

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 8th SEPTEMBER 2026

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER.....	8
1.1 Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor	8
1.2 Tribute to Michael Voisin, former Deputy of St. Lawrence	8
APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS	8
2. Appointment of unelected members of the Public Accounts Committee.....	8
2.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement (Chair, Public Accounts Committee):	9
MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE	10
3. Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade will raise a matter of privilege.....	10
3.1 Deputy M. Tadier:	10
QUESTIONS.....	11
4. Written Questions	11
Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding RNLI lifeguard rescue and first-aid incident data. (WQ.129/2026).....	12
Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the financial implications of creating a Minister for Planning and Regulation. (WQ.133/2026)	14
Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding different minimum wage rates across industries. (WQ.143/2026).....	15
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Jersey Pupil Premium Programme. (WQ.144/2026).....	16
Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding additional pedestrian crossings on Route de la Baie, St. Brelade's Bay (WQ.146/2026).....	17
Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Evidence-Based Energy Strategy. (WQ. 147/2026).....	18
5. Oral Questions.....	19
5.1 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Chief Minister regarding Freedom of Information request decisions (OQ.74/2026).....	19
Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (Assistant Chief Minister – rapporteur):.....	19
5.1.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:	19

5.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	20
5.1.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:	20
5.2 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Chief Minister regarding assurance and approval processes for major capital projects (OQ.72/2026).	20
Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):	20
5.2.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	21
5.2.2 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	21
5.2.3 The Connétable of St. John:	21
5.2.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	21
5.2.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	21
5.2.6 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	22
5.3 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Minister for the Environment regarding protecting 30 per cent of the marine and terrestrial environment by 2030 (OQ.64/2026).	23
Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):	23
5.3.1 The Connétable of St. Martin:	23
5.3.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	24
5.3.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	24
5.3.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	24
5.3.5 Deputy A. Maltman of St Mary, St Ouen and St Peter:	24
5.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for External Relations regarding expired bank cards (OQ.67/2026).	25
Senator I.J. Gorst (The Minister for External Relations):	25
5.4.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	25
5.4.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	25
5.4.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:	26
5.5 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the outcomes of the trial of free entry into the Jersey Museum (OQ.71/2026).	26
Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	26
5.5.1 Deputy M. Tadier:	26
5.5.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	27
5.5.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:	27
5.5.4 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:	27
5.5.5 Deputy C.S. Alves:	27
5.5.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	27
5.5.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	28
5.5.8 Deputy M. Tadier:	28
5.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding establishing a taskforce to urgently tackle child poverty in Jersey (OQ.65/2026).	28
Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):	28
5.6.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	29
5.6.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	29
5.6.3 Deputy M. Tadier:	29

5.6.4 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	30
5.6.5 The Connétable of St. Helier:	30
5.6.6 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	30
5.6.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	31
5.6.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	31
5.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the economic impact of lowering the minimum wage (OQ.63/2026).	31
Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	31
5.7.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:	31
5.7.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	32
5.7.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:	32
5.7.4 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	33
5.7.5 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	33
5.7.6 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	33
5.7.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	33
5.7.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews:	34
5.8. Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding additional funding the Minister would seek through the 2027 Budget process (OQ.69/2026).	34
Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):	34
5.8.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	34
5.8.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	34
5.8.3 Deputy M. Tadier:	34
5.8.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	35
5.8.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:	35
5.8.6 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	35
5.8.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	36
5.8.8 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	36
5.8.9 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	36
5.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the development of adult safeguarding legislation (OQ.76/2026).	36
Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):	36
5.9.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	37
5.9.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	37
5.9.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	37
5.9.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	37
5.10 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding legislation for a scheme of mandatory post-release probation supervision (OQ.77/2026).	38
Senator H.M. Miles (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):	38
5.10.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	38

5.11 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding the materials dredged from St. Aubin's Harbour and deposited on the foreshore between St. Aubin's Fort and the St. Aubin's Yacht Club (OQ. 78/2026).....	38
Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):	38
5.11.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	38
5.12 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding an update in the development of the Women's Health Strategy (OQ.66/2026).....	39
Connétable A. Howell of Trinity (Assistant Minister for Health and Social Services - rapporteur):	39
5.12.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	39
5.12.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	39
5.12.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:	40
5.12.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	40
5.12.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	40
5.12.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	40
5.13 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Housing regarding the needs of pet-owning tenants when designing and managing high-density social housing (OQ. 75/2026).	41
Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (The Minister for Housing):.....	41
5.13.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:	41
5.13.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	41
5.13.3 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	42
5.13.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:	42
5.14 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding senior members of staff leaving employment where due process had not been followed (OQ.68/2026).	42
Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (Vice-Chair of the States Employment Board - rapporteur):	42
5.14.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	42
5.14.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	43
5.14.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	43
5.14.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	43
5.14.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	44
5.14.6 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	44
5.14.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	44
5.14.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	44
5.14.9 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	44
5.14.10 Deputy T.A. Coles:.....	45
5.15 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding Government policy on the minimum wage (OQ.70/2026).	45
Senator M.E. Millar (The Minister for Social Security):.....	45
5.15.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	45
5.15.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	46
5.15.3 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	46
5.15.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	46

5.16 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the proportion of the budget for Children and Families spent on early intervention and prevention (OQ.73/2026).	46
Connétable R.P. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):	47
5.16.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	47
5.16.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	47
5.16.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	47
5.16.4 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	48
5.16.5 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	48
5.16.6 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	48
6. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Treasury and Resources	53
6.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	53
Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):	53
6.1.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	54
6.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	54
6.2.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	54
6.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	54
6.3.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	55
6.4 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	55
6.4.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:	55
6.5 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	55
6.5.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	55
6.6 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:	56
6.6.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave:	56
6.7 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:	56
6.7.1 Deputy B. Ward:	57
6.8 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	57
6.8.1 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine:	57
6.9 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	58
7. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Housing	58
7.1 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	58
Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (The Minister for Housing):	58
7.1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	58
7.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	58
7.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	59
7.3 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:	59
7.3.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave:	59
7.4 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:	60
7.4.1 Deputy L.D. Carpenter:	60
7.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	60
7.5.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	60
7.6 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:	61
7.6.1 Deputy B. Ward:	61
7.7 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	61
7.7.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:	62
8. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister	62
8.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	62

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):.....	62
8.1.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:.....	62
8.2 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:.....	62
8.2.1 Deputy L.D. Carpenter:.....	63
8.3 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:.....	63
8.4 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:.....	63
8.4.1 Deputy V. Li:.....	63
8.5 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:.....	64
8.5.1 Deputy B. Ward:.....	64
8.6 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	64
8.6.1 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine:.....	64
8.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	65
8.7.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	65
8.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	65
8.8.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	65
8.9 Deputy B. Ward:.....	66
8.9.1 Deputy B. Ward:.....	66
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	66
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT	67
PUBLIC BUSINESS	67
9. Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.61/2026).....	67
9.1 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):.....	67
9.1.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel):.....	67
9.1.2 Deputy C.D. Leck of St. Saviour:.....	67
9.1.3 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	68
9.2 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	68
9.3 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	70
10. Reinstate the States Grant to the Social Security Fund (P.63/2026)	70
10.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North:.....	70
10.1.1 Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (Minister for Treasury and Resources):.....	72
10.1.2 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:.....	74
10.1.3 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:.....	75
10.1.4 Senator M.E. Millar:.....	76
10.1.5 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	77
10.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	78
10.1.7 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:.....	80
10.1.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	81
10.1.9 Connétable A.N Jehan of St. John:.....	81
10.1.10 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier:.....	81
10.1.11 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:.....	82
10.1.12 Deputy M.B. Andrews:.....	83
11. Rate Appeal Board: appointment of Members (P.64/2026)	85
11.1 Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):.....	85

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	86
12. Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):.....	86
ADJOURNMENT	86

[9:30]

The Roll was called and the Dean led the Assembly in Prayer.

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Bailiff:

1.1 Welcome to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor

On behalf of Members, I would like to welcome His Excellency to the Chamber this morning.

[Approbation]

1.2 Tribute to Michael Voisin, former Deputy of St. Lawrence

Members will have been saddened to see that Michael Matthew Godfrey Voisin, who served as Deputy for St. Lawrence from 1969 to 1975, passed away on 14th July at the age of 86. This is the first opportunity we have had as an Assembly to mark his passing. Deputy Voisin was called to the English Bar in 1962 and joined Voisin Law, the firm founded by his great-grandfather, in February 1963, where he worked for 40 years. Elected at the top of the poll as Deputy of St. Lawrence in 1969, he was appointed to the Finance and Economics Committee, the Agriculture Committee and the Legislation Committee. He was also part of a special committee formed to consider the establishment of sound radio in Jersey, which in turn paved the way for the establishment of a Jersey-based radio station. He was re-elected in 1972, again topping the poll in St. Lawrence, and reappointed to the same committees. He served on a committee of inquiry to inquire into the policy of the J.E.C. (Jersey Electricity Company) and the policy of the Housing Committee regarding gas supplies in 1973, and also pursued matters individually, bringing a petition to the States in the same year that a car ferry should be operated between St. Catharine's and Carteret, although unsuccessful with the proposition. Deputy Voisin played an important part, alongside Senator Ralph Vibert, in negotiating Jersey's relationship with the European Economic Community, which ultimately led to Protocol 3 of the Treaty of Accession. He did not stand for election in 1975. Michael Voisin's long legal career and dynamic leadership of Voisin Law is well known and he was regarded as one of the pioneers of Jersey's finance industry. He lectured at global conferences and wrote extensively on the Island's role in international finance. Voisin Law, in its own tribute, recorded that Michael Voisin, a familiar presence in the Island's court, was affectionately known as Mr. Bojangles by the ushers, owing to the chain bracelets he wore in court and the way they jangled during hearings. Outside the legal world, he enjoyed travelling between Jersey and his home in Majorca, and his great enjoyment of deep-sea fishing led him to travel the world in pursuit of his next catch. Our thoughts have been and remain with his family. I invite Members to rise for a moment of silence and reflection. **[Silence]** May he rest in peace.

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS

2. Appointment of unelected members of the Public Accounts Committee

The Bailiff:

Under F we turn to Appointment of unelected members of the Public Accounts Committee, and I invite the chair of the committee, Deputy Wilson, to make her nominations.

Deputy R.E. Binet of Grouville and St. Martin:

Sir, could I just lift the défaut on Deputy Labey?

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to raise the défaut on Deputy Labey? The défaut is raised. Yes, Deputy Wilson.

2.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement (Chair, Public Accounts Committee):

Good morning. I am pleased to recommend 3 members as non-elected members to the Public Accounts Committee under Standing Order 124. The first person that I would like to recommend is Clive Heal. Clive has more than 35 years of international executive experience in procurement, commercial management and organisational transformation. This includes senior leadership positions with global organisations such as the Prudential, GSK (GlaxoSmithKline), Roche and GreenTech. He currently leads in an artificial intelligence business and has extensive experience in procurement strategy, supply governance, commercial negotiations and innovation. He brings specialist expertise in procurement, commissioning, value for money assessment, digital transformation and technology governance, together with significant experience of leading complex organisational change. The second person I would like to recommend is Mark Oliver, who is a qualified accountant and senior finance executive with more than 30 years of board level experience across commercial and charitable organisations.

[9:45]

His experience includes service as a finance director, chair of an audit and finance committee and chair of an investment committee. Throughout his career he has been responsible for financial governance, budgeting, performance reporting, risk management and strategic planning, as well as supporting major organisational projects and commercial initiatives. He brings considerable expertise in audit assurance, financial management, governance, and value for money assessment. The third person I would like to recommend is Robert Duncomb. He is a former NHS (National Health Service) chief pharmacist with more than 20 years of senior leadership experience within major healthcare organisations, including the Royal Marsden and the Christie NHS Foundation Trust. His responsibilities included oversight of substantial medicines and staffing budgets, governance and risk assurance, workforce leadership and service improvement. He has also held national leadership roles within the pharmacy profession and has contributed to the development of policy and best practice across the health sector. He brings significant expertise in public sector financial stewardship, healthcare governance, workforce leadership, value for money, decision-making and complex data systems. I can inform the Assembly that the appointment process was conducted through an open and competitive recruitment exercise. An advertisement was published locally on careers.gov.je, and promoted through social media and a LinkedIn campaign managed by the States Greffe. The vacancy was also circulated through the Jersey Chamber of Commerce's weekly newsletter and, in addition, a note to the media highlighted the recruitment campaign, which subsequently received local media coverage. In all, we had 17 applications and we shortlisted 8 candidates down for the roles. The advertisement sought professionals with a demonstrable track record in the following areas: audit assurance and risk management, financial management and public accountability, corporate governance and organisational leadership, programme and project delivery, digital and technology governance, including technology strategy, health and workforce leadership, including workforce planning, infrastructure, estates or asset management, procurement, commercial management and commissioning, and human resources and people management. The aforementioned skills and experience are aligned with the recommendations made in the previous P.A.C.'s (Public Accounts Committee) legacy report, as well as the key themes arising from the work and recommendations of the Comptroller and Auditor General (C and AG), including matters raised by the C and AG in relation to critical resilience infrastructure and healthcare expenditure. The addition of the proposed non-elected members will bring a broad range of skills, knowledge and experience to strengthen the committee's ability to discharge its responsibilities under the Public Finances Law and to undertake robust scrutiny throughout its 4-year term. It complements the elected members. In addition to the relevant professional expertise, applicants were also required to demonstrate strong analytical and

communication skills, together with the ability to work constructively and collaboratively as part of a committee. The shortlisting panel consisted of myself, the Greffier of the States and the practice director of the Law Officers' Department. We used a scoring matrix at both shortlisting and interview stages to ensure candidates were assessed consistently and objectively. Eight applicants were shortlisted for interview, which took place on 19th and 20th August. Following the interviews, the panel unanimously agreed to recommend the appointment of those nominees that I have just outlined. In reaching its recommendation, the panel carefully considered the relative merits of all candidates, including their professional and academic backgrounds, and sought to ensure that the collective experience of the non-elected members would complement and strengthen the knowledge and experience of the elected members on P.A.C. I am asking the States to approve the appointment of the nominees as non-elected members of the P.A.C. I have received ... or the Greffier has not received, to my knowledge, any alternative nominations to the Membership, and I recommend these nominations to the States.

The Bailiff:

Are the nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Accordingly, as there were no other nominations made by the time prescribed by Standing Orders, I declare that Clive Heal, Mark Oliver and Robert Duncomb have been appointed to the Public Accounts Committee. **[Approbation]**

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

3. Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade will raise a matter of privilege

The Bailiff:

We now move to G, Matters of Privilege. Deputy Tadier has given notice under Standing Order 8 of his wish to raise a matter which he believes to affect the privileges or immunity of the States. Under Standing Order 60 he will now state the facts which he wishes to draw attention and the grounds on which he believes that the facts affect the privileges or immunity of the States. When he has done so, I will then give a ruling under Standing Order 60 as to whether or not those matters affect the privileges or immunity of the States.

3.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Thank you for allowing this. I understand that matters being raised under G, privileges of the States, are rare, and I do not think I can remember one, if indeed one has taken place, since I have been here. But I do so because I think there are some important principles at stake. I will outline what I think is an issue here. Whether or not it crosses the line into undermining the privileges of States Members is another question. But I think it is worth raising it here. You will be aware, Sir, that some emails were sent on Friday from the Office of the Chief Executive advising initially all civil servants, which was copied into States Members, that they should not comment publicly on the trial, which is proceeding in the other place today. A big trial, which I am not going to go into detail of. I queried that email initially as to why it had been sent to us, and I think it was acknowledged that that was probably inappropriate, and that it was a group email which happened to include States Members but it was not specifically meant for States Members. So I thought the matter had closed there. But then again at 1.18 p.m., States Members specifically received an email only directed to them and maybe one other group saying that States Members should specifically not refer to the proceedings that are going on in that trial. The problem I have is that the email instruction came from the head of government comms from the Chief Executive's office, and at that point I did not reply directly to the sender of that email but I sent it to the Chief Minister who, to be fair to him, has acknowledged that I have a point - I think is what his email said - and that it is not appropriate for Government to seek to direct this Assembly. I raise these for 2 primary reasons. Whether or not the instruction itself is a sound one, and I am not questioning that. The

first point is that this has the risk of undermining parliamentary sovereignty. So the principle of parliamentary sovereignty is that our Assembly, being the Parliament, is separate. It does not answer to Government. Government does not ... well, it does strangely answer to Parliament because it comes from our Assembly, and similarly that the court is separate. So it is wholly inappropriate for either the Chief Executive or the Head of Comms for the Government to send instructions to States Members, including of course the co-leader of the opposition as to what he or she may be able to say on any matter. If a direction were to have come it should have come, in my view, from the Comms Unit of the States Greffier, if indeed it was deemed necessary for that to happen, or from an entity or an individual within the States Assembly who has the authority to do that. The second is that it has a risk I think of trampling into the territory of freedom of speech and therefore parliamentary privilege. One of the foundations of parliamentary privilege is that States Members have the ability to speak freely and that when we are in this Assembly we are covered by parliamentary privilege and we cannot be held to account and sued, for example, or taken to court for what we say here. There may be limitations of course as to what we can say here, and it may be entirely appropriate that we do not comment on what is going on in the other place at the moment, Sir, but you will understand that I raise this after careful thought because I do think it needs to be put on record that the lines between the 3 areas of government - the courts, the Executive and the Assembly - need to be respected. There seems to me, and I can give other examples in future either to yourself or to the Privileges and Procedures Committee, about how I feel these lines are being blurred.

The Bailiff:

I am grateful to Deputy Tadier for raising this matter. Although the email in question was undoubtedly sent in good faith and motivated by sincere reasons, it should not have been sent. It is not appropriate for a civil servant acting on behalf of the Executive to tell Members how to conduct themselves in this context. Members are well able to understand their duties and obligations in respect of criminal trials and, indeed in the case of new Members, have been recently asked to consider such matters in the course of their induction. Any messaging thought necessary on the part of Ministers could have been delivered with a different tone, certainly a less directive tone, and potentially by an elected Member from within Government. Parliamentary privilege is enshrined in statute; see Articles 34 and 35A of the States of Jersey Law. Nonetheless, I do not think this intervention in fact affects the privileges or immunity of the States. The email, while inappropriate, could not itself affect or limit Members' freedom of speech whether within or without the Chamber. It is for the Assembly alone to determine its own rules as part of parliamentary privilege. Members themselves have made Standing Orders governing their own conduct, which provide, for example, at Standing Order 107, a power to prevent Members from referring to matters relevant to proceedings in any court, and a duty under Standing Order 104 not to refer to a case pending in court in a way which might prejudice that case. Outside the States, what Members say is a matter for themselves, subject to the law on contempt of court and the Code of Conduct for Elected Members. The contents of the email in question did, in effect, no more than allude to these rules, but to be sent in the terms it was unnecessary and perhaps high-handed. Thank you for raising that matter, Deputy.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I thank you for your consideration in that matter?

QUESTIONS

4. Written Questions

**Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development
regarding RNLI lifeguard rescue and first-aid incident data. (WQ.129/2026)**

Question

Will the Minister advise –

- (a) whether records are maintained of water rescues, resuscitation incidents (including CPR) and first-aid treatments undertaken by RNLI lifeguards on Jersey beaches and, if so, provide a breakdown by beach location for each of the last five years and;
- (b) how many water rescues, resuscitation incidents (including CPR) and first-aid treatments have occurred at Havre des Pas bathing pool in each of the last five years, and whether this information has been used to assess the need for lifeguard provision at the site?

Answer

I am sure that all members would acknowledge the important role that RNLI lifeguards play in keeping Jersey's wonderful beaches safe for both islanders and visitors. In recent years, they have sought to increase the number of lifeguards who are Jersey residents, which we welcome.

a) This data is held by the RNLI and has been provided in the tables below.

b) The Havre des Pas Lido is managed by a private operator and is not included within the Government's beach-lifeguarding contract with the RNLI. Lifeguarding provision is therefore provided at the discretion of the private operator.

Nevertheless, the I&E Department do hold historic data on incidents over the last five years which is provided below:

Havre Des Pas

Year	First aid	Lifeguard rescue	Medical Emergency	Medical Emergency Alcohol related	Medical Emergency Cardiac	Medical Emergency dislocation in pool	Slip first aid	Total
2020	10	2	1	0	0	0	1	14
2021	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	7
2022	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	8
2023	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	9
2024	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
2025	0	1	2	2	1	1	7	14
Total	20	5	3	2	2	1	21	54

2025

Lifeguard Incident and Incident Actions

Lifeguard Unit	Incidents	People Aided	Lives Saved	Rescue	Assistance	Casualty Care	Minor First Aid	Search	Missing/ Found	Non Aquatic Assist	Near Miss	False Alarm	Anti Social Behaviour	Animals	Other	Preventative Actions
El Tico	39	63	0	9	15	0	15	2	1	1	18	0	0	2	0	6,299
Greve De Lecq	46	60	0	19	11	7	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,026
Le Braye	45	48	0	11	5	4	25	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	9,519
Plemont	71	75	3	3	2	3	64	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	6,666
St Brelade's Bay	53	63	0	21	6	8	28	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,024
Watersplash	37	61	0	19	27	3	7	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	5,807
Total	291	370	3	82	66	25	164	3	6	2	26	0	0	3	0	43,341

2024

Lifeguard Incident and Incident Actions

Lifeguard Unit	Incidents	People Aided	Lives Saved	Rescue	Assistance	Casualty Care	Minor First Aid	Search	Missing/ Found	Non Aquatic Assist	Near Miss	False Alarm	Anti Social Behaviour	Animals	Other	Preventative Actions
El Tico	54	81	0	19	36	1	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6,014
Greve De Lecq	26	26	0	0	1	4	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5,181
Le Braye	53	96	0	3	13	9	30	1	1	0	41	0	0	3	0	8,699
Plemont	70	71	0	2	6	5	57	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5,603
St Brelade's Bay	80	92	0	18	5	7	40	0	10	0	13	0	0	0	0	7,882
Watersplash	49	68	2	19	23	4	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6,884
Total	332	434	2	61	84	30	189	2	11	0	56	1	0	4	0	40,263

2023

Lifeguard Incident and Incident Actions

Lifeguard Unit	Incidents	People Aided	Lives Saved	Rescue	Assistance	Casualty Care	Minor First Aid	Search	Missing/ Found	Non Aquatic Assist	Near Miss	False Alarm	Anti Social Behaviour	Animals	Other	Preventative Actions
El Tico	32	76	0	18	25	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	23	4,660
Greve De Lecq	48	60	0	11	8	3	35	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5,135
Le Braye	45	55	0	8	14	3	26	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	8,989
Plemont	46	47	0	3	2	1	39	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6,073
St Brelade's Bay	79	104	0	11	14	4	42	0	7	1	21	4	0	0	0	9,533
Watersplash	22	27	0	7	10	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4,878
Total	272	369	0	58	73	20	150	0	9	2	31	4	0	2	23	39,268

2022

Lifeguard Incident and Incident Actions

Lifeguard Unit	Incidents	People Aided	Lives Saved	Rescue	Assistance	Casualty Care	Minor First Aid	Search	Missing/ Found	Non Aquatic Assist	Near Miss	False Alarm	Anti Social Behaviour	Animals	Other	Preventative Actions
El Tico	44	65	0	24	19	4	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	8,993
Greve De Lecq	45	55	1	2	2	2	33	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	6,453
Le Braye	27	31	0	9	3	2	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	8,262
Plemont	100	116	0	4	18	1	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,652
St Brelade's Bay	98	113	0	15	15	6	66	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	8,986
Watersplash	15	17	0	5	3	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,665
Total	329	397	1	59	60	16	232	1	4	2	3	1	0	1	6	46,011

2021

Lifeguard Incident and Incident Actions

Lifeguard Unit	Incidents	People Aided	Lives Saved	Rescue	Assistance	Casualty Care	Minor First Aid	Search	Missing/ Found	Non Aquatic Assist	Near Miss	False Alarm	Anti Social Behaviour	Animals	Other	Preventative Actions
El Tico	28	40	0	13	17	3	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	8,324
Greve De Lecq	39	41	0	2	5	1	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	6,048
Le Braye	30	37	0	3	10	3	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8,911
Plemont	60	62	0	0	4	2	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	5,797
St Brelade's Bay	62	70	0	7	11	4	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	6,357
Watersplash	11	12	1	4	3	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5,168
Total	230	262	1	29	50	16	160	0	3	3	2	0	0	8	0	40,605

Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the financial implications of creating a Minister for Planning and Regulation. (WQ.133/2026)

Question

Further to [R.106/2026](#) and the proposed Order to separate planning and regulatory functions from the Minister's responsibilities and to create a Minister for Planning and Regulation, will the Minister –

- set out where the revenue to fund her department will come from if the proposed changes take effect, specifically whether the income currently generated through planning and regulatory fees, licences and application charges will continue to be included;
- advise what assessment, if any, has been made of the net financial impact to her department from the transfer of functions (and any potential associated fee income) to the new Minister for Planning and Regulation; and

- (c) inform the Assembly whether any transitional funding or budget reallocation has been agreed with the Minister for Treasury and Resources to ensure her department is not left with any shortfall as a result of the creation of the new role?

Answer

While Members understandably have questions in relation to the creation of new Ministerial Offices and portfolio transfers, and seek assurance over budget allocations, the intention remains, as it has under previous transfers, to ensure no adverse or positive budget impact from these political transfers, i.e. they are, of themselves, budget neutral.

Specifically:

- (a) The intention is that each Directorate (Regulation and Natural Environment) will have a dedicated Head of Expenditure in Budget 2027 – 2030 that reflects their responsibilities and activities.
- (b) A detailed financial assessment was not made as part of the transfer to the new Minister for Planning and Regulation, because the intention was, and is, that the transfer will be budget neutral, i.e. there would be no financial impact.

The existing budgets for each of the Natural Environment and Regulation Directorates, save for any other decision to be made as part of Budget 2027 – 2030, will be maintained.

- (c) No transitional funding or budget reallocation has been agreed with the Minister for Treasury and Resources. The reasons for not agreeing any such funding or budget are that none is needed for the reasons explained in part (b) above.

The Natural Environment function will not be left with any shortfall as a result of the creation of the new role.

Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding different minimum wage rates across industries. (WQ.143/2026)

Question

In relation to the minimum wage, will the Minister advise whether consideration is being given to –

- (a) setting different rates across industries and, if so, will she state who she plans to consult; and
- (b) a youth minimum wage rate and, if so, what age group will this rate apply to?

Answer

The statutory consultation on the minimum wage rate for April 2027 is currently being undertaken by the Employment Forum, in line with the requirements of the Employment Law. Once it has considered all the evidence it has received, the Forum will make its recommendations to me. I expect to receive those recommendations in September.

In her direction letter to the Forum, the previous Minister for Social Security did not ask it specifically to consider sectoral minimum wage rates or a youth minimum wage.

I will consider all matters relating to the Minimum Wage once I have received the Forum's report.

A link to the current consultation exercise is here: [Employment Forum consultation on minimum wage 2026 to 2027](#)

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Jersey Pupil Premium Programme. (WQ.144/2026)

Question

Will the Minister provide an update on the impact of the Jersey Pupil Premium programme, including any demonstrated improvement in educational attainment gaps?

Answer

School level impact

Each school evaluates the impact of their Jersey Premium strategy annually, with reports published on their webpages in January/February of each year. Evaluation of these reports shows that schools are adopting a consistent Island-wide approach:

- funding is now consistently used in an evidence-informed way, in line with the recommendations of the Education Endowment Fund;
- schools tend to prioritise developing and ensuring teaching quality for all students rather than using it for isolated interventions with groups or individuals;
- literacy, numeracy and communication remain the key academic targets;
- wellbeing and attendance are now treated as equally important outcome measures;

In addition, the Jersey School Reviews always evaluate the application of Jersey Premium funds. Reviewers assess how well pupils receiving Jersey Premium funding progress by the end of each key stage compared with pupils who started at a similar level. They consider whether these pupils are meeting age-related expectations and whether any gaps in progress or attainment are reducing over time as a result of the funding. Reviewers also evaluate the impact of the school's use of Jersey Premium funding in helping pupils reach expected standards, achieve greater depth in their learning, and access increased challenge. Where funding supports pupils with particular talents or aptitudes, reviewers comment on the overall effectiveness of that provision. For example, a recent report stated, 'The school goes to significant lengths to ensure equity and adapt its curriculum around its pupil groups so they are ready for later life. Leaders check carefully that pupils who are from disadvantaged backgrounds..., benefit from the same curricular opportunities as others.'

Island level impact

Schools receive funding for each cohort of pupils identified as eligible for Jersey Premium in their school and allocate that funding to best meet the needs of that cohort of learners, as detailed in their published Jersey Premium Plans and evaluations.

At an Island level we evaluate how different groups of children (such as those who are eligible for Jersey Premium funding) are being supported in their education. We consider comparative results in

teacher assessments of reading, writing and mathematics in primary schools (KS2), at KS4 (GCSE and level 1/level 2 qualifications) and KS5 (A level and level 3 qualifications) between Pupils eligible for Jersey Premium and those who are not eligible. This comparative analysis will identify the difference in attainment between the groups, or as the question asks, an 'attainment gap'.

Between 2021 and 2025 the gap between Pupils with Jersey Premium and those not eligible at the end primary school (Key stage 2) has reduced in reading, writing and mathematics based on teacher assessments, with the overall attainment difference reducing from 20.9% to 15.8%. At GCSE, the gap difference has fluctuated both up and down over the same period but overall has remained static at 27.4%.

At KS5 over the same period similarly there are year on year fluctuations which are best interpreted with the context of year-on-year differences in the cohort and their characteristics. Overall, the gap in A level achievement between 2021 and 2025 has dropped from 6.4% to 4.8%.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding additional pedestrian crossings on Route de la Baie, St. Brelade's Bay (WQ.146/2026)

Question

Is the Minister aware of any calls from local residents and businesses to install additional pedestrian crossings on Route de la Baie, St. Brelade's Bay, and will he advise whether it is his assessment that such crossings are needed to improve road safety for users of the Bay and, if so, what steps he is taking to deliver them and within what timeframe?

Answer

There have been requests from residents, businesses, and Parish representatives for additional pedestrian crossings on La Route de la Baie, St. Brelade's Bay.

The Department has investigated these requests through a combination of site assessments, speed surveys, collision analysis, and wider route review work. That work identified clear pedestrian desire lines between the public car parks, hotels, the parish church, visitor attractions, promenade and beach, and recognised opportunities to improve pedestrian connectivity and the overall pedestrian environment within the bay.

The evidence gathered has not identified speeding as a predominant issue within the Bay, with traffic surveys recording generally good compliance with the 20-mph speed limit. Similarly, the collision information reviewed did not indicate a notable road-safety problem, and assessments undertaken in relation to Midbay recorded no pedestrian injury collisions within the relevant five-year period then available, which is the standard review process.

The Department's assessment is therefore that the principal issue is not vehicle speed, but the difficulty pedestrians can experience moving between key destinations within the Bay, particularly where footway provision is absent or crossing opportunities are limited. While there is merit in improving pedestrian access, the Department has concluded that it would not be appropriate to consider individual crossing requests in isolation.

At a number of locations, including those most frequently suggested by residents, the provision of a conventional pedestrian crossing is constrained by factors such as limited footway or waiting space, restricted visibility, private accesses, nearby bus stop infrastructure, and the operational requirements

of adjoining premises. Officers have therefore concluded that some crossings would be difficult to deliver as standalone measures without more substantial alterations to the highway environment.

As a result, the Department has developed a broader package of potential improvements for St. Brelade's Bay which form a bay-wide improvement strategy rather than a series of isolated interventions. The proposals remain at feasibility stage. Before any scheme could proceed, further design development, stakeholder engagement, consultation, landowner cooperation where required, and the identification of a funding source would be necessary. Any scheme would also need to be prioritised alongside other Island-wide road-safety and active-travel programmes, including the Safe Routes to School programme.

It should also be noted that opportunities to incorporate such improvements within the planned reconstruction of Route de la Baie and associated roads in 2031 will continue to be considered as that programme is developed.

Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John. St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Evidence-Based Energy Strategy. (WQ. 147/2026)

Question

Further to the adoption of '[Evidence-Based Energy Strategy](#)' (P.11/2025), as amended, and the request that the Council of Ministers develop and begin implementing such a strategy for Jersey by 31st December 2026, will the Minister –

- (a) provide an update on the status of the strategy and advise whether it remains on track to be developed and to begin implementation by 31st December 2026;
- (b) detail what progress has been made since the response to [WQ.360/2025](#), including on stakeholder engagement, and advise whether any of the reports mentioned in that response have identified findings that will shape the strategy;
- (c) advise whether the change in Ministerial functions described in [R.106/2026](#) will have any impact on the responsibility or timeline for this work; and
- (d) state when a draft or summary of the strategy will be made available to the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel and the Assembly?"

Answer

- (a) The energy strategy currently remains under development and is on track in accordance with P.11/2025. I endorse the comments of my predecessor ([P.11/2025 Com](#)) that the energy strategy should provide a high-level vision and long-term roadmap for how energy should be managed, supplied and used over time in Jersey, set broad goals, identify key themes, priorities and areas of tension, provide a framework for decision-making and identify further policy development in areas such as legislation, regulation and specific policy actions to implement the strategic intent.
- (b) Work has continued to analyse appropriate evidence, including information from energy suppliers and the development of an energy forecast and potential future scenarios. Officers are in the process of developing potential policy approaches to the issues raised. This work

will continue through to the end of Q3 2026 and at that point it will be further considered how best to engage on a draft strategy with stakeholders, including the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel, during Q4 2026.

The [Energy Trends report](#), [C&AG's review of energy infrastructure resilience](#), the [JCRA Electricity Market Study](#), the [Carbon Neutral Roadmap](#) and the [report on the potential of offshore energy for Jersey](#) have all provided evidence that will shape the strategy. The Energy Trends Report 2025 is due to be published by the end of August which will provide up-to-date energy trends data.

(c) No. It is not currently envisaged that there will be any change in responsibility or timeline.

(d) See (b).

5. Oral Questions

The Bailiff:

We now move to Oral Questions of which there are 16, which means approximately 8 minutes will be allowed per question.

5.1 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Chief Minister regarding Freedom of Information request decisions (OQ.74/2026).

In light of the Information Commissioner's concerns regarding central Government involvement in freedom of information request decisions, will the Chief Minister advise what role central communications or other Government functions currently have in decisions on whether information is disclosed and what action, if any, he intends to take to ensure that such decisions are made independently by the relevant scheduled public authority?

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):

The Connétable has agreed that Deputy Ferey take this, as he has delegated responsibility for the matter.

Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (Assistant Chief Minister – rapporteur):

I thank the Connétable for her question. Freedom of information decisions are made by the scheduled public authority and, for clarity, that is the relevant department which holds the information and are signed off by the relevant accountable officer. A scheduled public authority is entitled to seek advice from legal communications, policy or other specialist colleagues when preparing responses. This is a normal and sensible part of Government administration. The role of the Information Commissioner is to consider whether decisions comply with the law. How the Government organises advice and support functions is a matter for Government, provided statutory responsibilities remain with the relevant authority. Officers are currently reviewing how the Government operates across its various scheduled public authorities to ensure services are delivered in the most efficient, consistent and cost-effective way possible.

5.1.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Can the Assistant Chief Minister confirm whether freedom of information responses are seen by communications or any other central units before issue and whether any requests are flagged as reputational sensitive and whether communication officers can recommend withholding information, and if so who makes the final decision and where it is recorded.

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Connétable for that back-up question. So communications may see the request or the ultimate response but they are not responsible for whether or not that response gets delivered. They are just responsible for ensuring that the response is in good order but they have no jurisdiction over the scheduled public authority, the relevant individual department or accountable officer who is responsible for releasing that information.

[10:00]

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

I wonder if the Minister knows of any data as to how often there is any pushback when the senior officer signs off on information, whether the F.O.I. (freedom of information) authority ever pushes back and asks for more.

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Deputy for that question. Obviously, some requests are very straightforward and can be dealt with expediently. Some are more complex and require more thought and more discussion, so I do not have the numbers on how many are straightforward and how many require more oversight. But as any requests would go, some are straightforward and some are naturally more complicated.

5.1.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Just recently, given the commissioner just overturned a decision to treat 9 requests as vexatious and given that 23 per cent of decisions are challenged and internal review were reversed, will the Assistant Chief Minister commit to publishing an audit of how the existing vexatious power has been used before the proposal extends and bring to the Assembly?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, we are reviewing processes. We are trying to improve those processes where we can and we are reviewing the decision-making around freedom of information requests. I think it is fair to say that over the last number of years the number of requests has grown exponentially, and sometimes officers and staff are overwhelmed by the number of requests. So it is important that we give them due regard and that they are properly dealt with. That will be part of the work that I am undertaking during this political term.

5.2 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Chief Minister regarding assurance and approval processes for major capital projects (OQ.72/2026).

In light of recent concerns raised regarding the assurance and approval processes surrounding major capital projects, will the Chief Minister advise what steps he has taken, or is considering taking, to ensure no major contract is signed by Ministers before all legal, financial, governance and independent assurance processes are completed?

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):

The Government already has robust legal, financial, governance and assurance processes in place for major capital projects, and I am not proposing changes to those arrangements at this time. The recent hospital contract was an exceptional case. The Minister acted transparently through the Ministerial instruction process after becoming aware of an outstanding due diligence requirement immediately before the contract was due to be signed. Following legal advice and discussions with the Council of Ministers, a contractual mechanism was agreed that allowed the contract to be signed while ensuring that the necessary due diligence would still be completed and satisfied under specified conditions. In effect, the Ministerial instruction became unnecessary as that process was conducted successfully. The Council of Ministers supported that approach because it protected the public

interest, maintained the required assurance processes, and avoided further delay to a project of critical importance to our island. I am therefore satisfied that the Government's existing governance and assurance framework remains robust and that this exceptional situation was dealt with transparently and appropriately by the Minister and the Council of Ministers. I do not propose to make any changes at this stage.

5.2.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Given the exceptional circumstances of this need to sign the contract 2 days before an election, can the Chief Minister confirm whether or not, or he accepts, that authorising a contract of this size before the prescribed assurance and approval mechanisms have been completed created a situation where the Government's own assurance framework under the Public Finance Law could not operate?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I think the process did operate in line with how it should. There is a reason why we have a Ministerial authorisation and it was, I think, brought in and applied appropriately, as I said in my original answer, in the public interest.

5.2.2 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:

Would the Chief Minister confirm that there was a senior Treasury member on the hospital project team throughout, and also agree with me that a mechanism was in place to complete any outstanding due diligence to ensure nothing of concern had arisen and the contract could be cancelled as something arisen, as outlined in the Minister's letter received by Members this morning?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, that is correct. I thank the Connétable for the question. Just to clarify, at the point of signing the contract, including a 2-week break clause to allow the Treasury ongoing review to be completed, those reviews subsequently concluded without identifying any issues.

5.2.3 The Connétable of St. John:

Can the Chief Minister also confirm that both he and the Council of Ministers had access to senior legal advisers both on Island and subject specialists in London throughout the process?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, that is correct.

5.2.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

Could the Chief Minister enlighten the Assembly as to how we came to the point where the Minister got into an exceptional circumstance whereby all of the due diligence had not been done prior to the requirement of the signing of the contract?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I think it was more assurance rather than due diligence. Members will have seen a statement from the Minister this morning, which explains it all in greater detail [Appended to the Official Record at page number 47]. There were important sensitive negotiations that have been going on for some time to ensure we got the absolute best deal for the Island, and they were time sensitive. As I said before, in the public interest it was deemed appropriate and right at the time, albeit being close to an election, but in the interests of the Island and the potential costs of the project the contract was signed.

5.2.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I think I have heard the Minister for Health and Social Services refer to a last-minute request for additional information to be provided. How did it get to the point that this request was seen as a last-

minute request despite the fact that this is part of the usual procedures as requested in the Public Finances Manual?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

As we approached the proposed day of the signing of the contract the Minister was made aware by a letter from the Chief Executive that there were further assurances required, and that led to the Minister for Health and Social Services and his team negotiating the 2-week break clause into the contract to allow for that work to be completed.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Sir, I do not think the Chief Minister has answered my question. My question is specifically related to the usual processes that are followed. The Chief Minister alluded to additional information. My understanding was that this was not additional information for this specific programme. It is information that is standard and the hospital team should have planned in their timeframe for it to be done ahead of the contract signing.

The Bailiff:

Anything you want to add, Chief Minister?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

That was not the Minister for Health and Social Service's understanding, as I believe, and as in the Connétable of St John's questions, a Treasury official sits on the hospital team that has worked with the project all the way along. But it is clear that if the Treasury do require further information and assurances we must take that seriously. That is exactly what we did. The Minister for Health and Social Services negotiated a 2-week break clause so that information could be provided.

5.2.6 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Could the Chief Minister confirm who has the specific responsibility for any risks associated with this contract? Can he confirm whether this was a collective decision or whether it was under Ministerial Order?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am sorry, I missed ... I did not quite hear the first part of the question. Could the Deputy ...

The Bailiff:

Repeat the first part of your question, Deputy Wilson.

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

I have asked who bears the specific responsibility for the risks in relation to the contract being signed under these circumstances.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I might need legal advice on that. I presume the Government does, but perhaps you could help?

The Bailiff:

No, I am not here to help you answer questions. [Laughter]

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The second part of the question, I think, ultimately, was the Ministerial instruction required?

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Maybe if I allow the Chief Minister to seek the advice on the first part of the question as to who bears the specific accountability around the risks relating to the signing of this contract.

The Bailiff:

Do you want to give an answer in writing after?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Thank you, Sir. If the Attorney-General will be present at some stage, perhaps he could help.

The Bailiff:

Well, not in relation to questions, and during question time he will not be able to, but if you want to give a written response to this question, then of course you may.

5.3 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Minister for the Environment regarding protecting 30 per cent of the marine and terrestrial environment by 2030 (OQ.64/2026).

I was delighted to read the M.P.A. (Marine Protected Area) press release last week. Will the Minister advise how the Government intends to protect 30 per cent of the marine and terrestrial environment by 2030 in accordance with its international commitments under the U.N. (United Nations) Convention on Biological Diversity, and whether this work will include a programme of implementation and discussions with the Jersey National Park?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):

I thank the Connétable for the question. Firstly, I think it is important to recognise the significant progress Jersey has made in this area and the work undertaken by successive Ministers and Assembly Members, including former Deputy Steve Luce and, indeed, Deputy Renouf, in helping to establish the current network of marine protected areas. As the Connétable will be aware, the last week, following States approval in the spring, a significant expansion of Jersey's territorial waters receiving the highest level of protection has increased from 6.5 per cent to 21.7 per cent, with 2 further areas due to come into force on 1st January 2030, taking this figure to 23.4 per cent. As Minister for the Environment, I remain committed to supporting Jersey's international obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity, including the global ambition to protect and conserve 30 per cent of land and sea for nature by 2030, and to playing its part in delivering the ambitions of the global diversity framework. However, achieving those objectives is both from the marine and land area combined and cannot be delivered within a single designation. These measures are the result of considerable scientific research, habitat mapping, ecological surveys and stakeholder engagement and are focused on protecting Jersey's most important sensitive marine habitats. The Jersey National Park is an important part of Jersey's environmental landscape and has a valuable role in promoting, conserving and enhancing the Island's natural and cultural heritage. An identified activity of a recent review of the National Park was to establish the National Park as a I.U.C.N. (International Union for Conservation of Nature) cat V protected area and include it on the I.U.C.N. green list. Our officers are now regularly in discussions with the National Park team about conservation and environmental management.

5.3.1 The Connétable of St. Martin:

I thank the Minister for her answer. I would just like to say that it is a significant amount of work that needs to be done, and it is a significant amount of important work to be done. Does the Minister believe that this Government has the resources and commitment to achieve this vitally important step by 2030, bearing in mind that it is only 4 years away?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

As I have already stated, the work is already ongoing and it is important to identify that when we are doing work in relation to both marine and our land protections, is that we continue to consult with all of those people which it affects and we continue to work on projects which are achievable and reasonable. Obviously the question that stands, should we look at to find an additional 7.6 per cent to hit the target by 2030 for the sea. However, as I said, we need to be realistic and we must make sure that when we are doing these things that we are actually making proper gains, and that they are worth us doing and it is not just a paper exercise. So I am committed to achieving as much as we possibly can.

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

Could the Minister elaborate if part of this work will be to update Jersey's biodiversity strategy?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I thank the Deputy for the question, and that is yes. Both myself and the Assistant Minister are committed to looking at the biodiversity strategy, and that work will be ongoing.

[10:15]

5.3.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for her answer. I would like to ask the Minister if, with that in mind, the strategy of course you need implementation and that needs budgets, and will she be putting further budget towards biodiversity strategy implementation in the next Budget?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

At this present time, with only 2 months in this role, we need to look at all of the budgets and look how it is going to be divided, bearing in mind that the role that I have taken has been split from another. So obviously we will be looking how we are going to fund it and how much the costs are, but obviously the work is ongoing with the teams that we already have.

5.3.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

The Minister kindly mentions the role has been split, and of course this leads me to the question around the Marine Spatial Plan that was presented previously by the Minister for the Environment, which these roles have now been split. The Marine Spatial Plan is mentioned within the Bridging Island Plan, so is the Minister certain that she has responsible for this area or does it sit to the Minister to her right?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

As far as I am concerned, my role is in relation to the Marine Plan, and so that sits with me.

5.3.5 Deputy A. Maltman of St Mary, St Ouen and St Peter:

Could the Minister explain the structure of the Jersey National Park and what kind of statutory powers that the park has? Could the Minister explain whether there are any plans in the future to bring more statutory powers to the park enshrined in law?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

At this time I cannot answer that question. I am just, at this present time, visiting all of the areas where we work with closely and I am not in this, at this particular time, able to provide a structure of the National Park. But I am happy to ask a member of the team to do that today and to be able to provide that to the Deputy. [Appended to the Official Record at page number 52].

Deputy A. Maltman:

Thank you. I would welcome that conversation, Minister.

The Bailiff:

Final supplementary, Connétable of St. Martin.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

No, thank you, Sir.

5.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for External Relations regarding expired bank cards (OQ.67/2026).

Will the Minister advise whether he is aware that banks allow money for subscriptions to be paid out on expired bank cards and, if so, what action does the Minister intend to take in respect of this practice?

Senator I.J. Gorst (The Minister for External Relations):

I am aware that payments of subscription services can continue after the card originally used to set up the subscription has expired. Automated services such as Visa account updater and the Mastercard automatic billing updater should securely share updated bank card details with participating merchants when replacement cards are issued; for example, when a card has expired or been stolen. This system is used in many jurisdictions and helps to ensure that payments for reoccurring bills can continue to be processed without interruption, avoiding the unintended loss of access to a subscription service. So I am not aware of any concerns having been raised by Islanders regarding this service, but if the Deputy is aware of any I am happy to consider them.

5.4.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Well, unfortunately this happened to me, so I will raise my concern right now as I was unaware that an expired bank card was able to still process payments. This led me to have £62 taken from my bank account without my knowledge or consent, whereas if I had walked into a shop with that card I would not have been able to purchase something. So does the Minister believe that this system provides an adequate level of protection towards a consumer with regards to these financial transactions?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I think it does. The position is that it is in place to benefit the consumer. In certain instances, of course, if there has been fraud on the card then a different approach is taken. As I understand it, these structures or organisations or one's banking institution, one can opt out from these services. But I would caution very strongly any individual before doing such a thing because what it would probably mean is that all of their payments that they may have through the card, if they have authorised it through the card, would stop being made and they could find themselves in debt in certain areas. So I do think that the system as currently stands is appropriate but, as I say, individuals can opt out.

5.4.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

In light of the fact that many more people are now taking out subscription services, and given that there are more protections perhaps offered by credit cards in relation to this matter, would it be appropriate for Government to undertake some form of communications to let people know what protections are in place with a credit card as opposed to a debit card?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am not sure that it is the Government's job to do that. I think that credit card providers do a very good job of that, because it is one of the major selling points of having a credit card. It is not the credit, because credit on credit cards is relatively expensive to other forms of credit, but it does

provide this extra security for all sorts of reasons. Individual users of banking facilities of course have got to balance up. With a credit card you get a large bill at the end if you have used it, whereas if you are using it on your debit card then it is coming directly from your current account, therefore you may consider that you can manage your expenses more reasonably. But I do not think this is an area for Government to issue communication. What is an area for Government to issue communication, and it does in conjunction with the banking sector and the regulator, is around fraud and how all of these instruments could be used for fraud.

5.4.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

The Minister in his response to my first supplementary was around that a consumer might find themselves in a level of debt, but of course if the card is allowed to take money without pre-authorisation or additional authorisation off the new card then that debt could accumulate. Is it not better or is it the Minister's opinion that it might be better to lose services every 4 years and have to reconsider whether you still want your subscription rather than to have it automatically renew without your consent?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am not really in a position to second-guess what is in the best interest of any individual using such a service. From my personal perspective, the less I have to fiddle around with standing orders and direct debits and subscription services the better, because otherwise it means the children are logging on to Netflix and all of a sudden they cannot access it because something has happened at the bank which cannot be resolved very easily. It is a balance. Education is important. As we have just said, that is a job for the banking community and also for regulators and the provider of these products.

5.5 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the outcomes of the trial of free entry into the Jersey Museum (OQ.71/2026).

Further to the Minister's response to Written Question 136/2026 regarding the trial of free entry into the Jersey Museum, will the Minister advise whether he has had the opportunity to evaluate the outcomes of the trial and what his position is in relation to continuation of free entry; and if he has not yet undertaken this work, when will he do so, given the Museum's importance to the visitor economy?

Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

Since I responded to the Written Question in July, my focus has been on identifying how we are going to grow our economy and wider Council of Ministers commitments. I have not had the opportunity to evaluate the outcome of the trial. The Deputy will be aware that I have recently delegated functions for arts, culture and heritage to my Assistant Minister, Senator Kersten. I have asked her to liaise with Jersey Heritage to review the effectiveness of the free trial. I am confident that she will be able to recommend whether the trial restarts in due course.

5.5.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

First of all, can I also acknowledge that there has been a new appointment and congratulate Senator Kersten? I was really not sure who was going to answer the question this morning, but I am sure there will be a collaborative approach from the Ministry. Could the Minister clarify what the policy position is? Because while Jersey Heritage have run the trial, and I did hear on the radio this morning they think it has been a success from their point of view, that ultimately if we compare our situation in Jersey to the U.K. (United Kingdom), where there is a government policy that says national museums should, as a principle, be free to enter, does Government of Jersey have a policy principle and what considerations would it be underpinned by if it did?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

I think there are a couple of things here. First of all this was a trial, and a trial by its implication has a start date and a finish date, and I understand that the trial finished at the end of Q1 of this year. As far as a policy for encouraging visitors to visit our museum, of course this is all part of our visitor economy, and I do acknowledge that in 2025 the number of visits to Jersey Museum increased by about 34 per cent. But it is also interesting that visits to the Maritime Museum in Mont Orgueil also fell, which would have also had an impact on the revenue of the museum service. I think the thing is that the cost of the trial is about £500,000 a year, and it is a question of how best we are going to spend or allocate the resources of the one per cent funding that has been agreed by this Assembly.

5.5.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

I look forward to see the outcome of the evaluation. Would the Minister advise when he is expecting to get the evaluation before the Budget debate to ensure that we can have a discussion if this type of policy would benefit visitor economy and before we will go into the Budget debate?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

We have certainly got to agree the budget with all of the recipients of the Art, Culture and Heritage Fund. So that will be in the fourth quarter of this year. I would hope that it will be before the Budget debate.

5.5.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

The Minister mentioned about a trial. I would like to check if the evaluation measure the wider benefit to town, including footfall for nearby businesses or only museums on admission?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

The data we have is just for museums.

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

I think I was probably one of the last school cohorts of pupils who benefited from the flashcard back in the day where we were able to visit a wide range of heritage sites for free. Can the Minister tell me what is his position with regards to maybe having a look at bringing that back for children specifically, and has he done any comparisons with other countries? For example, I know in Portugal that the museums are free every Sunday.

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

No, as I said earlier we have not done the evaluation, and obviously any evaluation can certainly include looking at a flashcard system. I was not aware of that, so thank you for letting me know about it. And also what happens in other countries, so we can bring that in as part of the evaluation.

5.5.5 Deputy C.S. Alves:

Is the Minister aware of what the K.P.I.s (key performance indicators) for this trial were, please?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

I understand it was visitor numbers, but we also wanted an understanding of how the museum service translated that increase in numbers into increased revenues from other sources.

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

While I am interested in the visitor economy and the K.P.I.s around that, I am also interested in local children and whether they can access our local culture. I would be really interested to understand whether those K.P.I.s included measuring the number of local children visiting our museum. I also remember that scheme. Are there any K.P.I.s that measure the impact for our local children?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

I am sorry, my briefing papers do not cover the K.P.I. figures and whether they include entrants from children. All the information that I have is for local people attending and tourists, but this is something we can certainly look into as part of the review.

5.5.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

That is great to hear that the Minister is open to that. Would he be open to perhaps extending the trial in a slightly different format? Indeed a previous questioner gave some ideas there, perhaps a flashcard that allowed children one entry to each of the sites per year would make a huge difference to their cultural experience if their families cannot afford those memberships.

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

The trial has come to an end, so it is a question of restarting it on new parameters.

5.5.8 Deputy M. Tadier:

From my understanding, the trial was supposed to be a year and it lasted 2 years and it sounds like no measurement has meaningfully been taken. Does the Minister agree that he risks putting the cart before the horse and the first thing that his department needs to do is establish its policy on free entry to Jersey's National Museum?

[10:30]

And if the agreement that everybody should be able to access our National Museum for free, whether they are a visitor, a child or a local family which has grown up, that everything else should follow from that and it should not be simply a haggling argument between his department and Jersey Heritage, does he agree that it is valuable to establish that policy first or does he have a different opinion?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

I can certainly take that on board but I do think that an important part of this is, I am afraid, and I am sorry to say this, the financial element and whether we encourage free access to our museums for everyone. There is, as I said earlier on, a cost of about £500,000 for this, and it is a question of whether that is the best way to spend that money. I think the other issues of free entry for our youth is a separate issue, and certainly is important to discuss, but I think that also ... we have been talking about free entry to the Jersey museum, we have not been talking about free entry to all of our other museums in the Island.

5.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding establishing a taskforce to urgently tackle child poverty in Jersey (OQ.65/2026).

Will the Chief Minister agree to establish a taskforce, or similar, to urgently tackle child poverty in Jersey; and if so, what will the timeline and budget be for this work?

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):

I, together with all Ministers, share the Deputy's concern about the pressures facing children and families in Jersey, especially those arising from affordability and the cost of living. The Government is considering a number of options for how we can bring a stronger, more co-ordinated focus to these issues, including whether a taskforce, commission or similar time-limited body could help identify practical measures to improve affordability and support families. Ministers met with a delegation of local charities and other experts over the summer, and a further meeting is planned for next week, and we are focused on identifying real practical help based on their advice. No decision has yet been taken on the precise form, timetable or budget, but reducing the cost of living and making Jersey

more affordable remains a top priority for the Government and will play a central role in the Common Strategic Policy.

5.6.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Chief Minister for his response, and after the conversations that we had I am really pleased to see that there is something happening within Government. What I would like to understand is will there be actions set and decided upon in time to allocate funds in the forthcoming Budget?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

We certainly hope in the forthcoming Budget to build upon the work of the previous Government. Some help we have put in place for families included free G.P. (general practitioner) visits for children; extended childcare provisions for 2 to 3 year-olds; the roll out of school lunches in primary schools; significant additional funding for Children Services; and we will be building upon those in the forthcoming Budget. As I say, it does remain a top priority. We will be starting to address and provide help with cost-of-living measures, but I think the real work is around how understanding the affordability challenges, not just for children and families, but we need to understand what practical changes can be made over the next 4 years to reduce the cost of essential goods and services, increase disposable household incomes and make Jersey a more affordable place for all Islanders in which to live, work and have families. It is a complex piece of work that we need to fully understand.

5.6.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Child poverty and indeed families who are living in relative poverty in Jersey also are more likely to suffer from consequential potentially health-related issues, and we have seen that in Jersey. Obesity figures and overweight figures for children in Jersey are higher than elsewhere. When this was raised recently, it seemed that one media report said the Government of Jersey's Ministers said the Minister for Children and Families and the Minister for Health and Social Services were both unavailable for comment. I understand that Ministers were effectively passing the buck as to who was responsible for this area of children's welfare. Could the Chief Minister clarify that the reality is that all Government Ministers take responsibility but clarify who is the point of contact that should be dealing with these particular issues?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Ultimately that is correct, the Government is responsible and the Government is accountable to this Assembly, and this Assembly shares that joint responsibility to the wellbeing of all children, as the Deputy will know. I hope that answers the question.

5.6.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

I suppose the question is, when it comes to this particular issue, which I think is directly linked to child poverty and the health issues that arise, who would he seek to be updating him at the Council of Ministers on those kinds of issues from his Ministerial team?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

It is a general question. It would depend on the details of, or the facts of, the particular case that was being approached. The Minister for Health and Social Services is responsible for the health of the Islanders; the Minister for Children and Families is responsible for the welfare of children; in nearly all circumstances, the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning has responsibility for children; and the overall responsibility will, of course, sit with the Government, but it depends on what issue. But I cannot reiterate enough the importance and the priority this Government is placing on improving not just the affordability and cost-of-living challenges for families and children, but children's health and wellbeing.

5.6.4 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

Given that J.O.L.S. (Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey) found that 45 per cent of households in St. Helier would have been unable to afford unexpected, necessary expenses compared to 22 per cent in rural Parishes, does the Chief Minister accept that financial hardship is disproportionately concentrated in St. Helier, and will he ensure that any child poverty action considers targeted measures for families living in the Parish?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The statistics would indicate that, and I have said before, it is difficult to target support by Parish; we try and target it by case because while the statistics, I think by the very nature of the Parish - the built-up area - the statistics are more challenging in St. Helier. We want to make sure that the support is available right across the Island where it is needed. So, I am not sure how we would target support to a particular part of the Island. What I am trying to say is we want to make sure that support goes to whoever needs it, whichever part of the Island they live in.

5.6.5 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I would welcome a conversation with the Chief Minister because I do have some ideas as in physical actives, green space and other areas that exist ... less exist in St. Helier compared to other Parishes. Does the Chief Minister also accept ... he mentioned that he is bringing organisations and charities together and I do believe there is lots of support available across charities, Government, Parish. How will the Chief Minister ensure there is a single, clear accessible way for families to find out what financial and practical support is available across the third sector, Government and Parishes, because the information is not readily accessible and in one place?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Can I first say I wholeheartedly agree with the comments of the Connétable about the built-up area and the importance of town regeneration. The increase of green space in St. Helier, that undoubtedly has an impact on the welfare of parishioners, especially young people. We started to address that with the youth club and looking at where we can introduce new green spaces to improve wellbeing of parishioners. Could the Connétable just remind me of the final part of the second?

The Bailiff:

This is a question about setting up a taskforce, Connétable, we must not go too far away from that. What was your question?

The Connétable of St. Helier:

The question was that the taskforce would include Parishes, charity organisation and the Government, the support is available, but there is no one information hub where people can access and see what is available. Would this taskforce consider to create a joint information where people can go and say: "I need dentist". One of the charities can support dentists, for example.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I do not see that being a key deliverable of whatever group we establish to advise on cost of living, but it is an important issue for the Government. We started to work on that in the previous Government to make it easier and co-ordinated, because we want to make sure that people that need help and support are getting it. So, we will take that on board. It is a key priority for the Government, and I will identify the Ministers and make sure we work with the Connétable and other Members to ensure we improve our information to help Islanders receive what they are due.

5.6.6 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

In one of his previous answers, the Chief Minister mentioned meeting with a number of charities within the sector. Could he tell the Assembly what the key messages were from those charities and what actions he told those charities he would take next?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The meeting was chaired by Senator Boleat and was attended with other Ministers. Like I said, there is a follow-up meeting based on that. Senator Boleat and the Ministers went in really to listen to some of the concerns which are, I think, well known by most Assembly Members, around affordability and about the logistics of where help is received, and about a co-ordinated approach that is required by Government and the third sector to find the right solution. Senator Boleat is following up and chairing another meeting next week, I believe, and we will provide a report to the Council of Ministers following that.

5.6.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

The Chief Minister also said that he was seeking to understand the costs that put pressure on families and people living in poverty. Could he give an update on the work being undertaken to identify minimum income standards for the Island, which was instigated in the last term of office and would indeed inform this piece of work and any work that such taskforce would undertake?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I have no update on that at the moment, but I will consult with the Minister for Social Security to find out where we are and update the Deputy accordingly.

5.6.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

In terms of the actions being considered, Deputy Tadier mentioned the health of children. Would the Chief Minister consider actions that would help families access healthy foods, such as extending the healthy start vouchers or indeed making school meals fully funded?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The answer to that is yes, on both counts.

5.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the economic impact of lowering the minimum wage (OQ.63/2026).

Further to the Minister's letter regarding the minimum wage in Jersey, published in the *Jersey Evening Post* on 17th August 2026, will he advise whether he has instructed his department to investigate the economic impact of lowering the minimum wage and what policy discussions, if any, he has had with the Minister for Social Security about this issue?

Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

I have not instructed my department to investigate the economic impacts of lowering the minimum wage or of abolishing it. For the avoidance of doubt, the abolition of the minimum wage is not something that is being, or has been, considered. The Minister for Social Security and I met on 20th July to discuss the minimum wage and cost of living. We noted the economic analysis which had been undertaken, including the economic assessment presented to our predecessors ahead of recent increases in the minimum wage, and discussed my concerns about how the minimum wage was impacting some industry sectors.

5.7.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

In his letter to the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* the Minister made it quite clear that the minimum wage was strangling the economy, and so if this is the case, is the Minister potentially going to consider lowering the minimum wage and, as he said, so people could get more jobs?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

Our meeting with the Minister for Social Security concluded that it was right to allow the Employment Forum to continue and complete its work before recommending a minimum wage, and my comments were based around economic indicators that had been produced by the Statistics Unit and are available for all Members to read.

5.7.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Does the Minister accept that a balanced economy allows people to spend money across the range of services in the Island and allowing people to have money to spend on these services boosts our economy?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

Yes, that is fine to a point, but when increasing the minimum wage makes our businesses uncompetitive then it ends up damaging our economy. I think that what I would like Members to take away from ... if we are going to take one thing away today, please can it be that Jersey is suffering from the unravelling of globalisation.

[10:45]

Most prominently, this can be seen by Brexit, which occurred a few years ago now, and we have now got trade wars emerging around the world. We have got 2 world wars going on, and what this is doing is it is stopping the free movement of labour, it is stopping the free movement of capital and goods, and it is basically pushing up prices. It is pushing up the cost - all costs of business - in Jersey and also in other economies. These are structural problems that we have. The problem is that we cannot apply a cyclical solution, i.e. putting up the minimum wage, to address a structural solution. All we will end up doing is making our businesses uncompetitive. This is already happening in our visitor economy and what worries me is that it is going to happen in other parts of our economy as well. We have got to make sure that we maintain our economy as a competitive economy, and what I think everybody in this Assembly wants to do, is to see people have a better standard of living. The question is: are we going to do that just by putting up the minimum wage? That puts up inflation, so the money does not actually stay in people's pockets, it just flows out through increased food prices and increased rentals. So, really, we need to look at other structural solutions to address our structural problem so that more money will stay in people's pockets.

5.7.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I am just trying to digest everything that the Minister said there. I thought they were limited to 90 seconds in an answer, that felt longer. Though I agree with the Minister in that structural change is necessary, one of the biggest challenges the Island faces is recruitment and retention. By not allowing significant wages to be paid to people doing some of the most, what are considered, unskilled but essential work in our Island, are we not going to hamstring other sections of our economy by not being able to provide them other services?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

This comes back to the point that I was making about the free movement of labour has been interrupted. We used to get a lot of labour in Jersey from Europe, eastern Europe in particular, and that labour is no longer available. So the market is working inasmuch as where people have got to pay people more money to attract them, then those businesses, those services, are attracting those

people, and the issue really is about Government taking a step back and allowing the free market to work but also making sure that there is a safety net for people so that we do not see that people are being abused through very low wages.

5.7.4 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:

The Minister has also said he will not pursue abolition. Is it still the case that the Minister is personally opposed to a statutory minimum wage despite being a Minister in a Government which has explicitly said it will not abolish it?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

No, I am absolutely not opposed to a minimum wage. Not at all. But, yes, that is the answer. No, I am not. Definitely not.

5.7.5 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Does he believe therefore that the current minimum wage of £13.59 is too high, and if so, what rate does he believe would be appropriate?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

I have seen evidence that the minimum wage at £13.59 is too high for some sectors of our economy, and I have been told this by the Chief Executive of Jersey Business, who has seen the accounts of a number of businesses that are struggling. That is why I am particularly keen that we need to do something to help these businesses, because they need to regain their competitiveness.

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

The Minister talked about tackling some structural issues, so could the Minister give some examples of what those structural issues he would like to tackle going forward?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

Well, fuel prices have gone up significantly and I understand that the cost of a barrel of oil is going up to nearly 100 dollars a barrel, so that is not going to come down anytime soon. This feeds right the way through into our food prices, and generally the cost of things in Jersey are not going to come down. The question is can we try and bear down on the cost of inflation, on the rate of inflation, so that our increases are less?

5.7.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Could the Minister explain how he sees going about to do that, that bearing down?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

Bearing down on the cost of living?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

On the inflation that he was just talking about.

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

It is a question of making sure that every decision that is made by the States is cognisant of the effect that it has on inflation. To give you an example that has been given to me by the Economic Adviser, the increase in the minimum wage in 2025 accounted for inflation of 1.4 per cent. When you compare that to the overall rate of inflation of 3.7 per cent for R.P.I.X. (Retail Price Index excluding mortgage interest), so that is excluding the cost of housing in it, it means that the cost of living ... sorry, the minimum wage generated inflation was nearly about one-third of the overall inflation for that year. That is the sort of thing that we need to be cognisant about when we make these decisions in future.

5.7.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

The Minister mentioned that some industries are struggling with the current minimum wage rate. So, is the Minister potentially going to consider, alongside the Minister for Social Security, the setting of different rates across different industries?

Deputy F.G. Voisin:

As I said earlier on, I think it is for the Employment Forum to come up with its recommendations. The Forum has received the opinion and the report of the Economic Adviser, and I think we need to see what it comes up with.

5.8. Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding additional funding the Minister would seek through the 2027 Budget process (OQ.69/2026).

Further to the Minister's recent comments to ITV News that Health and Care Jersey will require additional funding, will he advise what additional funding he is intending to seek through the 2027 budget process?

Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

A couple of weeks ago, I raised the idea of establishing an economic growth fund with the Council of Ministers so that work on growing the economy could start during 2027. Given that I consider a first-class health service to be an essential component of an attractive place to live, visit and to invest, I included additional funding for the health service. These discussions are ongoing but the principal target areas are waiting list reductions, the development of a cancer centre, a replacement of essential equipment, existing hospital maintenance, and a sum of money for the continuation of the New Hospital Facilities Programme beyond Christmas 2026.

5.8.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Can the Minister be more clear as to whether he has presented business cases to Treasury and how much money he has asked for?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

No, I certainly have not presented a business case. I have opened a discussion about the possibility of establishing a fund from which money could be withdrawn, subject to approval of appropriate business cases.

5.8.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Is the Minister saying that the amount of funding given will determine the model and the services that he wishes to provide, or will he go to the Council of Ministers and say: "These are the services I wish to provide, this is how much they will cost, and this is how much money I will need"? Which of those 2 is the scenario we are talking about?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I will try and clarify my situation. There is an ongoing discussion about standard funding for the health service, and that is what it would have normally been had I not made this additional suggestion. What I am suggesting here is that we put together a fund of additional monies for growing the economy. I consider the health service to be an important part of that economy. That fund would be available for the projects that are put forward and approved in that initial stage, subject to those business cases being accepted.

5.8.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

I think the Minister is conflating 2 different issues. We are not talking about growing the economy here, we are talking about health funding. So would the Minister specifically comment on - he mentioned a cancer unit in Jersey in the future - could he clarify what his vision is for cancer treatment in Jersey and what that would comprise of? For example, would it have radiotherapy on-Island? Would it have chemotherapy? Would he still be envisaging for people to travel? What would the cost model be for that? Is it funded? Is it something that is supported by the Council of Ministers?

The Bailiff:

Well, Deputy, the question is about additional funding and not the detail of cancer services.

Deputy M. Tadier:

What I am trying to do is interrogate something the Minister said in his initial question answer, and I am using that as an example. I would like to know about the components. I do not know if the Minister wants to sit down while I am talking. The question is all of these components which he has either referred to now in his initial answer, are they predicated on the fact that they will be funded fully in the Budget? That is what we are trying to get to the bottom of.

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Forgive me, but I do not think I am conflating anything at all. I think having a really good health service, if we are going to attract people to come and live here and work here and invest here, I think we need a first-class health service. We do not have to have a first-class health service; we can have one that is OK and we can just carry on as we are and deliver that. We can deliver an average health service. But what I am suggesting is that if we want to grow the economy, health is an important part of that and we should put more effort into making it better. Yes, a cancer centre is part of that process. We have only just come out of an election, so I have been working with all of the various people that are putting this together, and we are at an early stage. As I said, discussions are ongoing and I am very happy to report to the Assembly how those discussions progress as we go. I do not have all the answers as a finished proposal at this point in time because I simply have not had enough time to work on them. But I make absolutely no apology for the work that I am doing or the suggestions I am making.

5.8.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Subject to another ITV article, it has highlighted that nearly 2,500 people are waiting for elective surgeries and nearly 10,000 people were waiting for diagnostic tests. If the Minister is not being proactive in requesting additional funding, how does he anticipate reducing these waiting times?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I will simply answer that by saying I do not think there can be a better demonstration of me being proactive than to be saying I want more money for the health service.

5.8.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:

But does the Minister not realise that this then has to be requested through the Budget process and that is what we are trying to get answers on?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Of course I accept that, that is why I introduced it as part of the Budget discussions.

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

We have been told, as an Assembly, that the Budget will be lodged within 3 weeks. Does the Minister feel that he will be ready and his proposals will be part of that within 3 weeks?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I think the best thing I can say there is that I certainly hope so.

5.8.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

If he is not able to, does the Minister have alternative ideas of how to ensure that there will be additional funding for Health?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I think I will have to cross that bridge when I come to it. I cannot think of any off-hand, but I shall do my best in the coming 3 weeks to make sure that we secure as much money for Health as we possibly can.

5.8.8 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

In the news item, the Minister for Health and Social Services said that the waiting times were currently completely unacceptable. Given, as Deputy Jeune has rightly pointed out, we are a matter of weeks away from the Budget being lodged, what is the process that the Minister for Health and Social Services is following? Has the Treasury given the Minister for Health and Social Services a process in order to request the amount of money that he needs? Why is there not a business case that has been produced at this point in time?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I am sorry, but I find this is just a bit of a nonsense. We have only just come out of an election. There is an awful lot of work going on. I have worked as much as I can throughout the summer to put as much forward as I can. I have put a lot of effort into the proposal that I have put to the Council of Ministers. I simply cannot do any more than I am doing, and if that is not good enough there is not much else I can say.

5.8.9 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I do not think the Minister answered my question. I asked what process the Treasury had asked him to go through.

The Bailiff:

Yes, what process have you been asked to go through by the Treasury in relation to this additional funding? That is the question you have been asked.

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I have not been asked to go through any process. I have put a proposal forward to the Council of Ministers and it is under discussion. Nobody has told me that there is any other process required for that to happen, and it has been happening, so I am ... perhaps the Deputy can tell me what she thinks I should be doing that I am not doing.

[11:00]

5.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the development of adult safeguarding legislation (OQ.76/2026).

Will the Minister advise the Government's position with regard to the development of adult safeguarding legislation and, if the intention is to proceed with such legislation, when is it anticipated this will be brought before the Assembly?

Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

Unfortunately, very little progress has been made in this area to date, but work is due to recommence early next year on the development of adult emergency protection orders. This work started in late 2025, but was delayed simply because resources had to be refocused on matters related to the prescribing of ketamine, medicinal cannabis and alongside advertising of medicines. The proposed emergency protection orders legislation, which will allow for relevant professionals to enter premises to conduct welfare assessments on adults suspected of being at risk of abuse or neglect, will also bring forward a number of statutory safeguarding duties on services, including a duty to operate, to carry out enquiries, to share information and to report safeguarding concerns. I hope that helps.

5.9.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for his answer. It is a shame that the Assembly was told in March 2025 that adult emergency protection orders would be prioritised and 18 months' later we hear that it has not been prioritised. There is of course a 2-stage approach that the Minister had set out back then. Can the Minister confirm what specific timetable related to the wider provision assessments for vulnerable adults that were supposed to follow these emergency protection orders and when that will be done?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Certainly. On this one I cannot say more than that work will commence again early next year. I shall try and produce a timetable for completion; I do not have that with me. I would need to consider that very carefully because I do not want to make promises here that we cannot stick to. I will say that we have got real resource problems in this area and we have had to move on to other things that have had a higher priority. That is very unfortunate but we will be back on to that early in the new year.

5.9.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Just to pick up on the legislation itself, can the Minister confirm whether any instruction has been given to include in adult safeguarding about self-neglect?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I can make that enquiry but at this point in time I would not know.

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

If and when this legislation is produced, are the services that would pair with that legislation up to scratch? Do they have enough funding and is that something the Minister will ensure happens alongside the development of any legislation?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

As I say, this is going to be some time away but I am very happy to take that point on board and ensure that that is the case. Thank you.

5.9.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Endorsing what Deputy Doublet said about the fact that this legislation is coming very late - we heard about it in 2024 and it is still not coming - what assurance can the Minister give that adults at risk in Jersey are not left relying solely on the Capacity and Self-Determination (Jersey) Law 2016 or the Mental Health (Jersey) Law 2016 because these are not designated as safeguarding frameworks? Could the Minister assure us that there is a risk assessment being done and that there is support there for adults at risk to be within the safeguarding framework rather than those laws that are inadequate?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Well I can confirm that we will make every effort that we possibly can but I cannot bring that legislation forward any faster than we are doing, but we will do our best in the meantime.

5.10 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding legislation for a scheme of mandatory post-release probation supervision (OQ.77/2026).

Further to Written Question 351/2025 regarding a scheme of mandatory post-release probation supervision first recommended in 2017, will the Minister provide an update on the progress of legislation, which was awaiting drafting capacity in 2025, and advise when this legislation will be brought forward?

Senator H.M. Miles (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

Development work on a system of post-custodial supervision has continued since my predecessor answered that question in September last year. There has been continuing engagement with the Law Officers' Department and the Legislative Drafting Office to ensure that the work can be progressed as soon as drafting capacity is allocated. I expect that we will be able to deliver this legislation in 2027 barring any unforeseen issues.

5.10.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for her answer and a clear date in 2027. Of course, finalising drafting instructions and bringing the law forward does not cover the delivery of mandatory post-release supervision in practice. Could the Minister confirm whether she intends to bid for funding for implementation for the next Budget or the 2028 Budget?

Senator H.M. Miles:

I thank the Deputy for the question. Yes, as was mentioned in the previous question, this legislation will not be brought forward before sufficient resources are allocated to the Probation Service to perform the function.

5.11 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding the materials dredged from St. Aubin's Harbour and deposited on the foreshore between St. Aubin's Fort and the St. Aubin's Yacht Club (OQ. 78/2026).

Will the Minister advise what concerns, if any, have been raised with her regarding the materials dredged from St. Aubin's Harbour and deposited on the foreshore between St. Aubin's Fort and the St. Aubin's Yacht Club?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):

I thank the Deputy for the question. I note that, having been copied into the letter on the issue, you will be aware, as I am, of the concerns raised on behalf of 24 residents. For the benefit of the Assembly the issues raised to me, Infrastructure and Environment Officers and Ports of Jersey focus on the deposit of material dredged from St. Aubin's Harbour to the foreshore by contractors on behalf of Ports of Jersey. The letter raises concerns of impacts on protected habitats, wildlife and public safety. The deposition of spoil dredged from the harbour for navigation was deposited under a Food and Environmental Protection Act licence issued by my department. This has been a regular practice for many years that has not raised issues in the past. On this occasion it is because it was identified that the normal place of depositing the spoil that was used in previous years had the potential of detrimental impact on the environment. Where they deposited it in the past the seagrass was flourishing; therefore, another site had to be used. I have asked our Marine Resources officer to review the matter alongside colleagues from Ports of Jersey. Officers will look to meet with the complainants in the coming days and review the situation before reporting back to me so a course of action can be decided.

5.11.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

If I can thank the Minister initially for taking the matter on; I know she has been copied into the correspondence. For example, there are concerns about where the sludge, as I would call it, because it is a very clayey material, ends up, for example, on the causeway to St. Aubin's Fort and it seems to have caused issues for people wanting to cross over to that area, as well as other potential impacts on the beach there. Could I ask the Minister, when it comes to the relationship between her role and Ports of Jersey, who regulates Ports of Jersey when these kind of issues are related? Or does she believe that she and Ports of Jersey are working hand-in-glove on this?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

As I said, when the Ports want to dredge the harbour, therefore, a licence is granted by my department. It is unfortunate that on this occasion ... as I said, there have been a number of years; the licence was issued in March of 2024 and expired in May of this year. Obviously where they had been depositing the spoil in the last 2 years it had not been a problem. Unfortunately, on this particular occasion this has been identified. I think it will be important moving forward that when they are going to dredge and when they are going to deposit, there is correspondence. There are parts of the licence which will tell them that they have to notify the department when they are going to do the dredging. There are a specific amount of days as to which they are allowed to dredge and they need to notify the department. So I think, having identified this issue on this occasion, I am quite confident that my department, if a new licence is requested, that those recommendations will be put in and that moving forward this will not happen again or hopefully it should not.

5.12 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding an update in the development of the Women's Health Strategy (OQ.66/2026).

Will the Minister please provide an update on the development of the Women's Health Strategy?

Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

Could I ask the Deputy if she would be happy to let my Assistant Minister with responsibility for this area answer this question?

Connétable A. Howell of Trinity (Assistant Minister for Health and Social Services - rapporteur):

I thank the Deputy for her question. The development of the Women's Health Strategy is progressing in accordance with the commitment set out in the 2026 Government Budget. The strategy will be published by the end of the year. It will be informed by the findings of the Women's Health (Jersey) Strategic Needs Analysis published in 2024, including the voices of women and girls who participated in this J.S.N.A. (Joint Strategic Needs Assessment) process and with further insight provided by healthcare professionals, women's groups and the service users who participated in the strategy engagement event held in May 2026.

5.12.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Assistant Minister for her answer. It is good to hear that the work is progressing. I would like to understand whether funding for this strategy will be put in place in this year's budget or whether that will be in next year's budget or some kind of interim arrangement.

The Connétable of Trinity:

The purpose of the strategy is to establish priorities and identify where improvements are required across women's health services. In most cases those improvements will be funded *via* existing budgets which may require changes to the way we deliver existing services, including perhaps reallocation of resources.

5.12.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Does the Assistant Minister consider as part of the strategy-to-be the principle of believe and enquire women in the first instance?

The Connétable of Trinity:

Yes, we are engaging with women in all sectors.

5.12.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I meant that in regard to medical practitioners as in to believe and enquire more further into women's health situations rather than having to come back later and being disbelieved and potentially gaslit by professionals in these instances.

The Connétable of Trinity:

I think some professionals are very good in this area but other professionals may need perhaps to have more education and that will form part of the strategy.

5.12.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

I have had a number of conversations in the past with the Deputy about how we can see some better movement on the strategy. We spoke at the time, I suggested an action plan being developed so that we could track actions. Will the Deputy ...

The Bailiff:

Connétable or Assistant Minister.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Sorry, the Connétable. Apologies, Connétable; I did speak to her when she was a Deputy on this. Will she commit to having an action plan that can be tracked and funded as well?

The Connétable of Trinity:

I thank the Deputy for her question. We have spoken at length over the last 2½ years and we have had an action plan for women. We have not been just sitting idly by. We have improved quite a few things already within women's health. We will continue to do that because that is my priority and I make a commitment to that.

5.12.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I cannot resist this one. Has a business case been put forward for funding for the women's health strategy in this Budget?

The Connétable of Trinity:

Not as yet.

5.12.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

The Assistant Minister said: "Not as yet." Does that mean she is planning to bid for any additional funding? Could she also address the issue of primary care, as in, the U.K. women's health hubs have been rolled out into all areas of England. We do have an excellent women's health hub in Jersey but it is of course only accessible to those who can afford to pay. Is that something that is being considered as part of this work?

The Connétable of Trinity:

We do have another very good women's health hub at Enid Quenault which is doing excellent work in fertility, assisted reproduction, in helping people who had lots of miscarriages. We are just setting

up a new P.M.O.S. (Polyendocrine Metabolic Ovarian Syndrome) Clinic, so we do have a health hub where patients can go at the moment to receive care.

5.13 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Housing regarding the needs of pet-owning tenants when designing and managing high-density social housing (OQ. 75/2026).

Will the Minister advise what consideration, if any, is given to the needs of pet-owning tenants when designing and managing high-density social housing and whether, in his assessment, Andium Homes tenants have reasonable options to keep pets safely when they do not have access to private outdoor space?

[11:15]

Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (The Minister for Housing):

I thank the Connétable for her question. The primary purpose of social housing is to provide safe, affordable homes for Islanders in housing need. Different developers provide different forms of outdoor space and inevitably not every home will have a private garden. What is important is that an appropriate outdoor amenity is provided and that the limited land available for housing is used effectively having regard to building by-law and planning requirements. Andium Homes and the Housing Trust permit tenants to keep pets in accordance with their tenancy agreements but it remains for tenants to satisfy themselves the property is suitable for the type of pet they wish to keep.

5.13.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I am sure the Minister is aware that this question came following Andium's decision. What considerations were given to tenants who had a pet according to their tenancy agreement and the ban on using balconies was introduced in the middle of their agreement? What solutions were offered for the tenants?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

To be clear, this does not ban pets from patios, from balconies. What it does is it asks tenants who have built structures on their balconies to remove them, primarily because in most cases they are a fire risk. Tenants can keep pets as long as they do not cause a nuisance to other tenants. They can keep those pets on their balconies but enclosing that balcony to prevent the pet from absconding is not permissible. Those tenants have been contacted and they have been asked to remove those structures. Fortunately, it is only a very small number of tenants, but Andium will work with those people to come to a satisfactory outcome.

5.13.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Has the Minister assured himself, and has he seen the correspondence that has been sent out, to make sure that the correspondence is not what one might call high-handed and that it treats tenants with due courtesy? Has he also given the matter consideration in regard to the right to tenants' enjoyment of their own homes and their properties as to what they can do reasonably and not be treated like children?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Deputy for the question. I think I come at this from firstly the viewpoint that pets are good for tenants' health and wellbeing. We appreciate that people have a right to keep pets and there is no interference with that right. In fact, Andium policy allows their tenants to keep pets. As regards the correspondence, I guess when someone is receiving news that they do not particularly want to hear, it is always difficult to frame it in appropriate language, but I do not think the correspondence was particularly high-handed. I think it was factual and I think it communicated the message

strongly. Because primarily at the back of this we do have a fire risk and if we do not take appropriate action and a tragedy occurs, then obviously that would be the much worse outcome than we are currently experiencing.

5.13.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

I take the Minister's point. He did not clarify whether he had read the correspondence. I am not sure if he wants to do that but could he make sure in future that it applies to all of Andium correspondence, that the phrasing that is used in letters can either be alarmist or it can be helpful? I have often had complaints, naturally because I think people tend to contact you when they want to complain, that they sometimes receive wording that could be more humane.

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, I have seen the correspondence, and we could always do better. If there are complaints about the way that was communicated, of course we can review that. I thought the communication was appropriate and factual, as I have already stated.

5.13.4 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Will the Minister confirm that the tenants affected by this requirement have been dealt with on an individual basis where removing an enclosure could make it unsafe for an existing pet to use the balcony and a solution will be found jointly between Andium and the tenant?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Connétable for that question. Yes, indeed, Andium will work with tenants to find appropriate solutions. Where there are genuine concerns about the safety of a pet, they will do all they can, always having regard for the fact that, where structures are inappropriate and are causing a fire risk, they will need to be removed. So, yes, within the bounds of that we will work with tenants as best we can.

5.14 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding senior members of staff leaving employment where due process had not been followed (OQ.68/2026).

Will the chair advise whether the States Employment Board is aware of any instances since the elections of June 2026 of senior members of staff leaving employment where due process has not been followed or where political pressure has been applied?

Senator L.J. Farnham (Chair of the States Employment Board):

Deputy Coles has kindly agreed to allow the vice-chair to answer the question. Thank you.

Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (Vice-Chair of the States Employment Board - rapporteur):

I thank the Deputy for that question. 2 senior public servants have left the Government of Jersey since the election. Their departures were part of organisational change arrangements that were supported by business cases approved by the States Employment Board. Due process was followed throughout in accordance with the Government's policies and procedures. The relevant policies and procedures include: organisational change, voluntary redundancy, compulsory redundancy. All employment policies, procedures and codes of practice are approved by the States Employment Board.

5.14.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Can the vice-chair of the Employment Board confirm whether any special payments have been made to any of these senior members of staff that are leaving and whether these will appear in the States annual accounts?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I will not comment on individual employment matters but if they are they will be duly reported in the proper manner.

Deputy T.A. Coles:

I did not ask for an individual, I just said in broad terms.

The Bailiff:

What do you say you need to know that you are not being answered?

Deputy T.A. Coles:

Whether any special payments had been made. This was a broad term rather than asking for an individual's case.

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

We are talking about 2 particular individuals and I will not comment on those 2 particular individuals. More broadly, people leave on different terms and it depends whether it is a compulsory redundancy or voluntary redundancy, but those sums are reported in accounts.

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

The vice-chair mentioned business cases. At what point were those made available to S.E.B. (States Employment Board)?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Deputy for that question. As part of any of the processes that we have gone through for voluntary or compulsory redundancy, those are reported to the States Employment Board at the earliest opportunity. We gather that information and we look at that evidence before making the decision during the relevant States Employment Board meeting which are conducted usually on a monthly basis.

5.14.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

What was the time that elapsed between viewing those reports and the individuals leaving employment?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Off the top of my head I cannot remember. Do not forget, this process was started in the previous Government so it would have been a number of months ago.

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

Given the sudden departure of the senior level directors, can the vice-chair outline what support has been provided to affected staff, what assessment has been made of staff morale following the exit and whether he is satisfied that the departures were handled appropriately?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

The Employee Assistance Programme is always open to any employee, whether that is the individual themselves or their surrounding team, to guide them through any period of transition and change. In any of these situations those individuals are always reached out to to make sure that they are properly and appropriately supported.

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Also, could he just answer the end of the question which was, does he believe that the departures were handled appropriately before I ask my supplementary?

The Bailiff:

I think he did answer that but what do you say?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, I would say they were handled appropriately and in accordance with the States Employment Board policies and procedures.

5.14.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Could he confirm if an exit interview was done, or an independent review of how the departures were handled took place?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I have not seen an exit interview but any employee who leaves service is offered an exit interview and that can be even done remotely if the individual does not want to do it face to face. They can highlight any good and bad that they wish to in that process. I think it is a really important part of the employment process that we hear from people when they leave and hear of their good and bad experiences because that is how we make more positive changes that can positively affect the lives of our other employees.

5.14.6 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

In his answers, the vice-chair has talked about organisational change. A period of consultancy usually comes before such organisational changes. Can the vice-chair confirm that such a period of consultancy did take place and it took place in accordance with the organisational change policy?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, as I stated earlier, this process started in the previous Government and it has been done with due regard to all the correct ways of doing these things, as difficult and unpleasant as they can be.

5.14.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Can the vice-chair confirm that he has read and understands all of the policies that he has referred to within his answers today?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Each individual policy I cannot say that I have absolutely gone through line by line but I am aware that everything is done in accordance with those policies. I am assured by our Chief People Officer that that is the case and I do take her word for that.

5.14.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The Minister confirmed in his initial answer that 2 senior members of staff have left States Employment. Would he confirm whether or not it is coincidental that the departments they worked for both have new Ministers come into the Assembly who have been elected and stood on a platform of deregulation and that we now see these 2 resignations, on the face of it? Could he confirm they are political sackings that we are seeing here by the Ministers of those departments?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

No, these are processes that were started long before the election. We were having discussions on the shape of government long before the relevant Ministers got into post.

5.14.9 Deputy M. Tadier:

So when he says that the discussions were taking place, were they specifically being taking place around these 2 individuals or is he talking in generic terms?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I am talking in generic terms.

5.14.10 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Can the vice-chair of the Employment Board confirm that the Government has not lost anybody or is not - I am trying to think about how to phrase this properly - around its statutory obligations and duties the Government has not left itself open and exposed to not complying with its statutory duties?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Again, as far as I am concerned from a governance point of view, everything was done in accordance with the proper policies and procedures, proper bargaining and proper process throughout and with final follow-up exit interviews should those individuals so desire to undertake that interview.

5.15 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Social Security regarding Government policy on the minimum wage (OQ.70/2026).

Will the Minister advise whether it remains Government policy to continue the transition towards a minimum wage set at two-thirds of median earnings, and explain what assurances she can give to low-paid workers that the Government will not seek to reverse the work undertaken during the previous term to increase the minimum wage?

Senator M.E. Millar (The Minister for Social Security):

I thank the Deputy for her question. As a previous Minister for Social Security, she will know that the current minimum wage rate of £13.59 per hour achieved the target of a minimum wage set at two-thirds of median earnings in April this year. Members will also be aware that following a period where the previous Minister set the minimum wage rate, we have now returned to the normal statutory process whereby the Employment Forum will run a public consultation and make a recommendation as to what the minimum wage rate should be for next year. Following significant public interest in the matter, the Employment Forum has recently extended its consultation into the minimum wage for 2027 for a further 2 weeks into the middle of this month.

[11:30]

The Forum will present its report and recommendation to me towards the end of September. I would encourage any employer or employees who have a view to participate in this consultation so that the Forum are able to report with the benefit of a full range of views. The Forum will provide its report based on this established framework and I will carefully consider their recommendations when I receive them. No decision about the minimum wage will be made before receipt and review of the Forum's report. Thank you.

5.15.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

We were quite clearly on a pathway towards meeting a States Assembly decision but we had not quite met it. In order to make the rises more affordable for businesses in addition to the Better Business Support Package, we had indeed put in a year's lag which meant that we never met the two-thirds of median wage. Would the Minister consider taking that lag out so that we could meet two-thirds of the median wage and the commitment made by the Assembly?

Senator M.E. Millar:

As I say, much depends on the report and recommendation of the Employment Forum. However, for the benefit of new Members, I will quote the exact commitment made by the Assembly in 2021.

This was: “To set the objective of raising the minimum wage to two-thirds of median earnings by the end of 2024 subject to consideration of economic conditions and the impact on competitiveness and employment of the low-paid in Jersey.” The commitment was not quite as blunt as the Deputy suggests: “The C.S.P. (Common Strategic Policy) will be published in the coming weeks setting out Government’s priorities and Ministers have already made it clear that these priorities will include growing the economy to create a prosperous Island which will include a highly-skilled and well-paid workforce.” Thank you.

5.15.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

What was the Minister’s reaction to comments made by her fellow Minister, the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, with regard to seeking to abolish the minimum wage, in particular on the implications this might have for her department and the payments that might be necessary to low-paid workers if they were paid even less than they currently are?

Senator M.E. Millar:

As he has confirmed, I do not believe the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development is suggesting abolishing the minimum wage, he was simply discussing its impact on inflation.

5.15.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

The question still stands. I was not asking about what he said, I was asking about the reaction to it. Would the Minister give her reaction to what he said?

Senator M.E. Millar:

I am not entirely sure what the Deputy is getting at, but I come back to the Employment Forum will make a report, I will make my decision based on the report. My discussion with the Minister made it clear that I can make no decision until the Employment Forum has reported. We will consider what that report says and make the decision based on the Employment Forum recommendation. I think what the Deputy is suggesting is that if the minimum wage was not increased or was to diminish, and there is no suggestion of those things happening at present, there could be a small impact on income support. I think it would be a very small impact given the relatively small number of people who are already on the minimum wage.

5.15.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Given that a minimum wage set below a living wage is indeed a poverty wage, what advice would the Minister give to somebody who is currently on a minimum wage and struggling to make ends meet, in particular those people who have not lived here for 5 years and cannot claim income support?

Senator M.E. Millar:

The issue that people have lived here for less than 5 years is something that we will continue to consider, but you would like to think that when people come to Jersey they are coming to take jobs that give them wages they can live. Many of the people coming to Jersey in hospitality or agriculture are provided with food and accommodation, as she is aware. If people are coming to Jersey and cannot survive, then I think they need to discuss with their employer whether they are having a wage that they can possibly survive on.

5.16 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the proportion of the budget for Children and Families spent on early intervention and prevention (OQ.73/2026).

Will the Minister state what proportion of the budget for Children and Families is currently spent on early intervention and prevention, and advise whether any investigation has been undertaken by his

department into the impact of increasing spending in this area with a view to reducing statutory interventions; and if no such work has been undertaken, will he commit to doing so?

Connétable R.P. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):

I thank the Deputy for this question. As Minister for Children and Families, I can assure the Deputy that I remain committed to ensuring early intervention approaches remain a key part of the wider service provision for children and families. I can say that it is a matter very close to my own heart and I am saddened by those young people who are in that late intervention stage who end up quite often in the area of criminality and imprisonment. As the Deputy will recall, the Assembly adopted the Children and Young People (Jersey) Law in February 2022 and this law placed an emphasis on early help and securing a team around the child which could respond to the challenges at an early stage. We were aware that early intervention in the past had been much talked about but not necessarily undertaken. The current proportion of the budget for Children and Families spent on early intervention is approximately 20 per cent of our budget, which equates to £12 million. This figure does not include the wider Government investment in early help secured through commission arrangements with organisations such as Brighter Futures, Family Nursing and Home Care and Jersey Childcare Trust, to name just a few. Taken together, they provide a comprehensive set of early interventions available to children and families in the Island. The Children's Improvement and Transformation Plan and the allocated investment remain at an early stage. The plan is scheduled to continue until 2030. As part of the plan, there is commitment to continually reviewing the impact and improvements being made and the amount being spent on early intervention services. I can confirm that that work is being done and therefore we do not have to commit to anything new.

5.16.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

I am grateful to the Minister for that response. Could he explain what evidence he has that the investment in preventative services is reducing referrals, re-referrals and entry into care?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I do not have figures on that with me but we do continually monitor these areas. Things are at a very early stage. I have to say that I do not like referring to the past but the fact is that what we see now is late intervention, or we see too much late intervention simply because the early intervention did not take place in the last decade and that really does sadden me. I am happy to provide the Deputy with further information from my officers. Thank you very much.

5.16.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

In his answer, the Minister referred to a number of other third sector organisations that help with early intervention. My understanding is that sometimes his department can refer people to those as part of the early intervention process. What kind of contract or agreement does his department have with such organisations to ensure that they can provide those services?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Those contracts are currently reviewed. I do not have details of the contracts themselves but what we are moving to is, rather than having grants to the organisations, payments for specific services, the contracts will be tailored to that to ensure that the money we give is being spent on the services that we want done by those organisations.

5.16.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Is the Minister confirming that it is the intention to move to a commissioning model with all of those organisations that he mentioned?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Certainly as many as possible. I am certainly aware of work ongoing with some of them and I think that it is important that we do not just ... in the past grants have been given. We did not necessarily pin down exactly what services that were being paid for and I think it is important that we do know that. I do not know if the Deputy minds, but I have got a statistic from the U.K. on spending which came out in June from a policy adviser to the U.K. Government, and I think this is quite interesting. They do not have the figure for early intervention but they know that 82 per cent of the budget is being spent on late intervention. When you think that leaves just 18 per cent for all the rest of their services, I think that we are doing significantly better than that.

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

One of the services that the Minister mentioned in his previous answer was Brighter Futures who I agree do an amazing job with the preventative work that they do. I note that earlier this year their C.E.O. (chief executive officer) I believe made a statement to the media that the charity was at risk of not being able to support vulnerable families because costs were soaring. Could the Minister - he was the Minister at that time also - outline what he has done to support that charity since that statement was made?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I think we go back to looking at commission services and we are working with Brighter Futures. I am due a briefing from my officers on the work that they have been undertaking with looking particularly at that charity. At this point I cannot provide any further information but I think we could provide the Deputy with an update fairly soon.

5.16.5 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I will slightly rephrase the question. That statement was made by Brighter Futures in April this year. What has changed between April and now in regard to how Government is interacting with that charity or supporting or commissioning them?

The Bailiff:

This is slightly beyond the question, Deputy Doublet, because it is about a specific charity. So, Minister, if you cannot answer it, I understand.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I can deal with that very briefly in that I have already answered it because we are working with that organisation to look at that particular issue and the funding. Yes, they made that statement in April and certainly our officers have been working with them to see what funding we might be able to allocate to them.

5.16.6 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Could the Minister describe what assessment has been made of unmet need among those families who do not meet the threshold for statutory social care?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I think wherever possible we would be trying to help those families irrespective of where they find themselves. I have not got any definite information on that area but, once again, I am happy to provide that.

[In relation to OQ.72/2026, the Minister for Health and Social Services has provided the following written statement as referred to above.]

Statement Regarding the Signing of the New Hospital Construction Contract

Senator Tom Binet

In light of ongoing discussion concerning the signing of the construction contract for Jersey's New Hospital, I believe it is important to set out the sequence of events as they occurred and explain the factors that informed my decision-making at the time.

The following account is intended to provide a factual chronology based upon my recollection of events and the information made available, or sought by me, during that period.

Both the detail and the timing of events require careful consideration if a fair and balanced judgement is to be made of the actions taken, the decisions reached, and the processes involved.

I believe the following account will assist in that regard.

Thursday 28 May

I attended a planned meeting at Mulcaster House, together with the New Hospital Project Director, to meet senior representatives of the contractor, with the intention of concluding the final points of negotiation and proceeding to the signing of the construction contract.

As the flight carrying the contractor's representative had been delayed, there was an opportunity for discussion before the meeting commenced.

During that period, I was informed by the Project Director that she had recently received a copy of a letter dated 21 May, sent by the Chief Executive of the States of Jersey to the Chief Officer for Health.

Apparently, it explained that the contract should not be signed until further due diligence had been undertaken, with completion anticipated some two weeks after the forthcoming election.

As the letter had neither been sent to me nor otherwise brought to my attention, I became aware of its existence only when the Project Director informed me of it immediately prior to the arrival of the contractor's delegation.

I did have access to the letter sometime later. It concluded as follows:

"I appreciate additional work and potential delay may not be welcomed by some Ministers. That may be circumvented by a letter of instruction to me. I hope however that all parties will see the wisdom of making this decision in a way that neither the process or outcome can be questioned after the fact.

In the meantime, I shall work with the Chief Internal Auditor to confirm the scope for the review and timeline to complete that review."

**It is noteworthy that the scope of the proposed review had not yet been established as of 21 May.*

The information presented to me whilst waiting for the arrival of the contractor's delegation presented a significant and unexpected dilemma.

Throughout discussions with the contractor, one of its principal concerns had been the prospect of entering an election period without a signed contract, given the uncertainty that naturally accompanies such periods. I had consistently sought to reassure the contractor that every effort would be made to maintain the agreed programme and avoid unnecessary delay.

There were also a number of practical considerations. By that stage, the short-term contract under which approximately 100 contractor employees had been undertaking preparatory work had already concluded in anticipation of the main contract being signed, and no fallback arrangement was in place.

More importantly, I was conscious of the possibility that the contractor might decide to withdraw from the project altogether if signing was deferred indefinitely pending a future decision that could neither be clearly timed nor guaranteed.

Such a development would have presented significant commercial and strategic risks to the project. I was also concerned that, in such circumstances, delay or withdrawal could potentially expose Jersey to financial or legal risk.

This was particularly concerning given the increasing challenges associated with maintaining the existing hospital estate in an acceptable condition.

What I therefore had to consider was whether I should advise the contractor that the contract would not be signed as planned and that a decision on whether to proceed might be taken at some unspecified point in the future, potentially after a new Council of Ministers had been selected and established following the election, with no certainty as to the eventual outcome.

Following the arrival of the Chief Officer for Health and the Chief Officer for Infrastructure, I suggested a short adjournment in order to discuss the position privately with them and the Project Director.

The purpose of that discussion was to determine an appropriate way forward in light of the information that had just come to my attention.

My recollection is that, during that discussion, it was agreed that I could issue a Ministerial Instruction which would enable the contract to proceed as planned; also that the relevant process was explained to me and that no concerns were raised regarding the proposed approach.

We subsequently returned to the meeting, concluded negotiations and reached final agreement with the contractor.

It was recognised that the matters decided at this final meeting remained to be incorporated into the contract documentation and, accordingly, the intention was to proceed to signing during the early part of the following week once this work had been completed.

Friday 29 May to Monday 1 June

As requested, on 29 May I telephoned the Chief Executive, who was off-island at the time, in order to explain that a decision had been taken to issue a Ministerial Instruction to ensure the signing of the contract as originally intended.

During that conversation, the issue of the ongoing assurance and due diligence work was discussed. However, my understanding from that discussion was that, should Ministers decide that the project ought to proceed, the issuing of a Ministerial Instruction was an available and proper mechanism through which that could be achieved.

I was further advised that the necessary documentation would be prepared by the Chief Officer for Health, reviewed through the appropriate channels and forwarded to me for consideration and issue during the early part of the following week.

The weekend then passed, as did Monday 1 June, without any indication to me that this position had changed in any material way. The only updates received related to the final drafting of the contract and the preparation of the Ministerial Instruction, both of which were said to be taking a little longer than originally anticipated.

Tuesday 2 June

At 13:56 on Tuesday 2 June, and somewhat unexpectedly, I received an email from the Treasury Minister advising, amongst other matters, that full assurance work should be completed, but could not be completed ahead of the proposed contract signing scheduled for the following day.

Given my discussions with senior officials during the preceding week, this represented a development that I had not anticipated.

Nevertheless, I responded approximately twenty minutes later, indicating that I intended to discuss the matter further with both the Chief Minister and the Chief Executive at the earliest opportunity.

Wednesday 3 June

Following discussions with the Chief Minister, and having considered the position carefully, I emailed the Treasury Minister at 10:59 to confirm my view that the project should continue to proceed as previously planned.

At 12:02 that same day, I received an email from the Chief Officer for Health containing the documentation that I had previously been advised would be prepared.

This included a formally drafted email for transmission to the Chief Executive explaining my intention to issue a Letter of Instruction, together with a draft of the Letter of Instruction itself addressed to the Chief Officer.

At that time I was attending one of several election hustings taking place during the campaign period, hosted at BBC Radio Jersey.

Having reviewed the documentation and satisfied myself that it reflected the process previously discussed, I requested my Private Secretary at approximately 12:40 to send both documents in the form provided, thereby progressing the Ministerial Instruction process.

Later that afternoon, at 15:44, I received an email from the Chief Executive acknowledging receipt of my communication.

Unexpectedly, that email also advised that it would be preferable for the assurance work to be concluded before the contract was signed.

A short time later, at 16:23, I received an email from the Chief Minister encouraging me to delay the signing until the due diligence process had been completed.

It is important to note that, by that stage, the Letter of Instruction had already been issued through the official process and in accordance with the documentation that had been prepared and provided for that purpose.

Thursday 4 June

During the course of the morning of 4 June, I opened email correspondence, with an accompanying letter attached, from the Comptroller and Auditor General.

The detailed letter contained requests for a significant volume of historical information relating to my decision-making and sought an urgent response.

At this stage it was evident that the atmosphere surrounding the project had altered considerably from that which had existed only a week earlier.

Matters that had previously appeared relatively straightforward and uncontentious were now attracting a substantially greater degree of scrutiny and concern.

In the space of little more than twenty-four hours, considerable pressure was being applied for the signing process to be halted pending completion of the additional assurance work several weeks after the election.

At the same time, I was in the final and busiest week of a Senatorial election campaign whilst continuing to discharge my ministerial responsibilities for Health and Social Services.

Against that background, I concluded that before any further decisions were taken it was essential to obtain immediate formal advice regarding the most appropriate course of action.

Rather than suspend the entire process pending a detailed written response to the Comptroller and Auditor General, I arranged an urgent meeting with the appropriate advisors and the New Hospital Project Director in order to ensure that any further action taken was fully consistent with my ministerial responsibilities.

Following that discussion, a potential solution was identified.

Subject to agreement by the contractor, a mechanism could be incorporated which would allow the contract to be signed whilst also preserving a period during which the outstanding assurance and due diligence work could be completed.

The arrangement would have to provide an option to withdraw, should the outcome of that work make such a course necessary, albeit subject to contractual compensation should that eventuality arise.

Immediately afterwards, through the offices of the Chief Minister, I convened a short-notice meeting of the Council of Ministers for 4:00pm.

At that meeting, I explained the sequence of events that had taken place during the preceding week and outlined the contractual mechanism that had been developed to address the issues that had emerged.

Following discussion, it was accepted that the proposed approach represented an appropriate means of reconciling the ongoing assurance process with the commitments already in place.

I was given the support of the Council of Ministers to return to the contractor and establish whether it would be willing to proceed on that basis.

In addition, I received the Council's support to proceed with the signing of the contract in the event that the contractor declined the proposed mechanism.

Friday 5 June

On the morning of 5 June, the Project Director and I met with representatives of the contractor by Teams to discuss the revised contractual arrangements.

Agreement was reached in principle, and the necessary drafting work was completed during the course of the morning.

The construction contract was subsequently signed at approximately 1:00pm by the Minister for Infrastructure and me, acting in my capacity as Minister for Health and Social Services.

As a consequence of the revised contractual arrangements that had, by then, been agreed and incorporated into the contract, the previously proposed Letter of Instruction was no longer required.

Conclusion

The decision to proceed with the signing of the New Hospital construction contract was not taken lightly, nor was it taken in isolation.

Throughout the period in question, I sought advice and guidance from senior officials, ministerial colleagues and ultimately the Council of Ministers, whilst also taking account of the significant strategic, operational and commercial implications that any further delay, or contractor withdrawal, might have had for the project.

The challenges involved in delivering a new hospital for Jersey are well known and have spanned many years, administrations and approaches.

Against that background, my objective throughout was to act in what I believed to be the best interests of the Island whilst ensuring that proper consideration was given both to matters of assurance and governance and to the practical realities facing the project.

These decisions were reached in good faith, on the basis of the information available to me at the time, and with the single aim of securing the delivery of a new hospital for the people of Jersey.

[The Minister for the Environment provided the following response to Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter in OQ.64/2026.]

The [National] Park is governed by an honorary Board of Directors comprising representatives from key organisations and interests in Jersey. These have included:

- National Trust for Jersey
- Jersey Heritage
- Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society
- Marine conservation representatives
- Trees for Life
- Independent landowners and environmental specialists.

The Board is led by an Honorary Chairperson.

Government representatives from Natural Environment and Economy attend meetings as advisers and are non-voting members

Meetings are held every quarter with its activities coordinated and monitored through an annual business plan.

The organisation has a very small operational structure, with limited staff support. Much of its work is delivered through partnerships, volunteers, contracted support, and collaboration with other organisations.

The Park receives grant funding from the Government of Jersey and this is accounted for through usual Government financial processes.

Policy protection for the Park is provided through the Island Plan, while planning decisions remain with the Government rather than the Park itself.

6. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Treasury and Resources

The Bailiff:

That completes that period of questions. We now move to questions without notice and the first period of questions is for the Minister for Treasury and Resources. The first question is from Deputy Feltham, then Deputy Coles, then Deputy Jeune. Deputy Feltham.

6.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

Given the Minister for Health and Social Services' answer to my previous question around the Budget, could the Minister for Treasury and Resources give the Assembly confidence that a clear process has been articulated to Ministers so we know that the Budget will be fully formed when it is presented in the coming weeks?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):

Yes, as the Deputy and Members of the Assembly would expect, there is a set process for Budget and that is being followed as we go through the process for the Budget that is due to be lodged at the end of this very month and then will be scrutinised thereafter. So, yes, there is a set process; departments know exactly what that process is. Indeed, we at Treasury have laid out very clearly the position with regard to growth bids. We are seeking to have a Budget that is broadly neutral for 2027 and departments are being advised for that.

6.1.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Could the Minister for Treasury and Resources articulate what the process is for growth bids and, if this is to be a cost-neutral Budget, what the process is to understand what is going to stop being done?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Departments have been made clear that we were not expecting growth bids. In reality, we have had a substantial amount of growth bids received.

[11:45]

Those are being assessed at the moment for those that are deemed to be of a serious or urgent nature and dialogue with the departments will continue through the rest of the process until the Budget is launched. Members will obviously not expect me to give too much detail at this stage prior to the actual lodging of the Budget but the process is robust.

6.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Is the Minister aware that a certain bracket of taxpayer pays more tax in Jersey than they would in the U.K. or even Guernsey?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Yes, I am.

6.2.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Does the Minister consider that this might have an impact on Jersey's recruitment and retention of key workers and also may be a reason why people are leaving Jersey?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

In reality, the section that the Deputy is referring to is relatively narrow but nevertheless should not be overlooked. We do take it very seriously and I think we are looking carefully at ways in which that can be balanced. It is largely the income range between around about £45,000 to £58,000 broadly speaking, so it is quite narrow but nevertheless important. The Deputy makes a good point, we are aware of it and we are looking at it.

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

It follows on from Deputy Feltham's question that answered my first question I would have asked about the cost-neutral Budget. If Ministers are not prepared to accept a cost-neutral Budget, what tools does the Minister for Treasury and Resources have to make them accept it?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

That is a good question. The rules have changed since I was last in this role as a result of the 2019 Public Finances Law, which effectively means that the Minister for Treasury and Resources and Treasurer have slightly less authority than perhaps was the case when I previously delivered Budgets. It is ultimately a matter for the Council of Ministers to decide, and that is where the final decisions will be made.

6.3.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for answering that question. It is good for the Assembly to understand that his aim is for a cost-neutral Budget. Would the Minister come to the Assembly ahead of that lodging if they were not able to meet that cost-neutral Budget for the Assembly to understand that?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

No, that would not be the normal process. We would lodge the Budget, then there is a period for it to be scrutinised. I think that scrutiny process through the official Scrutiny Panel is the appropriate course. Of course all Members can ask whichever questions they wish, either directly at myself, the department or through this Assembly, which I think is the appropriate process.

6.4 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:

Where a Minister authorises a major financial commitment before the Government-established assurance processes and mechanisms have been completed, who does the Minister believe ultimately carries responsibility for the financial risks accepted by the Government and the taxpayer?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I think the Deputy has highlighted the answer in the end of her question, which is ultimately the taxpayer is the group that takes on any burden that should result from a contract that is a poor or failed contract. That aside, it would be the accounting officer of the relevant department and ultimately the Chief Executive of the States, I suppose.

6.4.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Can the Minister explain then how Treasury provide assurance to the Assembly that the £710 million commitment represents value for money if the assurance processes have not been completed before the contract was signed?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Well this matter, as Members are well aware, is before my time but nevertheless we have heard earlier answers to this question from the Chief Minister. I think that gives all the facts that are particularly relevant as far as this is concerned. Treasury was involved. Treasury officials were involved in the process and after the contract was signed, as I understand it, there was a cooling-off period of some 2 weeks which allowed Treasury officials to double-check and complete the process that they had started and ultimately completed.

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

On the day that we elected the Minister as Minister for Treasury and Resources, he gave a very sympathetic response to my question about child poverty. He mentioned addressing this issue in a collaborative way with other Ministers. I would like to understand what actions he has taken in this respect since that question.

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

The Deputy is right, I was sympathetic to the question that she raised. It is an important issue and I do believe we need to understand more about it. It has been raised in a number of forums and the matter is not straightforward. It does, as I think I mentioned in my previous answer, require a multi-agency response. In order to do that we need to understand the true facts and nature of the problem which we are facing. I think that work through various Ministers is in progress at the moment. I am sure we can come back to this Assembly with an update in due course.

6.5.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

What would any actions arising from this work look like in the context of a cost-neutral Budget?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

That is almost impossible to answer. There is significant funding in relevant departments already for tackling such matters. I would expect that budgets and departments allocate the funding they have available, the significant funding they have available, to the areas of most need. This clearly is an area which needs attention and there is funding available, I would expect, for dealing with it.

6.6 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:

As the Government prepares its next Budget, can the Minister confirm whether provision is being made for a properly funded long-term maintenance programme for the Jersey Opera House and whether that funding will be clearly identified in the Budget?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I cannot give the details at this precise moment. Clearly there has been significant investment in the Opera House. I think from memory, off the top of my head, it was something like £12.7 million. A fantastic job for an extraordinarily important building in the Island. Of course, we do need to make sure that it is properly maintained going forward. It is something, I am afraid, that this Assembly and Government generally has not been particularly good at in ensuring that our assets are maintained and looked after; hence, we have some which are in very poor shape. What I can say to the Deputy is, as part of the Budget process, we will certainly give due consideration to the budgets that would have responsibility in that area. I would also say that the Arts, Culture and Heritage budget has grown more than double, I think it is, since 2022. About £11.6 million of that is specifically for arts, so there is scope between that and infrastructure to look at the maintenance and a plan for the future.

6.6.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave:

I am glad to see that the Minister recognises the failure of previous Governments to maintain the building going forward, which is why we ended up with such an expensive and costly refurbishment programme in the first place. Given the substantial public investment already made in restoring the Opera House, does the Minister agree that failing to build adequate maintenance funding into the budget risks storing up a much larger capital cost for taxpayers in the future?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Absolutely, and I am afraid we have seen that across the whole of our estate. I see the Minister for Infrastructure nodding, not surprisingly. He is only too aware of some of the stored-up issues from not maintaining our assets properly. Catching up is more a difficulty. Clearly there are constraints within industry to manage a big programme, and also of course the funding side of it, but it is an important matter to keep in mind.

6.7 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

Can the Minister for Treasury and Resources state how the £10 million which was withheld back from the Social Security Grant during 2025 has been spent? Has this been audited and, if so, why have the findings not been published?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

That is a tricky question from the Deputy. I do not have the detail to hand. What I can say is it was supposed to be used for reducing debt and for areas like hospital expenditure. I do believe there was some revenue expenditure included in that. I do not know the detail at this precise moment, and I have asked officers because I was interested in that particular topic myself. I will get back to the Deputy to give her more detail when I have it myself.

6.7.1 Deputy B. Ward:

To add some more work for your officers, can the Minister advise the Assembly how that £10 million during 2025 was shared between businesses, especially with the small businesses, or has it just invested into large businesses? What was the result of this spend and did it improve recruitment and the engagement of apprentices in these areas?

The Bailiff:

Deputy Ward, under Standing Orders I am required to rule out of order a question without notice that requires an answer containing statistical, technical or other detailed information it would be unreasonable to expect a Minister to provide without notice. I think your question may fall foul of that Standing Order.

Deputy B. Ward:

Then I apologise.

The Bailiff:

Well do not apologise. Yes, Deputy Rebindaine.

6.8 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

I would like to know the Minister's strategy for maximising the long-term benefit of the Pillar Two tax windfall?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

My strategy would be very clear. As far as I am concerned, the Pillar Two revenues should be deployed towards paying down debt, funding the hospital and there is an element in the base case Pillar Two revenues which is also allocated towards the Time to Win competitiveness area.

6.8.1 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine:

How much reassurance can he give to those of us who want the monies ringfenced from normal Government spending that he will prevail if other States Members attempt to spend it?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I am very determined that we ring-fence the Pillar Two money and, in particular, the uplift element which at this stage is still uncertain. It is going to be limited; I would describe it as a windfall. As I have said previously, we have significant investment required in our hospital estate, particularly the new hospital and debt, and that is where that money should be focused on. I will do my very best within the powers of the office that I have in order to deliver on that because it is absolutely crucial for the Island that that money is allocated appropriately to the areas I have just mentioned.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

How long have we got left?

The Bailiff:

Well the clock is broken. [Laughter]

Deputy M. Tadier:

That is music to my ears.

The Bailiff:

I am sure it is. I think there is one minute left.

6.9 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will stick on the theme of the Opera House. I did think the Minister was conflating capital spend with revenue spend for the arts. Would he consider, given the fact that the Opera House needs, and has needed, a new sound system and a new light system so that it can put on top-range shows that match its new décor, perhaps it would be worth considering reducing the police budget in order to use that money to spend on the Opera House. Does the Minister agree?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I am not going to get involved in agreeing transfer of funds on this Assembly floor between departments. I have already stated that the Opera House maintenance, we have spent considerable amounts of money, £12.7 million, in doing a fabulous refurbishment job. It needs to be maintained going forward, so we need to find the appropriate funds in order to do that. That can form part of the process we are currently undertaking for the Budget.

7. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Housing

The Bailiff:

That brings that period of questions to an end. I now move to questions for the Minister for Housing. The first 3 questions are from Deputy Coles, then Deputy Jeune, then Deputy Gleave.

7.1 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

In his letter to the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel, the Minister says he will be progressing an evaluation of the Residential Tenancy Law. Given this law only came into effect in April, when does he first expect to see anything to review from that law?

Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour (The Minister for Housing):

As the Deputy will note, I used the word “evaluation” not “review”. It is keeping a watching brief on how the legislation is working. That is why I am meeting with organisations who have an interest, to see how it is working for them. The word is not to be confused with a review. It is an evaluation which is an ongoing process, does not particularly have an end date. It makes sure that the law is working as it was intended to.

7.1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Will the Minister confirm that he is going to set a terms of reference for this evaluation to ensure the scope creep of this evaluation does not become broader than originally anticipated to keep the focus properly on areas that he has concerns with?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I am using the word “evaluation”, you do not have a terms of reference for an evaluation. It is a watching brief on the legislation. It is not a review, it does not have a firm end date or a terms of reference, it is simply part of my ongoing work to make sure that the legislation is still appropriate for the circumstances that we find ourselves in.

[12:00]

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

In his letter to the Scrutiny Panel, the Minister said accommodation arrangements for the new hospital facilities programme are being considered with relevant stakeholders. Specifically for construction workforce building the hospital, can he confirm whether a construction contract obliges the contractor to source accommodation for its own workers or whether that responsibility falls on the Government?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

While I have a great interest on the workers who come to build the hospital being adequately and safely housed, of course that is the preserve of the Minister for Health and Social Services who is going to have overall responsibility for that workstream and particularly that piece of work. While I have an interest primarily because it is going to draw on the housing stock over that next 4 years, it will be large numbers of people coming to the Island; that is my main interest in the subject. But as regards the detail of the contracts, that will not be something that I will be getting involved in.

7.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

It was because the Minister specifically mentions the New Hospital Facilities Programme and the concern to ensure to minimise impact on the local housing market is why the question really was to ask why he brought this up in the first place in the letter. Could he confirm whether it is for the Government to find housing for the construction workers?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, ultimately, we will have to source some of that housing stock to house those workers, and that is why I have got a primary interest in it because it will affect some of the housing stock in Jersey.

7.3 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:

The Minister has identified both future-proofed accommodation and greater housing mobility as priorities. I am sure Senator Binet will be interested to know that research into extra care retirement communities in the U.K. found that residents had 38 per cent lower N.H.S. (National Health Service) costs over 12 months to comparable people living in the wider community, while unplanned hospital stays fell from around 8 to 14 days a year to just one to 2 days and frailer residents' N.H.S. costs fell by more than 50 per cent. Given Jersey's ageing population, is the Minister looking seriously at the development of genuine retirement for extra care communities here, rather than simple age-restricted housing? Is he examining successful models in the U.K. and Scandinavia?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I have no doubt that when people have particularly reduced mobility at any time in their life, but particularly towards their older age, it is really important that they reside in safe, suitable accommodation that meets their needs. The outcomes from that are far better for the individual and for the cost on the house service should things go wrong. Yes, it is not just a question of finding property or building property which is suitable in terms of the size for what people need in their advancing years but also for the adaptations that are already contained within that property, so that those people can just move into the property without having to do any further work on it if their health changes. The bigger picture here of course is it is one of the actions that may facilitate downsizing. There are people who are residing, stereotypically in the country, under-occupied and they would like to move into a smaller property that better suits their needs. But they are not doing it because properties simply are not there for them. If we facilitate those type of properties being built we will make housing mobility both up and down the market much easier for people.

7.3.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave:

It is not just about reduced mobility. Obviously that is part of it but if designed properly retirement communities can help people remain independent and fully mobile for far longer, as well as reducing the hospital use and, potentially, delaying need for any sort of care, including residential care, which would obviously help with our long-term care bill. Will he work with the Health and Social Services to assess the potential whole Government savings from developing this type of accommodation in Jersey?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I am sure there is a financial benefit to be gained but, most importantly, these type of properties, they are real communities and the residents support each other. In some circumstances there is even a caretaker. In effect, people do not then have the need to move into a care home because 90 per cent of the time their needs can be met by staying in that community. Yes, I am definitely on board with that proposal and will keep pursuing it in any way that I can.

7.4 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:

The Minister has spoken about potentially expanding the First Step scheme. Given the success of the first iteration in helping people onto the housing ladder, could the Minister please comment on whether we can expect this scheme to continue?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Deputy for the question. I would love to see a further iteration of the First Step scheme and perhaps expand it into a second step scheme. It would allow people to either be first-time buyers or people that need that extra help to become second-time buyers, also include them. Of course all of this would need a business case and it would need budgeting. Yes, I would see that as a slightly longer-term project, not going to happen this year. But I think it would be an investment in the community. As I have said before, the way that it is structured when the householder benefits over time the Government benefits. It is an investment for the Government. It is a long-term investment but it is not dead money. Because, ultimately, the money does come back to us with interest as the property increases in value.

7.4.1 Deputy L.D. Carpenter:

Could the Minister confirm whether we will see the first iteration continue sooner rather than later?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I would like to see it sooner rather than later of course but it is all down to negotiation and how the monies can be found, how it is going to shape up. It is certainly not going to happen this year but it is ongoing discussions.

7.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

Given that the work of the housing portfolio also touches on the work of other Ministers, could the Minister, as Minister for Housing, give us confidence that changes that we heard about before in terms of organisational change with regard to regulation, in particular, that was reported in the *Jersey Evening Post* over the weekend, that that will enable the legislation to be enacted properly and appropriately so that people can be assured that they will be able to make use of legislation if the homes that they are living in, their rented dwellings, are not meeting required standards?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, absolutely, there are strong links with the work that I do and the Minister for Planning and Regulation. We do work closely together and we share some of the same officers. We do have a joint intent there to making sure that people are residing in safe suitable accommodation.

7.5.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Continuing the theme with working with other Ministers, will the Minister commit to continuing the work that I, as previous Minister for Social Security, had undertaken with the previous Minister for Housing in relation to the housing of people that are harder to house and enabling Andium to buy some properties and house people where the properties that are under Andium's current ownership were not suitable for them?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Yes, indeed. I have already had early discussions with some officers. I have not yet broached it with the Minister for Social Security. But our officers are speaking to each other and I am sure we will end up with a conversation between the 2 of us. That piece of work that was started is very much continuing because certain vulnerable people definitely need to make sure that they do not fall out of the housing net.

7.6 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

Social housing rents continue to put financial strain on families. We are aware that rents can be supplemented *via* income support. Then we hear that the States received some £29 million as the shareholders' dividend. Can the Minister look into this circular event by considering social rents are determined by means-testing to ensure the renter pays no more than 30 per cent of the total household income like it used to be?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I remember the system of rent rebate and rent abatements and it was changed because it did not work well. It was changed to a system of income support. Two-thirds of Andium tenants have their rent either fully or partially covered by income support payments. You could see that as wooden dollars or circular payments. But the most important person in that equation is the tenant and it makes sure that there is no undue pressure on tenants' family budgets through the income support system which pays for their accommodation component. While we did have a system that worked differently in the past, I would not say it was a better system. I think lots of people missed out by it. What we have got now is an all-encompassing system that makes sure that people are paying the right amount of rent for their property and that they are adequately supported if their income does not demand that they cover that full payment.

7.6.1 Deputy B. Ward:

Could the Minister for Housing even give some consideration to looking at this?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I think I have already made my position clear. We can always look at systems to see if they can be improved. I think there are some additional pressures within the system that need to be resolved first.

7.7 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

When a person on the Affordable Housing Gateway list goes to the website to see how long they will be waiting, the first line they see is: "We do not know how long you will be waiting for." When they look to find more information on how long they might expect to wait, the waiting list report provides very little information. Will the Minister advise what work is being undertaken to support and improve forecasting with regards to waiting lists to ensure those on the list, especially those in urgent scenarios such as band 1, have greater predictability for when they may be able to be homed or rehomed?

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

I thank the Deputy for that question. The reality is, of course, properties become available unexpectedly. Work can take longer or less time to renovate those properties if they are handing over between tenants. It can be really difficulty to give and manage those expectations. Because if you promise someone a month or 3 weeks and then that goes out further, people are going to be even more upset. I do appreciate that for people who are in the most urgent need it is an incredibly stressful time in their lives, and I speak to those people on a regular basis. We do all that we can to make sure that band 1 in particular is prioritised and that people are kept in contact with. But it is not possible

to give people a firm date or number of weeks of when they will be housed because the picture is so changeable.

7.7.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

The provision of housing is obviously a hard thing to change overnight, but the easy access to the statistics and the information behind it is something that I think could have work. Will the Minister take this away and think further about the accessibility of statistics, including how long average periods of wait are in the respective bands, so those who are not being promised something may have a far better understanding as to what they might reasonably expect looking at past performance, accepting that is not indicative of maybe their individual circumstances?

The Bailiff:

Minister, you have got 5 seconds to answer that question.

Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Anything that can be done to make the situation cleaner and easier for would-be tenants has to be a good thing and I will obviously take that into consideration.

8. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. We now move to the third period of questions without notice. These are for the Chief Minister. The first question is from Deputy Jeune, then Deputy Carpenter and then Deputy Gleave and then Deputy Li.

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

Could the Chief Minister confirm whether it is the Government's intention to move the regulation Department and place it under the Cabinet Office?

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):

Yes.

8.1.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Thank you very much, Chief Minister, for that answer. Is the timing of this connected to the current vacancy in the Group Director of Regulation's role?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

No.

8.2 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:

Today the U.K. Government is expected to announce a ban on trade in goods and services from illegal Israeli settlements in the West Bank area of occupied Palestine. Can we expect Jersey to swiftly follow suit?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

As the Deputy rightly points out, the speculation that the U.K. will announce something today, although nothing has been announced as yet.

[12:15]

On the wider point around the U.K. reset that Foreign Secretary Miliband is likely to announce, I would just remind Members that Jersey usually aligns with U.K. foreign policy and will engage with

the relevant U.K. departments concerning the practical effects of any confirmed policy implications. It is too early to say, other than I would reiterate we usually align ourselves with U.K. foreign policy.

8.2.1 Deputy L.D. Carpenter:

Does the Chief Minister recognise the important role that Jersey can and should play, given our own history of following occupation, with showing solidarity to those suffering similar oppression around the world?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, I do absolutely understand that. I would support Jersey showing solidarity wherever it feels it is needed.

8.3 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:

While securing the future of Les Mielles may be desirable, can the Chief Minister reassure the Assembly that given the very real pressure on limited public funds and the ones that we have already just discussed about the Jersey Opera House, that the Government would not seek to fund its purchase from general taxation or any purchase, which the Minister said would be desirable and would instead prioritise alternative routes, including private donations, philanthropic support or other non-Government funding?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I made the mistake of suggesting it might be desirable for the public to own that important piece of land, while not meaning to make any intention that we should buy it, although I think that land across St. Ouen's Bay is highly valuable and should be protected. I also understand the need for leisure and particularly golf course facilities. Hopefully something can be arranged for the future where there is a blend; I think private sector has an important part to play in the provision of golf courses. I hope any new golf course owner would be open to allowing more integration with the surrounding area.

8.4 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:

Would the Chief Minister back positioning further education skills and lifelong learning as a core economic strategy in the C.S.P., recognising that upskilling and reskilling throughout the people's work lives is essential to improving our productivity and supporting the sustainable economic growth?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I do not want to give too much away from the C.S.P. because it is not agreed yet and we are still discussing it around the Council of Ministers' table. But that was a priority from the last C.S.P. and I would like to see it continued in some form and so that is under discussion.

8.4.1 Deputy V. Li:

Thank you, Chief Minister, for answering that question. Alongside the further education lifelong learning and support for our children and families, would the Minister support recognising green spaces and the community spaces as essential infrastructure that strengthens our community's well-being, social cohesion and a long-term economic prosperity?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am not sure that is a supplementary, it is a different question but I would be very pleased ...

The Bailiff:

Well, she did connect it with the first question, but I know what you mean.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I would be very pleased. I have always supported the provision of additional green space, especially in St. Helier. I think we all know that St. Helier and other aspects of the Island fall short in some areas, while it is in abundance in other parts of the Island. The short answer to that is, yes, we have some very interesting policy discussions on education and the future of the school estate coming up, based on birth rate. I think that is something we will address at the time. But I would like to see an increase of green space in urban areas.

8.5 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

Following an online petition where 5,000 to 6,000 Islanders had signed and raised the issue around the double taxation on social security payments and then, again, when one is in receipt of their old age pension, many Islanders still feel aggrieved. Will the Chief Minister commit to looking into this whole situation of double taxation?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Our tax system tends to align with many other similar jurisdictions in relation to taxation on pensions. I made a commitment before the election and during the election that we should look at this without making any promises. Because, as the Deputy knows and Members will know, the cost of doing this runs into many tens of millions of pounds at a time when the Government and the Assembly are going to be wanting to ensure we have at least a Budget which will maintain our financial spending and make sure that is kept tightly under control to make sure that Jersey has a very secure financial future. While making that point clear, I think we should revisit it. I know the Minister for Treasury and Resources and we have discussed it very briefly ... and he is asking me to sit down now, so I shall.

8.5.1 Deputy B. Ward:

I thank the Chief Minister for his response. As part of the Council of Ministers' Budget discussions, can the Chief Minister state that improvements for the older persons' benefits and pensions are being considered and, if not, why not?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, we are considering the impact of the cost of living and affordability for all Islanders as part of the Budget policy debate.

8.6 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

At a hustings in his home Parish the Deputies were challenged to come up with a radical position on a topic. With due deference to the other Deputies who were elected alongside me, we had valiant attempts to answer it but we mostly played safe. Having had a few months to mull on it, how about we make the Island duty-free once more? In one bound economic growth, alongside making Jersey better value for the visitor economy. Can the Chief Minister tell us how radical he is prepared to be?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am prepared to be extremely fiscally responsibly radical. [Laughter]

8.6.1 Deputy C.J. Rebindaine:

If the Chief Minister does not plan to be radical, how is he responding to the cry I heard in the recent election for a change of direction?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The Deputy raises an important point that is part of the thinking we have behind a number of key policies that we are developing, not least the way we help support all Islanders deal with the affordability issue but also raising the competitiveness of the Island. Deputy Gorst has launched the Time to Win competitive programme that looks at making sure our financial servicing industry is fit for the future. I know Deputy Voisin has plans to launch a similar piece of work that deals with the rest of the economy. The old saying, if we do what we have always done we get what we have always got. We do have to be prepared to be radical and make changes. Moving forward, we live in a very different world to that when a lot of these policies were developed. But I would put a health warning with that, while being radical and making changes we must not lose sight of the very fact that we must make sure we look after our own finances. Because the cost of not doing that would far outweigh any benefit that could be made from being overly radical.

8.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

Will the Chief Minister agree that the levels of poverty and people at risk of living in poverty are unacceptable on an island such as ours?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, and the Deputy knows because in the previous Government we gave this issue a great deal of thought and we started to take policy decisions that began to address it. I would like to see that direction of travel continue. That is part of the thinking behind the potential for establishing a Ministerial group or a taskforce or commission to deal with that problem. Because, if I am honest, Government in this Assembly do not have all the answers and if we did have all the answers we would find it difficult to co-ordinate them. I think we need to be working closely with the third sector and Islanders and people with lived experience or people on the front line of dealing with this. But I agree affordability is an issue leading to relative poverty in our community and must do everything we can to reverse that position.

8.7.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Will the Chief Minister commit that his Government will not take any actions that will risk more people being put into poverty or risk being in poverty?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I would very much hope not but I am not sure. I am thinking off the top of my head how we would do that. I can state categorically that is not our intention. Our intention is to reduce relative poverty suffered by some Islanders in Jersey. That is why we must work closely across the Assembly and with Scrutiny so we can make sure that our intentions are properly scrutinised and we do not end up moving in the opposite direction. Happy for that collaboration to take place. But to reiterate, that is not our intention at all.

8.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The U.K. Government, which we are told that we apparently follow when it comes to foreign policy, recognised the state of Palestine in September 2025. Does Jersey also recognise the state of Palestine and, if so, what does that mean in reality and, if not, why not?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Currently it means we are aligned with U.K. policy, as I stated previously, so that is the current position.

8.8.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Given the fact that Jersey then does recognise Palestine as a state in its own right, has the Chief Minister given any written correspondence to Palestine directly? If not, would he consider doing that

and perhaps sending an invite to one of their representatives to visit Jersey on a diplomatic mission when appropriate?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

That has been discussed and talked about previously. I have had discussions with the Minister for External Relations in the previous Government but I have not yet discussed the subject with him in this Government. I think what has happened in the last 24 hours with, potentially, U.K. announcements I think will act as a catalyst to reignite those discussions and I undertake to do that with the Minister.

8.9 Deputy B. Ward:

We see published recently that families that engaged nannies to care for their 2 to 3 year-olds can now claim for financial assistance, which of course we support. But can the Chief Minister advise how this extension of provision is to be paid for and where will the additional monies come from?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

This, I understand, is part of the 2027 Budget formulation, so we will reveal that in due course. I cannot answer that off the top of my head. The Minister for Treasury and Resources will be doing the sums on that.

8.9.1 Deputy B. Ward:

Can the Chief Minister assure the Assembly that if there are any extra costs incurred that they will not be paid for by withholding more money from the Social Security grant?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am not sure I can give any assurances on the Budget until we have agreed it and the Minister for Treasury and Resources and the team have come back with the final proposals which need to go to Council of Ministers. Having said that, I take on board the Deputy's longstanding sentiment.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Chief Minister. That concludes the period of questions.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

Deputy M. Tadier:

Sir, I know it is slightly earlier than usual but would it be an apposite moment to propose the adjournment? I know we had been sent a reminder that there is an event going on at the Pomme d'Or for Jersey Sport. If Members did want to avail themselves it might give them time to get down there. But I will leave it in the hands of the Assembly, because it is 15 valuable minutes otherwise.

The Bailiff:

There is also another ... Greffier, I am right in saying that ... perhaps event is the wrong word, is it not? There is the photograph of this Assembly, which is due to be taken at 12:45 p.m. Does that conflict with the sports event? I do not know.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Not directly, Sir, but it might give us more time to preen ourselves for the photograph.

The Bailiff:

Yes, well perhaps I will get a quick haircut in the next 6 minutes. All right. Are Members content to adjourn now until 2.15 p.m.? Yes, all right. We will adjourn until we reassemble in a moment for the photograph. If Members can please stay for that purpose.

[12:30]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:15]

PUBLIC BUSINESS

9. Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-(P.61/2026)

The Bailiff:

The first item of Public Business is the Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) Amendment Regulations lodged by the Minister for the Environment. The main respondent is the chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Articles 6 and 29 of the Sea Fisheries (Jersey) Law 1994.

9.1 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):

I am pleased to bring to the Assembly the final of 3 annual increases to the minimum size for lobster. This incremental process agreed in partnership with the fishermen is the foundation of our work to secure and rebuild the lobster fishery over the coming years. This change from 89 millimetres to the length of 90 millimetres length brings us in line with the U.K. Channel fishery and has been mirrored by France. This means that all lobsters living in the Western Channel now have increased opportunities to reproduce before being fished. The benefits of these changes are not instant, with lobsters taking around 7 years to reach a fishable size but should be long-lasting in the increase they bring to the breeding populations. Later this year I intend to bring forward further industry-supported measures to support this and other sustainable fisheries in our waters. In line with the principles of the Trade and Co-operation Agreement we have a responsibility to fish sustainably and using the precautionary principle for stock management. Our Marine Resources team are working to deliver stock assessments and improved management across all key stocks, including scallop, crab, bass and even now tuna, in addition to lobster. This is not made simple by a factor such as climate change-driven migration and the recolonisation of the region by predators such as the common octopus. I ask Members to support this proposition.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]**

9.1.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (Chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel):

I rise to speak on behalf of the E.H.I. (Environment, Housing and Infrastructure) Scrutiny Panel. Our view is straightforward; this measure follows an established management strategy. It has been properly consulted on and has been phased sensibly. One point I do want to place on record, a limit is only as good as its enforcement. The panel emphasises that effective monitoring and enforcement of minimum size regulations matters, just as much as setting the limit itself. I would ask the Minister to confirm what enforcement capacity is in place to support this change. Subject to that assurance, the panel is satisfied that these regulations appropriately complete this established programme and the panel supports them.

9.1.2 Deputy C.D. Leck of St. Saviour:

Can the Minister explain, in the light of this legislation and other legislation affecting Jersey fishermen, what financial assistance will be given to them, noting that the Jersey farmers have an Agricultural Loans Fund in which they can draw £1 million per business, while Jersey fishermen do not appear to have one?

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? I call upon the Minister to reply.

9.1.3 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

In relation to the point brought by the chair of the Scrutiny Panel, we obviously have our Marine Resources which will be monitoring the catch, as they already do at the moment, and that will continue over the coming years and we will manage that appropriately. In relation to the financial assistance that the Deputy talks about, it is part of the ongoing programme whereby there will be some funding in relation to the fisheries industry. Deputy Leck is correct in that there is an amount of money for the agricultural industry but it is also within the programme that as part of the Better Business Scheme that fisheries will be included and will be able to take those opportunities.

The Bailiff:

Those Members if they are adopting the principles kindly show. Thank you. Those against. The principles are adopted. We now move on to the regulations in Second Reading. Minister, how do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

9.2 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

En bloc, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading? The appel has been called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Second Reading:

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Senator L.J. Farnham				
Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean				
Senator M.R. Le Hegarat				
Senator T.J.A. Binet				
Senator H.M. Miles				
Senator M.E. Millar				
Senator Sir M.J. Boleat				
Senator S. M. Kersten				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Brelade				

Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.D. Carpenter				
Deputy S.J. Gleave				
Deputy C.D. Leck				
Deputy V. Li				
Deputy A. Maltman				
Deputy R.J. Parker				
Deputy G.A. Raimondo				
Deputy C.J. Rebindaine				
Deputy P.J. Romeril				

The Bailiff:

Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

9.3 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Articles as adopted in Second Reading in Third Reading? Those in favour of adopting the regulations kindly show. Thank you very much. The regulations are adopted in Third Reading.

10. Reinstate the States Grant to the Social Security Fund (P.63/2026)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Reinstate the States Grant to the Social Security Fund, P.63, lodged by Deputy Andrews. The main respondent is the Minister for Treasury and Resources. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to agree that the States Grant to the Social Security Fund should be reinstated to its full formula value from 2028 onwards and to request the Minister for Treasury and Resources to reflect this within the Budget 2027 to 2030.

10.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North:

There is a good reason why I am bringing forward this proposition, P.63/2026. I have been very concerned about the extent of Government expenditure over the last few years and I have also been concerned about the way our public finances have been mismanaged. We have been drawing down reserves. We are about to commit to more borrowing; £61 million in 2028. Of course the Council of Ministers in the position that they have taken, they are not committing to restore the States grant to its full formula. There is a good reason for that because they want to keep in mind the fact that there is £40 million worth of growth bids that have been proposed for the Budget 2027. We have also got to contend with the fact that over the last 6 Government Budgets £334 million in growth bids have been approved; that is an unsustainable position. Even the Fiscal Policy Panel have highlighted cumulative deficits of £345 million since 2019. What we must recognise, back then we had a pandemic to deal with and the Le Fondré regime I thought did quite well from an interventionist perspective. At the time it was probably appropriate to reduce the States grant to allow the current account to have more funding to increase day-to-day spending to stabilise the economy. However, in the Budget 2025 what we did see was the States grant be partially withdrawn, so the Government could spend more money in its current account and of course that continued into Budget 2026. There is an operating balance deficit of £12 million in the 2026 Budget because there was a £74 million withdrawal from the States grant to fund day-to-day services; that in itself is an unsustainable position to be in. If the Government wants to fund day-to-day services, then it should do so through general tax revenue measures. What it should not be doing is expending more than it generates in income and, unfortunately, that has been the case. We have seen expenditure growth of 58 per cent and income growth of 49 per cent over the last 6 years; that in itself is highly problematic. When we were all canvassing recently in the election I encountered many constituents in St. Helier North who were telling me: “We have massive concerns about public expenditure. It has got to be curtailed; this cannot continue.” I totally agree with those individuals and I encountered many of them on the doorstep. Because when we look at the reserve drawdowns between 2020 and 2029, so there is this forecast element as well, we are looking at about £540 million worth of transfers from the Social Security Reserve Fund to the Social Security Fund. The reserve’s purpose is to meet the needs of future generations and the Government can say: “We have got a strong investment return.” That is

beside the point because if you look at the benchmark that was evidently made very clear in the Fiscal Policy Panel report and also the States' accounts as well and we are told: "We have had a very positive return on investment." It has gone in excess above our benchmark. But when you take into account the transfer from the reserve into the Social Security Fund, the fund is worse off; it is performing below its benchmark. That is a reason why I am so concerned and that is why I brought this proposition today. Because the current financial situation is one that has been politically constructed by the previous Council of Ministers and the new crop of Council of Ministers, when they put their comments paper together, mentioned about this formula and they want more clarity from the actuarial review in terms of will the formula remain the same or will it be different. But also as well there are concerns because when I heard the Chief Minister respond to Deputy Barbara Ward's question before and she was asking how much are we going to be withdrawing from the States grant, he basically acknowledged that we, potentially, could be withholding more funds and that really makes sense. We have heard from the Minister for Treasury and Resources before who said there is about £40 million of growth bids that have been put forward by individual Ministers. If all of those growth bids are approved and we look at my comments paper, to P.63, where the Council of Ministers say it is about £46 million planned for that is going to be retained in the Consolidated Fund to allow the Government to spend more, then that additional £40 million, does that mean we are going to be spending in excess of, what, £86 million being withheld in the Consolidated Fund? Are we going to be spending more in our current account? Are we going to be running more deficits over consecutive years? Because, if so, that is certainly not what the public voted for in June. There were so many candidates who were saying: "We need to be more fiscally prudent. We need to cut expenditure." But what is this proposition seeking to do? It is seeking to cut expenditure. When we have got fiscally conservative Members who are now in the Council of Ministers all of a sudden saying: "No, no, we are not going to be supporting it", how does that look? There is a reason why so many people are concerned about the position that the Council of Ministers have taken. Because believe me when I say this, once the borrowing for the new healthcare facilities comes into play there will be even bigger problems compared to the ones that we are dealing with now. The Council of Ministers, all they will do is draw down the reserves. We have been told time and time again by the Fiscal Policy Panel: "Do not commit your reserves. Operate within your means. Use your taxable revenue to fund your day-to-day expenditure." That is being fiscally prudent. My proposition makes it very clear, each Minister has to be tasked securing expenditure savings. It is pivotal. It is pivotal. If we do not do it, then how much in transfers will be made over this term of office? I think probably a lot more than what is being planned for, and that is the concern that I have. When I stood for election I made it very clear in my manifesto we have got to cut expenditure. We cannot continue operating cumulative deficits. It is not a good thing for Jersey. It is not good for public finances and also as well I think many people obviously do not really have much faith in us as an Assembly. We had the concerns last term, and I think now with me bringing this forward it is conspicuous, it is holding Ministers to account and we can see where the land lies. They can oppose me but I am sorry, I am correct in what I am saying here.

[14:30]

I think the Council of Ministers, they do not really have a leg to stand on here. They are in a very susceptible position because they have not made it very clear why they would be opposing me. All they have really come up with is the whole thing about the formula and, potentially, the formula potentially changing. It just makes me feel surely the full formula is in place for a reason because the full amount should be transferred. It should not be partially withheld, and that is what the intention is. They cannot be open about that nor could they be open about the fact that there has been £40 million in growth bids being brought forward. Because if they had put that in the comments paper then there would be public outrage. I think it is important that I do highlight the concerns that I have and I know Deputy Barbara Ward has as well. Because we are in the beginning of this term

of office and we have got to make sure that we set the tone for the next 4 years. I think the first 18 months is probably going to be the most crucial part. But if we are not going to be doing the groundwork now, especially before the borrowing has to be serviced, then I think there are going to be problems later down the line. It is something of a concern for many Islanders as well. I must say at the moment, having listened to question time, it seems to me that quite a few of the Ministers are obviously considering the Budget but they do not really know how much of the States grant will be withdrawn. I would argue it should not even be withdrawn from its original formula in the first instance. We need to ensure that the Social Security Fund has a sustainable level of income coming into the fund. If we then withhold that States grant, then we are having to use the Social Security reserves. The one thing that I would also argue as well is when we speak about investment returns they are much dependent on how the markets perform. There is no guarantee that we can say, look, why do we not just make transfers from the reserve into the Social Security Fund? Because one day you could end up in a position like we did for one of the years in the last 5 or 6 years where in fact there was a negative fund balance. If you are then funding services *via* an overspend you are making that commitment and you are still going to have to then rely upon the reserve. You are going to be eating away at that capital as well, and that is a danger that we have. I do not think it has really been thought through. I think it has been very much a short-termist approach, and this is what Deputy Miles mentioned in a BBC Jersey article I think probably just before the debate for the Government Budget, if I remember correctly. I think she was absolutely spot on in the words that she used. Because I think the Island can only really be served by politicians who are quite happy to bring forward a longer-term vision for the Island and making sure that we make commitments to benefit future generations, instead of politicians and their short-termist goals. I will leave it there.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition?

10.1.1 Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (Minister for Treasury and Resources):

I will start by just commenting on a couple of points that the Deputy made. He did refer to the £40 million of growth bids, which indeed I did mention to him at a meeting in confidence. I also said that the majority of those bids had been rejected but were going through a process. It is a process; I alluded to that earlier on today when I was talking in question time. It is a robust process, so I would not hold too much out with regard to the £40 million of growth bids that have come in; that is a fairly normal process from my perspective. I understand also the motivation behind Deputy Andrews bringing this proposition. And, as I have said, I did meet with him to discuss it. Although I appreciate that this is an important debate to have, I had rather hoped that I persuaded him to defer it until more information was available. I clearly was not persuasive enough. I do have considerable sympathy, however, with the principle behind the proposition. Indeed, Members might remember that during the recent election campaign I made my own position clear on this matter. I was uncomfortable with the way in which the States grant had been used and the Social Security Reserve Fund used, in effect, to help relieve pressures elsewhere in Government finances. I said that I wanted to see the grant reinstated. I meant that then and I mean it now. I have also been clear about the wider principle. Government must live within its means. Recurring expenditure should, as far as possible, be met from recurring income. We should be extremely cautious about relying on reserves to support the day-to-day expenditure of Government. There is an important history here, between 2020 and 2023 approximately £290 million of States grant that would otherwise have gone into the Social Security Fund was not paid. The initial decision was taken to help finance the response to COVID and later cancellations continued against the exceptional financial pressure arising from the pandemic. Since then there have been occasions when the grant has been reduced to relieve wider pressure on general public expenditure. Let me be clear, that cannot become the normal way of balancing the

Government's books. Government must allocate the resources it has wisely to the areas of greatest need. Indeed, every pound of taxpayers' money must deliver value for money. I am sure every Member in this Assembly agrees with that principle. As a matter of sound financial discipline, reserves should not be treated as a convenient source of funding recurring revenue expenditure. Where reserves are used in support of the wider public finances, the objective should be to strengthen the balance sheet, including reducing debt, not to finance an ever-growing day-to-day cost base. Our reserves must not become what some in the past have described as a self-service buffet. I would like Members to understand precisely what I am asking them to do today. I am not asking them to reject the principle behind Deputy Andrews's proposition. I am asking Members to wait until quarter one next year or around that date when the actuarial review of the Social Security Reserve Fund will have been completed; that distinction is important. This proposition, if approved today, would require the full formula base grant to be restored by 2028. On current figures that would increase the annual grant from around £54 million to around £100 million. That is approximately £46 million every year, not as a one-off payment but as a permanent recurring commitment against general revenues. The proposition does not identify where that additional £46 million a year should come from. If we commit that money today it will, ultimately, have to be found from somewhere, from additional revenues, from savings elsewhere or from expenditure that would otherwise have been available to other priorities. That does not mean we should not make the commitment. It means we should know that it is the right commitment before we make it. That brings me to what I believe is a central issue in this debate. The original grant was established in very different circumstances. We should not simply assume that because it was considered appropriate then it remains the right formula for Jersey today and indeed for the decades ahead. That is precisely why work is already being undertaken. The Council of Ministers, as Members will be well aware, has commissioned a comprehensive review of the Social Security Reserve Fund and the future role of the States grant. Alongside that, the statutory actuarial review is also taking place. Both are due to report in early 2027; well before decisions need to be taken for the 2028-2030 Budget process. Those reviews will give us the evidence that we need. They will examine the long-term sustainability of the fund, the appropriate level of reserves, future contribution requirements and, importantly, whether the existing States grant formula remains the right mechanism today. I ask Members a simple question: why would we decide the answer today when we have commissioned independent experts to examine that question and they will give us the answer in a matter of months? It would make little sense to commission that work and then pre-empt it today, and there is no financial emergency requiring us to do so. The Social Security Reserve Fund is indeed in a strong position. It is forecast to rise from approximately £2.6 billion today to almost £3 billion by the end of 2029, while maintaining reserves equivalent to more than 7 years of annual benefit expenditure. That increase, I should add, is based on the conservative assumption of around 4 per cent *per annum*, whereas the fund has been achieving almost double that over the last few years. Indeed, that strength gives us something valuable; time. That does not mean that we should be complacent, quite the opposite. This fund exists to protect pensioners and benefits of Islanders, not simply today but for generations to come. Its size is not an invitation to spend it. It is a responsibility to manage it properly. We should remember that forecasts are forecasts. Investment markets indeed rise and fall, economic conditions change, demographics change. That is another way why the actuarial evidence matters. I also want to be clear about something else. This is not an attempt to kick this issue into the long grass, nor should today's decision be interpreted as accepting the reduced grant indefinitely. The current reduction has been described by the last Council of Ministers as temporary. Let me be absolutely clear, I regard it as temporary. I want us to return to the question in 2027 once the evidence is available, so that this Assembly can make a properly informed decision for 2028 and beyond. That may mean restoring the existing formula. It may mean a different formula. It may mean a different balance between contributions, the grant and the level of reserves we believe should be maintained. But whatever we decide, it should be based on evidence rather than just assumption. There is also a wider principle

here, which I believe matters greatly for the creditability of our public finances. We cannot say that Government must live within its means and then make permanent spending commitments without identifying how they will be sustainably funded. A strong balance sheet is not a licence for an unsustainable income statement, and neither should we use reserves as an excuse to avoid the difficult job of ensuring that recurring Government expenditure is affordable and from recurring revenues. That principle applies across Government and it must apply here as well. So my position is straight forward. I support the objective behind Deputy Andrews's proposition. I support restoring an appropriate States contribution to the Social Security Fund. What I cannot support is deciding today that a formula designed years ago must automatically apply from 2028, just months before we receive, as I have mentioned, independent evidence telling us what that appropriate formula should be. I thank Deputy Andrews for bringing this issue before the Assembly and for ensuring that it remains firmly on the agenda as it should be. But I ask Members to reject this proposition today, not because its underlying objective is wrong, as I have mentioned, and not because I have changed my position, but because we should make the right decision at the right time with the right evidence. We will have that evidence in the quarter one 2027.

10.1.2 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

This is my fourth speech on this topic, and I make no apologies for repeating myself, and please forgive me, previous Members, you have heard a lot of this before. But for the new Members, I think it may be worth a listen. Well, I hope so. At least one can say that I remain consistent and true to my beliefs. Since 2000, money has been consistently held back from the Social Security Fund, which has become an established practice by past Governments. These actions, in my view, show a disregard to the seriousness of protecting our Social Security Fund. It is just too easy to withhold grant money to fund new services and cover up Governments' overspends. If I may repeat my findings on how much money has been withheld, and please forgive me if I am going to be throwing a few figures at you. 2020 to 2024, just short of £300 million, but the promises from the then Ministers for Treasury and Resources that the grant would return to its usual formula and be paid in full, these assurances sadly have been consistently just not materialised.

[14:45]

2025, £50 million plus £10 million for the living wage and that equals £60 million. In 2026, £50 million plus £10 million plus another extra £17 million, that is £77 million being withheld during this year. Then in 2027, 2028 and 2029, you have got 50, 50, 50 being taken. But withholding money from the Social Security grant is just not the whole picture and its impact this has, because what has not been factored in, one, that money needed to be transferred from the Reserve Fund to pay for pensions and benefits in 2024-25, that was £300 million, and then again in 2025-26, another £254 million, totalling £414 million had been taken from the Reserve Fund to fund pensions and benefits. 2, the loss of compound interest on the money withheld and the money transferred from the Reserve Fund. Now, I am not a mathematician or an accountant, but I have been rather conservative and I have said based on 5 per cent interest over those years would reveal an investment loss of some £400 million. That is just on investments, because we have done very well in our Pension Fund. So we can see since 2000, the estimated loss to the fund by these actions is approximately over £1 billion. Yes, over £1 billion. This worsening process of withholding funds from the fund just cannot go on. Social Security benefits is the bedrock of social insurance provision and must be protected and not be seen as a piggybank to bail the Government out to balance the books. These continued reductions have internal effects on the fund, as it reduces the percentage of the monies that is transferred into the Health Insurance Fund, which we know is in the decline and desperately needs more investment to pay for prescriptions, G.P. visits, address increased community pharmacies and dental provisions, and so on. I can hear some Members state: "Oh, but there is £184 million going into the fund during 2026 to 2029." But in reality, it should be £471 million should be invested during this period. The

Pension Fund is deemed to be in a very healthy position due to favourable investments, but for how long? If we, as an Assembly, keep withholding monies, agreeing to withhold monies that are deemed to pay for pensions and community provisions, where does it end? There is only enough money in the fund to cover for 6 to 7 years. Now, in my book and my pensions experience, that is not a fully-funded scheme; that is under pressure. Yes, the Pension Fund has done very well with its investments, but we - the global “we” - are living in uncertain volatile fiscal and unsure economical times. We need to be cautious, as indicated by our Fiscal Policy Panel and our economic advisers. We must take heed - serious heed - of their professional wise words. The actuaries are conducting an actuarial review as we have heard. In my previous speeches during 2024 and 2025, I have asked for review of the formula process and I hope that this has been done as a top priority, or has the Government put the process to one side, and if so, why? If the formula is deemed out of step, then we need to consider a formula change under Article 9A of the 1974 Social Security Law or not. We need to get our house in order. The Deputy’s proposition, I believe, is a fair compromise proposal to have the States grant restored to its full value as set out by the formula in Article 9A. Eighteen months, 2 years’ notice is more than adequate time for the Government to get its act together and live within its means. In times of budget setting and awareness of the proposed income, we must cut our cloth accordingly and live within our income, and not automatically look to our Pension Fund to withhold money *via* its funding stream to balance the books, which is technically the Government overspending by up to £50 million every year. What will happen in 2030? I am sure if nothing is done more monies will be required to be transferred from the Reserve Fund to prop up payments and benefits as we have seen twice in 2024 and 2025. I feel very strongly that our social security and pensions must be protected, and if there are surpluses or the fund is so healthy that monies are considered to provide new and improved benefits, for example, a carer’s allowance, tax free old age pensions, increase old age pension benefits, and so on. May I conclude by relaying - and some of you will have heard this one - may I conclude by relaying the famous quote by Mr. Micawber, who is a fictional character in the Charles Dickens 1850 novel, *David Copperfield*: “Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen and six, result happiness. Annual income of twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds and six pence, result misery”. The famous quote is essentially saying that it is better to live within your means than to spend more than you earn. This makes plain economic sense and leads to prosperity. As we clearly are not living within our means, we are experiencing misery and discontent. Thank you, Sir, and Members for listening, and please can you support Deputy Andrews’s proposition.

10.1.3 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:

I would like to speak in support of the Council of Ministers position on this proposition, which seems to me to be both sensible and responsible. As their comments paper demonstrates and as the Minister for Treasury and Resources has explained, the Social Security Reserve Fund is a strong financial position. The balance is forecast to increase from £2.6 billion to *circa* £3 billion over the next 3 years, with annual benefit coverage forecast to increase from £7.4 billion to £7.5 billion over that same period. I have no details on how the fund itself is managed, but an annualised investment return of 9.3 per cent over 5 years and 7.3 per cent over 10 years, on what is presumably a relatively low risk investment profile, is a strong performance. I therefore really struggle to understand the urgency with which the Deputy seeks to reinstate the full States grant, in particular, when this Assembly is due to receive the conclusions of 2 important reviews into the Social Security Fund and the Reserve Fund early next year. In my view, Deputy Andrews’s proposition puts the cart before the horse. He wants us to commit to reinstating the full States grant from 2028 when there is no pressing need to do so, and without key information that can help inform such a decision that is due to arrive relatively soon. There is also no indication of where he would like to see budget cuts take place to absorb this transfer. The Council of Ministers comments paper states that this proposition would leave an annual funding gap of £46 million, and what I find most striking about this proposition is that there seems

to be no benefit were we to do what is actually being asked. Is it really a good use of taxpayer money to have it paid into a fund that does not currently need topping up when it could be put to funding our schools, our public services, or fixing and maintaining infrastructure? The proposition does not seem remotely concerned where these cuts might be made. This proposition, in my view, is ill-considered and poorly timed. It seems to me that the primary goal of this proposition is to curtail Government spending and it is using the States grant as a vehicle to force Government to do so. Ensuring that Government spending is sustainable is of course a reasonable aim, but this is not the way to achieve it. While fiscal prudence is certainly something we should expect and demand of Government, forcing the annual transfer of £46 million of taxpayer money into a fund that does not currently need it in lieu of significantly key information that will help inform such a decision, or in order to force Government to make cuts when we have not even seen the Budget yet, is certainly not a responsible approach to dealing with the issue. It is for these reasons that I will be rejecting this proposition.

10.1.4 Senator M.E. Millar:

I am grateful for Deputy Carpenter's comments. It would be wrong of me, given the opportunity and the discussion about the social security scheme, not to mention, as you will see over the next couple of days in the media, that on Thursday, the social security scheme is 75 years old. **[Approbation]**. It was established ... I think we should give a round of applause. It has served the Island very well. It was created as part of the Insular Insurance Act in 1951, and in its day, at that time, it was enormously controversial. There was a petition, and this was in the days before an electronic signature, of 12,200 signatures opposing the scheme. There were protests in the Royal Square, I think particularly from the agricultural sector, who were convinced it was the end of industry as they knew it. But the Government, the scheme was led particularly by Senator Philip Le Feuvre, whose name subsequently adorned the office of the Social Security Department, the vision and leadership shown by that Government was immense. I do wonder how many of us would press the pour button in the face of a 12,000 signature against from the public. It was vision and leadership that brought the scheme into being, and I think we should reflect on the foresight of that generation of politicians for the work they did in bringing this forward. Imagining a Jersey where there is no old age pension, no funds to support doctors' visits, pharmacy, we would be in a very strange place. In the social security scheme many people receive benefits without even realising they are receiving benefits. When you pick up a prescription, when you go to see the doctor and receive an over £50 subsidy for the cost of the doctor's visit, when your child has free healthcare, free medical care, short-term incapacity, long-term incapacity, death grant; there are numerous benefits supported by this fund. I am concerned Deputy Ward's speech in particular creates a level of anxiety where none should exist. The house is very much in order as far as the funds are concerned. I do think we should reflect on the value of the social security scheme to this Island. I do not support Deputy Andrews's proposition. I am the Minister responsible for the fund, and indeed for the 2 reviews that are currently underway and which will be reporting in the spring of next year. I would remind Members that the Social Security Fund does not work from a huge bucket from which we draw funds - although we may do that - but it works by collecting contributions from today's workers, people of working age, and using that to pay for the pension of today's pensioners. There is a commitment between generations that each generation of workers will support the pension payments of the previous generation of workers; being the current generation of pensioners, in case you are getting lost among the generations. At a time of demographic and economic change it is appropriate to review the overall system, and this is what we will be doing over the next few months. The actuarial review is a regular review completed every 4 years looking at the current rules of the social security scheme and providing projections for future income and expenditure over the next 60 years. It is, by any stretch, a long-term review. My predecessor as Minister for Social Security also initiated a second review looking at the way in which the fund has built up since the late 1990s, and how the rules of the fund and its contributions may

need to be adapted to meet the needs of current and future workers. That review will assess how the funds have developed since the reserves began to be built up in the late 1990s. It will consider the long-term objectives of the funds, including sustainability, intergenerational fairness, and contribution stability. It will consider the impact of wider public finance pressures and objectives and it will explore future funding options, including the balance between the States grant and indeed the level and method of calculation of the States grants, contributions, and investment income.

[15:00]

Some of our ideas from that review will be able to feed into the actuarial review, so as we develop some thoughts and plans we can go to the actuaries and ask them to model those changes so that we will come back to the Assembly ... you will see the actuarial reviews, those will be published, and we will have presentations that you can all come and hear, and we will also report to the Assembly on what the outcome of those reviews are and what our plans are. That will all be done in plenty of time for the 2028 Budget. So I ask Members to await the outcomes of these 2 reviews. The proposition today is poorly timed, asking Members to take a decision without providing them with information as to the negative impact on public services that would be caused by the early reinstatement of the grant. I agree with Deputy Andrews, many of us stood in June on a platform of reducing public spending, but that is very much easier said than done, and I say that as a former Minister for Treasury and Resources. Government has to look to how we cut spending but if we look at what we have talked about this morning - funding for the Opera House, funding for free access to the museum, support for fisherman because of changes to the rules in lobster catch - there are constant demands for money and we have to balance those demands very well with all other pressures, including what it would mean for the public at a time of cost-of-living issues to raise taxes. Nobody wants to raise taxes. I urge Members to wait and reject this proposition. I would also finally like to just reassure pensioners and today's workers, those who are currently contributing, that my overarching responsibility is to maintain a social security system that is fit for current and future generations. I can confirm the fund is very robust and will be paying pensions for many years - indeed decades - to come. In the short term the fund will continue to grow during 2028 and 2029. As I say, the house is in good order and no one should be worried about their pension. Both Deputy Andrews and Deputy Ward have talked about funds coming out of the Social Security Reserve Fund. This misunderstands the role of the fund. The fund was established to recognise the fact that as we have more and more pensioners and fewer people of working age paying into the fund there would - had we not created a reserve - be a funding failure. The fund acts like a deposit account for the social security scheme. Assets are invested and they are invested in very much a sophisticated and well-advised manner. It is not simply a matter of looking at interest in the bank. The Reserve Fund produces valuable investment income which also helps grow the overall fund. It is natural that there will be flows of funds from the deposit account - the Reserve Fund - into the Social Security Fund, which is effectively our current account. This is not a dangerous precedent, it is a normal operation of the linked funds. The Reserve Fund was designed to support the Social Security Fund and it was expected that funds would be withdrawn over time to meet the pressures of an ageing demographic. I think I am safe in saying that even if we reinstated the Social Security grant in full we would be having to withdraw from that fund in future years because of the increasing number of pensioners. The 2026 Budget forecasts the Reserve Fund increasing to approximately £2.62 billion at the end of 2026, and to approximately £2.96 billion - that is almost £3 billion - at the end of 2029. There are very many jurisdictions who would be envious of the fact that we could cover pensions for over 7 years. Very few jurisdictions have a cushion like that for their pension schemes. So I ask Members to wait for the reviews - to wait for the actuarial review and our longer strategic review - and oppose the proposition. Thank you.

10.1.5 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

I am no fan of propositions worded this way but I have sympathy for Deputy Andrews. Listening to Senator Millar, the Minister on this, it is easy to hear the facts of the matter about where the fund is but also where it is going, and the comments made about the Social Security Reserve acting as a buffer for demographic change are entirely correct. She is one of the experts on this matter, having spent time as Minister. But my concern is the fund is not in as rude health as has been described. When the changes were made in the 2026 Budget, letters were written to the Government Actuary's Department for updates for projections, and these were published in September and November of 2025. The United Kingdom Government reported on their publications from November in February 2026 on their blog and their headline for the changes made in the 2026-2029 Budget were titled as follows: "Jersey Social Security Fund Budget proposals impact." Subheading: "Analysis of the Jersey Social Security Fund shows how temporary reductions in income could affect the fund in the future." They go on to say of all the modelling they did on migration that the impact of the 4-year reduction in the fund broadly speaking brings forward the exhaustion date of the Social Security Fund and its reserve from 2082 to 2072. The modelling goes into more detail but the narrative of the press release explains how lower migration could bring forward that exhaustion date by 10 years, and high migration equally could put the exhaustion date beyond the end of the projection period. So it is fair and clear to say that all these factors play into the sustainability of a Social Security Fund. The concern to me is 2072 is very near. That is not to say that our system will be in failure, but my broad understanding is when we have no Social Security Reserve Fund, we have no buffer, income into the fund must meet expenditure. It is that generational relationship that the Minister touched on. My concern is whether those demographic challenges will be solved. I voted to oppose the changes being made in the 2026-2029 Budget and I am concerned that the solution to find a sustainable funding for pensions in the future may move other needles, one such as migration where the reporting shows higher migration or net migration will push our funding back. That has been the solution to declining productivity, that has been a solution to the demographic challenge, and that is - as we know - an unsustainable way to approach Jersey's community and sustainability going forward. So while I do not like this proposition I also am concerned that the vision for where we go in funding this and the compromises and challenges we must take are not coming forward either. I expect that when we see an actuarial review ... and I remember reading the one 3 or 4 years ago which at the time predicted 2081 as the exhaustion date, rather similar to its slightly updated 2082. That concerns me because, as I say, I hopefully - health permitting - could be alive at that point in time. Certainly I am closer to it than others. That is a demographic fact. We are all the same distance away from that date; some might have greater chances of getting there. At the end of the day talk can be cheap and action will be what is needed, and I do not expect should it even pass - although the mood is quite obvious - that we would get to a point where we would meet this in 2028 for the change. That said, I think we should be a bit clearer that sustainably funding pensions and being in some ways overly cautious about that funding is needed, and that when we look forward an exhaustion date of a buffer in the face of demographic changes that are pursuing us is essential. Seeing a date of 2072 under the current modelling should give us cause for some concern to plan ahead, and not to say that the best days are ahead of us.

10.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

It can feel like groundhog day here, but I appreciate there is also a new audience for some of the older Members so I am sure they have already learnt one or 2 things today, whether that is what they wanted to learn or not. It may surprise Members - although not necessarily - that I have not read a lot of Dickens. I have read more Dostoevsky than I have Dickens, and I hope to make up for that at some point, but I am a little familiar with Mr. Micawber. But with the help of the internet as well, of course, I have brought the quote up. I am reminded that while Mr. Micawber is often quoted ... and it is not the first, I recall I think a Deputy from St. Brelade of one term only in 2008, and she used to quote Mr. Micawber in exactly the same context. Mr. Micawber was quite right that if you spend

more than your means you are probably not going to end up too happy, but it turns out that Mr. Micawber himself ...

The Bailiff:

You have to say Mic-aw-ber; everyone is cringing when you say Mic-aye-ber. It is a point of clarification. **[Laughter]** I am sorry you did not give way. It is Mic-aw-ber, not Mic-aye-ber.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Thank you, Sir. I am happy to take that correction, and I know that there are people of Scottish heritage in the Assembly, including yourself, Sir, so I did not mean to offend anyone. Mr. Micawber, as we will call him from now on. **[Approbation]** I think that was back in the days of shillings and sixpences, but of course Mr. Micawber did not follow his own advice apparently, and I am told that Mr. Micawber was a grandiloquent and ridiculous. He is endlessly running into trouble because of his mass of debts. What would he have said about the idea of using money when you had a bank account for savings which was already really healthy, but you were struggling with your current account and your day-to-day living expenses. I do not think he would advocate for anybody reducing the amount of money going into their current accounts in order to put it into their savings account which was already healthy. I do not think he would be giving that kind of advice because it would lead to a position where you would be overspending and you would not have enough money to meet your debts. So I think if we are to follow Mr. Micawber's advice - and indeed Deputy Barbara Ward's advice by extension - then we would be doing exactly what the Council of Ministers is advocating here. I think Deputy Carpenter - and congratulations to him - made a very eloquent rather than grandiloquent speech on why the Council of Ministers is correct in this position. There is another elephant in the room though which I think inadvertently Deputy Andrews has raised but he has not found a solution for, and it is that age old problem that Government has to get to grips with the fact that we are not bringing in enough money. There is an easy solution which at every election, or every certain rounds of elections especially, the populist and the right-wing candidates come together to bang the table and say: "We must get States spending under control. We are spending too much." When we look at the facts and compare ourselves to other places that is not true. Whether it is our Education Department or our Health Department we spend much, much less on our public services than comparable democracies and jurisdictions around the world, to the point that our constituents are being let down by that. Also if we have a Social Security Fund which is relying on a mixture of blended funding from social security contributions being topped up by taxpayer centralised funding, which inherently is not progressive anyway because our tax system is not progressive, it is not even neutral. It favours those who earn more; the highest earners in Jersey, especially the very high earners, pay the least tax in percentage terms. We could perhaps get into moving from quoting Dickens to quoting the Bible about the widow's mite where the widow is paying from her poverty what she can barely afford to pay, while those in Jersey who have so much money that they are forced to drive around in outlandishly large cars with outlandishly small number plates that cost outlandishly large amounts of money. I understand that number plates are not transferrable so it is something that the Minister for Infrastructure might want to get his head around, how you can trade and sell number plates. There are people in Jersey who are crying out to pay more tax because they have got too much money, and this Government is not allowing them to do that. Now, this argument that in fact there is this social contract between the current generation and future generations, that is all nice and quaint but if we take it to the *reductio ad absurdum* where we have perhaps, say, one person who is working and there are 30,000 retired people - and I know that is an extreme position - that is clearly not sustainable. So it was right for the Minister for Social Security to flag up that that may be the current system that we have, but that formula is not going to always be sustainable. There may well need to be a different formula which is either introduced completely or is tweaked so the ratios between what taxation contributes to what the current working age

population contribute. I feel for people like Deputy Curtis because he talks about 2070, 2075, 2080 being far away, but it is his lifetime in fact. His lifetime will have to have been repeated again before we get to that point, and I think it is some 46 years away. The fund is healthy, it does not mean that we should not consider what is being done, but I think this is not a solution to what is being proposed today.

[15:15]

The last point I would make is that I agree that there seems to be an uninformed or misinformed populism that is creeping into our public discourse sometimes. Do not shake your head too much or agree with me too much, Deputy Ward, because this is partly a chastisement for yourself and Deputy Andrews, although the Members are entitled to their point of view. But I think ultimately it comes down to Government needing to give clearer information and to correct any misinformation in the public domain. I would put that challenge back to Ministers. Some of these ideas and figures are complex - of course they are - but it should not be beyond the wit of the Council of Ministers to put clear information out there into the public domain so that these rumours and this shroud-waving does not get traction the public domain.

10.1.7 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

As Deputy Ward ... I think it is my third speech, probably less than Deputy Ward, and a lot has been said about this particular topic. The Minister said: "Why today?" Why today? I am having another déjà vu because it is the same Budget debate when we talked about actuarial review. I have heard about this actuarial review for the last 18 months. It should come, it should come, it should come. It still is not here and now we are facing another Budget debate and funds will be withheld from the Social Security Fund because the review will not be ready for the time of another Budget debate. I am not saying if the fund is in good health or bad health. The only thing that is clear, the Fiscal Policy Panel said do not reduce fund transfer until the actuarial review will be ready. This is the advice; very simple, clear advice that we got last year in 2025 from the Fiscal Policy Panel. Here we are again. Maybe it will come back and will say the fund is in really good health and we can spend this money. Great. As Deputy Ward suggested, we can have a debate in this States Chamber on how this would be spent. Would it be spent in Education, would it be spent in Health, would it be spent on care allowance? Deputy Andrews is putting a safe stop saying: "Enough. Take the money, let us have 2028 that the grant will be reinstated, and nothing stops the Government in 2027 to bring a proposition and say: 'This is the actuarial review, this is the result'." I completely agree with the Minister for Treasury and Resources when he said: "We must make an evidence-based decision." The only evidence that we have now is the Fiscal Policy Panel said: "Do not do it." We still continue to do it, we continue to spend the money, we continue to spend above our means, and we did not speed up - which we could speed up - our actuarial review. We would not be debating 2028, 2029, 2030, 2032; we would have evidence in front of us. From my perspective I was very clear 18 months ago and I was clear less than a year ago and I am clear now. The Council of Ministers should wait for actuarial and policy review and the proposition does not prevent any of the work, it provides a clear starting point. Unless the Assembly consciously agrees to a different sustainable model with the full grant would be reinstated in 2028, and if we will not agree any other model we at least have the safety that it will be reinstated. Deputy Tadier said we need to communicate to the public, and I am sure that most of us in day-to-day conversation said: "Money was taken out from the Social Security Fund" because this is what the public remember. We all know that funds were not taken from the Social Security Fund. The funds were not put in the Social Security Fund, as it was agreed within the States. I know it is wordplay but the matter of truth, the Government in 2025 came back and said: "We overspent £50 million, can we have an extra £50 million not to put in the fund?" Somebody spoke about investment, and we all know that investment performance can change. Recent strong returns are welcome but they are not suitable for predicting how it will continue going

forward. This is for me more about the present balance of the fund. It is good that it is healthy. It is about the discipline, transparency, and the public trust. The public trust is extremely important and here we are again: “It is okay, let us wait for another review.” So P.63 provides that direction of the trust, of clarity, and some backstop, allowing sufficient time for the Government to prepare. For those reasons I will be supporting the proposition.

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

I have been listening to the speeches with interest because I can see both sides of this, and particularly some of the speakers who have mentioned some of the pressures on public spending. Nevertheless, my decision has been made because I returned to the work of the previous Health and Social Security Panel and one of our key findings which was put into the Budget review reflected the Fiscal Policy Panel advice that reducing contributions to this fund before a full actuarial review is completed would not be prudent. I find myself wanting to be consistent in that approach. I wonder if there are any Assistant Ministers, now that the Minister has spoken, who could shed some light on this actuarial review. I think the Constable of St. Helier mentioned that we have been waiting for it for 18 months. That seems puzzling to me because surely an actuarial review is something that is a snapshot of time because it is weighing up the current risks of a moment in time. So if anybody in Government could shed some light on that please, that would be helpful, but I am likely to support Deputy Andrews with this one.

10.1.9 Connétable A.N Jehan of St. John:

I arise in trepidation, having listened to my colleagues on either side of me, but I have to say I think they are both wrong. Nobody is taking any money out of Deputy Ward’s piggybank or anyone else’s piggybank. The piggybank is on the shelf untouched, we are just not putting as much in as we have in previous years. We have a formula that was agreed almost 30 years ago. We were told in 2025 that we had raised £748 million from investments in the period of 2020 to 2024. That would suggest to me that the formula we had 30 years ago had worked very well, but perhaps was not needed at this time. Let us not fall into the trap of talking Jersey down, let us talk Jersey up. Seventy-five years ago those brave people made those decisions. We are being asked to make a decision not as brave as that but just to carry on with what we agreed at the last Budget and wait for the results of the actuarial review. How many other jurisdictions have got the level of reserve we have? We were told in 2025 that if there were no further investments made in we would have enough to cover I believe 7½ years if no money was paid in. We were told that Guernsey and the Isle of Man had enough at that time to cover 4 years, and the U.K. had less than a year. We are in not a bad position. It is not great but I would say it is a pretty good position to be in. I would not swap with the other countries or islands I have mentioned. Let us wait for the review, let us reject Deputy Andrews’s well-thought and well-meaning proposition. I have to say I would take the Minister to task on one point. He may have had a confidential meeting with the Deputy but in this Assembly this morning he spoke about £40 million of budget drift, so that was not very confidential. That was said in this forum this morning. But I would urge Members not to support Deputy Andrews and let us move on.

10.1.10 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier:

I was not intending to speak on this debate because I did speak a lot when this was previously debated as the then Minister for Social Security. But given the reviews that I commissioned as Minister have been talked about and questions have been asked, I feel like I should answer those questions. The main actuarial review that is being undertaken by the Government now is the actuarial review that is done every 4 years I think, from memory, and it was timetabled. It is a very complex piece of work. It takes around a year to do and there would have been no way that that piece of work could have been sped up. In addition to that, I commissioned a second report that asked the very fundamental questions, as the current Minister outlined earlier in her speech, about what is going to work best for

Jersey in the future. We know what we have now has performed well in the past. What we do not know is whether it is fit for purpose for now and fit for purpose for Islanders in the future. That is a very important piece of work. The other thing I wanted to touch on was the comments made around the F.P.P. (Fiscal Policy Panel) advice. I remember Ministers sat around the table when that particular F.P.P. report came out and we were quite shocked to see that piece of advice because it became apparent later that the F.P.P. were not as informed around the letters of advice that the Government had asked for at the time, and they did not know that we had indeed asked actuaries for their advice at the time. Perhaps that recommendation may have been worded slightly differently if they had have had that information. I was pleased to hear my Reform Jersey colleague Deputy Carpenter speak because I think he really hit a good point which is what we are talking about when we talk about the States grant is this is taxpayers' money. When I was a Minister around the Council of Ministers' table discussing the last Budgets and faced with this question around how we spend this portion of taxpayers' money - do we continue to put it into the formula, into the States grant, or do we use it for other purposes - we were faced with a very stark decision. Do we put more money that is well-needed into Children's Services and things like Fire and Rescue Services, or do we put it into a fund that is outperforming where we thought it would be right now? For me it was around looking at our risk register, understanding the very real risks that this Island faces, and making sure that we mitigated those most very serious of risks within Children's Services and things like Fire and Rescue. I do think that Deputy Andrews's proposition is poorly timed. I would hazard a guess that the timing was more around having headlines and maybe meeting with what the public perception might be, but again I repeat the call that other Members have made ...

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Sir, I am going to intervene there. I think that is very disingenuous.

The Bailiff:

No, is this a point of order?

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

No, Sir, that is very disingenuous, I ...

The Bailiff:

No, is this a point of order?

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

No, Sir, I am just saying, I am ...

The Bailiff:

You cannot just stand up and make a speech during someone else's speech. Are you asking to give way or is it a point of order?

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I would like to repeat what other Members have said and say we need to think very carefully here about the use of taxpayers' money. Putting it in the right place now, but also then taking heed of the actuarial reviews that we get next year so that we can put the right measures in place for the future of all Islanders. I do urge people to reject this proposition. It is ill-timed and ill-thought through.

10.1.11 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:

As a new Member I think I am less interested in revisiting the past decisions than in understanding their long-term consequences. The Social Security Reserve Fund exists to support intergenerational fairness and to help meet the future cost of our ageing population, yet we are being asked to decide

whether a temporary reduction in the States grant should continue or whether the full contribution should be restored.

[15:30]

I believe Members - no matter whether we are old or new, or old new Members - need answers to the 3 important questions. First is what is the projected difference in the value of the Reserve Fund if the States grant is restored from 2028, compared with the current policy? The issue is not simply whether the fund survives but whether it is left stronger or weaker over the long term. Secondly, what assessment has been made of the impact on future generations of contributors and pensioners? If the Reserve Fund is intended to support intergenerational fairness we need to understand the long-term consequences of today's decisions. Third, can Members be provided with clear information showing how reductions in States grant related to expenditure decisions elsewhere in the Budget? The Government has stated that reducing the grant creates fiscal capacity for other priorities, including healthcare and Children's Services. As Members, our responsibility is not simply to choose between competing priorities but to do so with full transparency and a clear understanding of the long-term implications. For that, in Deputy Andrews's proposition he stated that: "I consider that this proposition has no direct or indirect impact on children."

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on this proposition? If no one else wishes to speak I call upon Deputy Andrews to reply.

10.1.12 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

First and foremost I just want to make it very clear. I asked 2 questions of the Minister for Treasury and Resources and the Minister for Social Security when they were both standing to become Ministers and it was due to the responses that I received that I was very concerned, especially with the Minister for Social Security. Her stance on the States grant worried me, and so that is when I decided to draft my proposition. I hold strong beliefs on the States grant. I have not done this for the purpose of generating headlines; I have never done that. As a Back-Bencher I always look to appraise all members of the executive. If they are doing a good job then I congratulate them, well done, but if there is an area where I think an improvement potentially can be made then the onus is on me to ensure that they are held to account. I think we have to be respectful of that instead of other Back-Benchers making suppositions which are totally inaccurate. I must thank the majority of Members who have stood up and been respectful, and of course we all hold different views on the States grant - some are obviously pro-reinstatement and others are not and that is fair enough. What I would like to say though is that the Minister for Treasury and Resources acknowledges that we have got this £46 million funding gap and he also proclaimed that: "Well, Deputy Andrews has not made it very clear where the expenditure reductions will come from." What he is also forgetting as well, I was quite open in terms of how my report was drafted. I mentioned about the need to potentially increase revenues as well. The important thing for me here is, yes, we can have an actuarial review but most importantly we need to be achieving public sector surpluses over consecutive years. I think what we have seen since 2019, since the pandemic - and it is quite worrying to see - is these recurring deficits. This is what I spoke about with the £345 million, and that was something that the Fiscal Policy Panel elaborated on. It is quite evident this is not something that we can continue with. There has also been mention about: "Well, we might need a new formula." Even so, there will be a formula in place for a good enough reason. Why? Because we need to be making transfers to the Social Security Fund because there is insufficient income received from Social Security contributions and, therefore, you have got a structural deficit. To circumvent that deficit we have the States grant in place. If you remove that States grant partially or in its entirety what then happens? You are then reliant upon the Social Security Reserve Fund and its investment income. If the investment income

is performing in excess of the benchmark then of course that could be a good thing, but if you are then making a transfer and drawing the fund balance below that benchmark and across then it really nullifies the whole purpose of having a benchmark for the fund. This is something that nobody really touched upon in response to my opening speech when I highlighted it. All I can do is try my best. I have tried to hold the Council of Ministers to account. We have got 49 Members, each Member is entitled to make their decision as to whether they accept, reject, or potentially abstain, but I think it was absolutely paramount that I brought it forward quite early on in response to the comments of the Ministers a couple of months ago now in July. We will see what happens with the outcome of the vote, but thank you. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have cast their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the proposition has been rejected:

POUR: 6		CONTRE: 41		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Martin		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean		
Connétable of St. Helier		Senator M.R. Le Hegarat		
Deputy M.B. Andrews		Senator T.J.A. Binet		
Deputy A.F. Curtis		Senator H.M. Miles		
Deputy B. Ward		Senator M.E. Millar		
		Senator Sir M.J. Boleat		
		Senator S. M. Kersten		
		Connétable of St. Mary		
		Connétable of St. Peter		
		Connétable of St. John		
		Connétable of St. Ouen		
		Connétable of Trinity		
		Connétable of Grouville		
		Connétable of St. Saviour		
		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
		Deputy C.F. Labey		
		Deputy M. Tadier		
		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		
		Deputy C.S. Alves		
		Deputy K.F. Morel		
		Deputy Gerald Voisin		
		Deputy R.E. Binet		
		Deputy T.A. Coles		

	Deputy C.D. Curtis		
	Deputy L.V. Feltham		
	Deputy M.R. Ferey		
	Deputy H.L. Jeune		
	Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		
	Deputy J. Renouf		
	Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		
	Deputy K.M. Wilson		
	Deputy L.D. Carpenter		
	Deputy S.J. Gleave		
	Deputy C.D. Leck		
	Deputy V. Li		
	Deputy A. Maltman		
	Deputy R.J. Parker		
	Deputy G.A. Raimondo		
	Deputy C.J. Rebindaine		
	Deputy P.J. Romeril		

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Those Members voting pour: the Connétables of St. Martin, St. Brelade and St. Helier, and Deputies Andrews, Alex Curtis and Ward.

11. Rate Appeal Board: appointment of Members (P.64/2026)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Rate Appeal Board: appointment of Members, P.64, lodged by the Minister for Treasury and Resources. The main respondent is the chair of Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – in pursuance of Article 44 of the Rates (Jersey) Law 2005, to appoint the following as members of the Rate Appeal Board from 1st October 2026 for an initial 3 year term: Mr. Matthew Beddoe, Ms. Daian Sumner, Mr. Olawale Bello, Mr. Mubashir Shaikh.

11.1 Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):

Today I am seeking Members' approval for the appointment of 4 individuals to the Rate Appeal Board with effect from 1st October 2026. Members may be aware that the Rate Appeal Board is established under the Rates (Jersey) Law 2005. Its members are required to hear and determine appeals against rateable value in accordance with the law, and undertake this role with no remuneration. The Rate Appeal Board represents the final stage in the rates appeal process, and I am sure Members will appreciate the important role it plays in ensuring that the system remains fair, robust, and independent. The individuals I am proposing for appointment are Mr. Matthew Beddoe,

Ms. Daian Sumner, Mr. Olawale Bello, and Mr. Mubashir Shaikh. These individuals bring a wealth of relevant experience and expertise to the board, although appeals are heard relatively infrequently. It is important that the board retains the necessary skills, experience and independent to discharge its responsibilities effectively. I am grateful both to the existing board members and to those proposed for appointment today for their willingness to give their time and service in support of this important work. I would like to extend my thanks also to the retiring board members, Miss Christine Vibert and Mr. Ron Treby, who retired from the board at the end of March this year for their valuable service and contribution. I propose the nominations.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition? Those in favour of adopting the proposition, kindly show. Thank you, Members, the proposition is adopted.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business for this meeting and I invite the chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose the Arrangement of Public Business for Future Meetings.

12. Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

At the moment there have been no changes since the publication of the Consolidated Order Paper. With only one proposition currently listed for the next meeting, I would anticipate the meeting will finish on Tuesday, unless other propositions are lodged and listed. Beyond the meeting on 29th September there are currently no propositions listed for debate. With that I propose the Arrangement of Public Business for Future Meetings.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy Alves. Are Members content to proceed as suggested by Deputy Alves? Are Members now content to adjourn? The States stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on 29th September.

ADJOURNMENT

[15:40]