel)" I would probably have told you were speaking pap. But it is something that the Constable of St. Lawrence said quite recently; I think it was in the bridging Island Plan before the election. She encouraged Members who had never thought about joining the Planning Applications Panel to do it because it is much more rewarding than she ever thought it might be, and that is something which I hope would also be the case if I am successful in this position. Let me just say this, I hope this is not seen as a partisan appointment. I have not heard the speech that the Constable of Trinity has given. I very much respect the Constable of Trinity, I know he has got experience on the panel, but I said to the people in St. Brelade that I wanted to put myself forward for any role that this Assembly would elect me for and I hold true to that. If this Assembly does not want me to do that kind of role, that is also fine, but I think it is a role that I could discharge with an element of experience. I would seek to put forward a team of people, I would be inviting applications for those roles. It is even more important now I think, given the fact that we have got bigger constituencies, that we have that cross-section of the Island, because of course we know that you cannot scrutinise or sit on applications within your own constituency. That is quite clear-cut for me as a St. Brelade representative but if you are a representative of those bigger geographical constituencies like St. Peter, St. Ouen and St. Mary where you may also be a Minister of course, it is important that we have balance because those are going to be areas which people will not be able to scrutinise. Therefore, we need people from across the Island and we want to leave a good legacy I think in the built environment that we can all be proud of. So I make those concluding remarks and I welcome any questions.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The first question for Deputy Tadier is from Deputy Alex Curtis.

8.2.1 Deputy A. Curtis:

The candidate mentioned Portelet and large developments and the impact they have on every Islander. So, my question to him is: does he believe that every Islander should have the right of

representation and the right for their voice to help bring an application to the committee regardless of where they live in respect to an application?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am not sure if I fully understood maybe the question or the underlying question but what I think is that, in a sense of course, every Islander does have access to putting in planning applications or to putting in objections or support for a particular planning application, and it is not a problem that is exclusive to the Planning Department, that there is an inequality of arms when it comes to access to, how shall we call it, the state functions, whatever they are. I have attended many Planning Applications Panels, either representing or just as an interested observer. Sometimes it is fairly clearcut but often you think: “How on earth did they come to that decision? Was it premeditated or have they seen something that I have not seen which was not taken into account?” and that can go both ways. It could be an application that was not passed that maybe should have been or one that was passed that should not have been or could have been amended, so I think there is a difference between theory and practice maybe.

8.2.2 Deputy A. Curtis:

Maybe I can help explain in particular what I am thinking about here, which is right now any Islander who makes an objection, and should 5 objections be made against a planning application from anywhere in the Island, that quantum of objections will bring the application in front of the committee and mean that the department does not have delegated power. Does that sound reasonable or does the Deputy think that the public should have far less opportunity to hold up their right and hold the department accountable?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think a threshold clearly needs to be set somewhere in that subjective. So a judgment call needs to be made if there is a problem with that number, so I can see how that might be an issue. But I have also experienced the opposite where just simply because there is a lack of promotion of a particular project that people say they cannot even get 4 objections and they only say afterwards when it appears in the newspaper or on television and say: “Well if I had known about that I would have objected.” So, I think there is an element of us as community representatives to listen to those voices which we can obviously do much more effectively now with social media but there is also a responsibility, I suspect, for community groups to do that. St. Brelade is a good example, we have had some well-known community planning activists who have now ended up in this Assembly.

8.2.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

The Deputy will be aware of an amendment which was passed to the bridging Island Plan at the end of the last term which put a requirement on applications from private developers of more than 50 homes that at least 15 per cent of them have to be made available for affordable housing. He will also be aware that there are exceptions to that built in with a viability test, for example. Would the Deputy commit, if he is elected as Chair of this committee, to ensuring that he takes a very robust approach to those exceptions to make sure that they are few and far between?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think this is an area where it is fairly black and white. New applications will have to have a minimum of 15 and I hope that developers would very much see that as a minimum rather than a target. But I also think that any excuses that are given for not meeting that target because of this caveat that the previous States Assembly has put in there, I think it is right that that should not just be the default position where they say: “It is not viable in this particular project” they should have to prove that beyond doubt, I would say.

[15:45]

8.2.4 Deputy A. Howell:

What does Deputy Tadier think about taking a rundown tourist hotel which has served for a long time and putting it in for one house?

Deputy M. Tadier:

So, I think this is an area where my own opinion does not really matter in the sense that, as head of the Planning Applications Panel or even as a member, I think you just need to look at the Bridging Island Plan and that is your bible and you go by it. I have certainly got a private view about what I think is privatisation and development of the coastline and I think some of that will be reflected already in the bridging Island Plan, so there will be safeguards in there which I think it is right that the Planning Applications Panel uses and interprets correctly. But ultimately if there is a wider issue it is up to us as individual or collective States Members to try and change the law where there are problems like that arising.

8.2.5 Deputy M. Scott:

In the case of the application to develop the Wayside site which was recommended for approval by a planning officer and it was rejected, though, by the Planning Committee, the director of Planning represented the Planning Committee in the appeal. In your role would you believe that this is the right way to proceed or would you encourage an independent person to represent the Planning Committee in these circumstances?

Deputy M. Tadier:

If I understood the Deputy, she is saying that the Director of Planning represented a client, an applicant, at one of the hearings, is that correct?

The Deputy Bailiff:

No. Do you want to clarify that?

Deputy M. Scott:

The Director of Planning represented the Planning Committee who refused an application that the planning officer had recommended for approval.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Without knowing the specific circumstances as to why that would happen it is difficult for me to comment. I presume that that is not the norm and I do not think it should be the norm at all but I would be happy to follow that up with the Deputy if she wants to fill me in later.

8.2.6 Deputy A. Curtis:

During COVID time the candidate may or may not be aware that the Planning Applications Panel met remotely and people could dial in. He can probably appreciate it is hard for many members of the public to attend St. Paul's Centre during office working hours on a Thursday in what can be a make-or-break kind of decision. Would he support the investigation into allowing members of the public who had given written submissions the access to meetings remotely?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Yes, I have no problem supporting that. I think it does speak to the wider needs in planning applications but probably more generally as to how we interact as an Assembly in Government about the democratisation of the planning process. I am not saying that it is broken but I think there are definitely things, like you say, if they meet on a Thursday at a particular time. I know that often even as a States Member I might be busy at those times, so how would somebody with an equally full-time job ... did I say that? **[Laughter]** Maybe a more regular job because it is full-time, how would they attend that?

8.2.7 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

In the previous term I helped assist a family who had applied for a modest extension to their home to provide space for their child, who had quite severe special needs, to thrive and be cared for by that family. It was turned down on multiple occasions until it finally went through to an appeal where it was overturned on the basis of putting children first and the needs of that child. That child's right to be in a family environment where they could thrive overcame some of the objections that the Planning Committee had taken to even though it was not the advice for them to do that. So, I just want to ask the candidate what putting children first would mean to him in a role as Chair of the Planning Committee and what regard to children's rights does he think this committee should have?

Deputy M. Tadier:

That is a good question and one which I obviously did not know was coming. I think that is again something that all departments in all aspects of Government really need to deal with and I suppose it is partly to do with long-term planning. We need to think about how young people, especially children who do not have a voice at the moment, are thought about and represented. I think it is also about the access that they have to their own communities but probably also about consulting more with them directly. So, I do not know if that is a helpful answer but I am happy to follow up.

8.2.8 Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin:

What are the Deputy's personal views on amenity space, tourist amenity space, being converted to private homes which then thwart public access to further amenities?

Deputy M. Tadier:

So, again I am happy to answer what my personal view is, it would not necessarily influence the way I approach the job. But I think I would say that it is a one-way membrane, is it not? You can go from tourist accommodation to building residential and not back the other way, and I think that applies the same to commercial. So, I am thinking of an application in my own constituency which is commercial going into residential and that is not going to go back to commercial afterwards. So I think we need to have a wider discussion in this Assembly about what kind of Island we want to see. Are we content to sell off our tourism hotspots and our coastline to people who have got, not just money, but obviously access to influence and who can pay people to design great applications? I would say that, again on a personal level, I am a libertarian, albeit of the left, and so I would approach any application by saying: "There is a presumption that you have the right to develop your property in accordance with human rights principles but any intervention or restrictions have to be justified." But I do think that we have gone too far the other way and - it is personal opinion again - we have sold off our coastline and that we have allowed people who have got a disproportionate amount of power in the planning system to have their way for too long.

8.2.9 Deputy M. Scott:

The Deputy has a pattern of resigning from panels and positions, so I just wondered if he would be able to assure the States Assembly that he would not be doing the same with this role should he become frustrated with its procedures, bearing in mind the ability to recommend changes in policy that is open to the Planning Committee?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do not know that I would call it a pattern of resignation. It seems to me in Jersey that depending on who you are, you can be hailed as a hero for resigning several times during your political career. I have served with very good politicians who got elected in 2008 who resigned several times on points of principle and they would be lauded as heroes and of course others who resign on points of principle ... and I suppose the last time I resigned was from my appointment as an Assistant Minister. I did that as a point of principle because we were being taken for a ride by Charlie Parker and the then

Chief Minister who was not keeping him under control. I decided I could not work in that, even though I really loved the job, I wanted to keep on in that, so I think you do have to have principles. I think this is a completely different kettle of fish because, as the Deputy recognises, whether you are a member or the Chair of that panel, you are in a position of influence to be able to change things that you do not think work. It always helps I think to have a fresh approach every now and again to procedures. So, going back to Deputy Alex Curtis's point, we should not be hung up on when a particular panel meets or where it meets rather than how we engage with the public and what kind of job we do.

8.2.10 Deputy M. Scott:

On the subject of frustration again, your hands will be tied in terms of commenting on planning applications and helping constituents in St. Brelade with planning inquiries, how comfortable will you feel about that?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Well first of all I think that if I was cynical I would say that is an advantage, it gives me less work to do. But that is not the case because in fact I have seen members of the panel, certainly ordinary members of the panel, when they feel strongly they can sit in front of the panel and represent their constituents. So, I have seen that done and if that cannot be done from the Chair then obviously we have got 3 great Deputies for St. Brelade plus a very, I think, active Constable in the Parish who does take a proactive stance, as well as many good practitioners who are very keen. So, if I cannot represent parishioners myself that is the beauty of having multi-seat constituencies.

8.2.11 Deputy A. Curtis:

I do promise it is my last. In relation to the mention that we heard from one of the Deputies to the candidate around employment land and expressing that that is often a one-way journey because what happens is in an Island where luxury residential is so valuable, employment land is often challenged, would the Deputy support encouraging all members of the Planning Committee, should he be elected, to read the supplementary planning guidance on protection of employment land, that if applied properly would provide incredibly robust protection for the loss of commercial land?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Yes, is the short answer. There will be a lot to read. We know from any Bridging Island Plan or a full Island Plan that they are thick documents but, yes, absolutely, it is good bedtime reading.

8.2.12 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

What did the Deputy mean when he made the comment a moment ago: "People with a disproportionate amount of power in the planning system have had their way for too long", who was he referring to?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am not referring to any specific individuals but what I am saying is that when we have a scenario whereby I have seen the small man or woman who have got a very modest application that they want to put forward which gets rejected for some particular reason, and it may be just simply the way the Planning Law is worded or the way it is being interpreted, more to the point. I see those individuals with an asymmetric amount of power compared to people who are able to put in something on a headland which is going to be an eyesore for a long time. Because there are huge amounts of money involved and because they can pay for representation and they may have access to that representation, we get questionable legacies that are left all over our beautiful Island. That is what I meant.

8.2.13 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

How would the Deputy resolve the matter?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think you resolve it by first of all having a good cross-section of members on the Planning Applications Panel. You also look at whether there are systemic problems in the way that the wording is drafted, find out if there are issues and you bring amendments to that. Certainly, the panel would be in a good position dealing with cases on a week-by-week basis to know what works in a system and what the unintended consequences are of albeit often well-drafted legislation.

8.2.14 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

A number of the questions to the candidate have understandably strayed into the areas of policy. Mindful of the fact that the Planning Panel has to work within the agreed policies as set out in the bridging Island Plan and in the supplementary guidance signed off by the Minister, I wonder if the Deputy could explain how he would deal with a situation which has got an officer recommendation for approval but for some reason of a pre-existing statement, some of which he has made earlier, he thinks that the application should be rejected. May I just politely ask him kindly if he could explain to the Assembly, because we are appointing almost a quasi-judicial role, how will he weigh up within the confines that he is able to do so to avoid an unintended consequence that we are appointing a Planning Minister here, which we are not?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I fully understand that. I think there has been an appetite in the Assembly to ask questions of policy which I have explained are not necessarily appropriate. What the Deputy, former Senator, describes is something that can apply to any member of the panel. I think exactly, as I said earlier, you use the bridging Island Plan and the supplementary guidance as your bible, if you like, your Old and New Testament or your New Testament and prayer book depending whatever the analogy is you want to use, and you stick to that but there must nevertheless at some point be a crossover. Because if it was simply the case that the bridging Island Plan as it was worded was completely black and white, as some have termed it, absolutely, we would not need a Planning Applications Panel that is made up of politicians.

[16:00]

We would simply defer all decisions to an officer and then to an arbiter who could deal with that. But for some reason, and it is something I do struggle with, as to what is the existential purpose of a Planning Applications Panel? I think it is because there are some grey areas that exist and that there are some judgment calls that need to be made all within the parameters of that interpretation. It is no different to the law of course, so you are looking at how you interpret a document in front of you based on who the Planning Applications Panel's members are.

The Deputy Bailiff:

We have only got 15 seconds left.

8.2.15 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

How will the Deputy deal with a situation where he has got a recommendation for approval? Is he bold enough to say no to a recommendation that has been strongly approved by officials?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Thank you for the gentle bell; it is the most courteous bell I have heard, I think. I think you make that judgment on its own basis. If you have got an officer who is consistently recommending something that seems to go against the law or the rules, and the panel were consistently disagreeing with that officer, there is clearly a problem there. But I think you just judge it on the basis, like I said, of what the planning rules are. Hopefully in most cases there will be an alignment, not because of any collusion, but because it is the right decision.

The Deputy Bailiff:

That concludes the period of questions for Deputy Tadier. I ask that the Connétable of Trinity return to the Chamber. Both candidates have spoken and answered questions, we now move to the vote. Any Member wishing to vote for the Connétable of Trinity should press the pour button when the voting is opened and any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Tadier should press the contre button. Members may abstain if they wish. Members attending remotely can either vote pour or contre or identify the name of the candidate for whom they wish to cast their votes. I will ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the number of votes cast for the Connétable of Trinity totalled 28; there were 17 votes for Deputy Tadier and 2 abstentions. Accordingly, the Connétable has been appointed as Chair of the Planning Committee. **[Approbation]**

Connétable of Trinity: 28		Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade: 17		Abstain: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy K.M. Wilson
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		
Connétable of Trinity		Deputy R.J. Ward		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy C.S. Alves		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy T.A. Coles		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy D.J. Warr		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
Deputy C.F. Labey		Deputy L.V. Feltham		
Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
Deputy K.F. Morel		Deputy R.S. Kovacs		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
Deputy S.M. Ahier		Deputy B. Ward		
Deputy I. Gardiner		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				

Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Connétable of Trinity:

Can I thank Members who supported me and can I appeal to anyone who is interested in planning, because I do not know who else is being groomed for stardom, if they would like to make themselves known to me over the next couple of days? Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well unless we are all glued to our Chairs that concludes public business for this meeting. The States stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 19th July 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

[16:07]