

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 14th JULY 2026

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):.....	10
Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	10
Deputy M. Tadier:.....	11
Deputy H.L. Jeune:	11
Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	12
Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North:	12
Senator L.J. Farnham:	12
PUBLIC BUSINESS	14
1. Reduction of lodging period	14
1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:.....	14
1.1.1 Senator L.J. Farnham:.....	14
1.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	14
1.1.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:.....	15
2. Take No Action on the Draft States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order 202- (P.62/2026).....	16
2.1 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	17
2.1.1 Senator L.J. Farnham:.....	19
2.1.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	20
Mr. M. Jowitt K.C., H.M. Attorney General:	22
2.1.3 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	24
2.1.4 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	25
2.1.5 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:.....	26
2.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier:	26
2.1.7 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:.....	29
2.1.8 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	29
2.1.9 Deputy T.A. Coles:.....	31
APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS.....	33
3. Appointment of the Minister for Planning and Regulation	33
3.1 Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:.....	34
3.1.1 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:	36
3.1.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	36
3.1.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune:.....	36
3.1.4 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	37
3.1.5 Deputy A. F. Curtis:	37
3.1.6 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	37

3.1.7 Deputy T.A. Coles:.....	38
3.1.8 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:.....	38
3.1.9 Deputy C.S. Alves:.....	38
3.1.10 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement:	38
3.1.11 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:	39
3.1.12 Deputy V. Li:	39
3.1.13 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	40
3.1.14 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	40
3.1.15 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	40
3.1.16 Deputy K.M. Wilson:.....	41
3.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	41
3.2.1 Deputy B. Ward:.....	44
3.2.2 Deputy A.F. Curtis:	44
3.2.3 Deputy A.F. Curtis:	45
3.2.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune:.....	45
3.2.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:.....	45
3.2.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	46
3.2.7 Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South:	46
3.2.8 Deputy C.S. Alves:	47
3.2.9 Deputy V. Li:.....	47
3.2.10 Deputy K.M. Wilson:.....	48
3.2.11 The Connétable of St. Clement:.....	49
4. Appointment of the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee	50
4.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:.....	51
4.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	51
4.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	52
4.1.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	52
4.1.4 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	52
4.1.5 Deputy K.F. Morel:	53
5. Appointment of the Members of the Privileges and Procedures Committee	53
5.1 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):.....	53
5.2 Deputy C.S. Alves:	53
5.3 Deputy C.S. Alves:	54
6. Appointment of the elected Members of the Public Accounts Committee	54
6.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement (Chair, Public Accounts Committee):	54
7. Appointment of the Members of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel.....	54
7.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (Chair, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel):	55
8. Appointment of the Members of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel	55
8.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South (Chair, Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel):	55
9. Appointment of the Members of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel.....	56

9.1 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):	56
10. Appointment of the Members of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel:	56
10.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (Chair, Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel):	57
11. Appointment of the Members of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel....	57
11.1 Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South (Chair, Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):	57
12. Appointment of Members of the Planning Committee.....	58
12.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Chair, Planning Committee):.....	58
13. Appointment of 2 States Commissioners of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission. 58	
13.1 Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin (Chair, Jersey Overseas Aid Commission):	58
13.2 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:.....	59
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	59
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT	59
14. Appointment of 2 Members of the States Employment Board	61
14.1 Senator L.J. Farnham (Chair, States Employment Board):	61
15. Election of a Member to represent the States of Jersey in the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly	61
15.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South:	62
15.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	62
16. Appointment of Members of the Bailiff's Consultative Panel.	62
16.1 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:.....	62
16.2 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:.....	62
16.3 Senator H.M. Miles:	63
16.4 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:.....	63
16.5 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	63
16.6 Deputy R.E. Binet of Grouville and St. Martin:.....	63
17. Election of an Associate Member to represent the States of Jersey in the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly	64
17.1 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement:	64
17.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	64
17.3 Deputy P.J. Romeril of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	64
QUESTIONS.....	64
18. Written Questions	64
18.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Strategic Reserve Fund, including investment income, withdrawals and allocations to the new health facility. (WQ.86/2026).....	65

18.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding Jersey Employment Trust and additional funding arrangements beyond 2026. (WQ.87/2026).....	69
18.3 Deputy K.M. Wilson of the Chief Minister regarding fuel stock levels, supply continuity and fuel contingency planning. (WQ.88/2026).....	70
18.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding trees on private land falling onto public roads or footpaths. (WQ.89/2026).....	70
18.5 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) assessments. (WQ.90/2026)...	73
18.6 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding visa vignettes, wet ink passport stamps and EU Settled Status confirmation letters. (WQ.91/2026).....	77
18.7 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the use of additional Budget funding to increase teachers' planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time. (WQ.93/2026).....	78
18.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding the transfer of funds from the Social Security Reserve Fund to the Social Security Fund in 2026. (WQ.94/2026)	78
18.9 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding Jersey's technology industry. (WQ. 95/2026)	79
18.10 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Housing regarding potential changes to the affordable housing rental cap and the impact on Andium Homes' business model. (WQ.96/2026)	81
18.11 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the review of statutory youth service provision. (WQ.97/2026)	82
18.12 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the DFDS service disruption following the Tarifa Jet collision. (WQ.98/2026).....	83
18.13 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding the establishment of electoral registers. (WQ.99/2026)	85
18.14 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding efforts by the Ports of Jersey to attract additional freight forwarding companies to the Island. (WQ.100/2026).....	86
18.15 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding actions being taken to attract an additional freight forwarding company to Jersey. (WQ.101/2026)	86
18.16 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Jersey Graduate Teacher Training Programme. (WQ.102/2026)	87
18.17 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) assessment provision in Jersey (WQ.103/2026).....	88
18.18 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding jury service in Jersey. (WQ.104/2026)	88
18.19 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding measures in schools to encourage and facilitate voting by eligible students. (WQ.105/2026).....	89

18.20	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding correspondence with DFDS following the Tarifa Jet collision and any contractual implications. (WQ.106/2026).....	90
18.21	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for the Environment regarding prosecutions under the Public Health and Safety (Rented Dwellings) (Jersey) Law 2018. (WQ.107/2026).....	91
18.22	Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the projected increase in the Government deficit in 2026. (WQ.109/2026)	91
18.23	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Children and Families regarding progress towards introducing internet filtering requirements to protect children from harmful online content. (WQ.111/2026)	92
18.24	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding progress in reprioritising funding for Le Rocquier School and community sports facilities. (WQ.112/2026)	92
18.25	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the performance of DFDS services and actions being taken to secure improvements. (WQ.113/2026).....	93
18.26	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding restricted tenure properties data. (WQ.114/2026)	94
18.27	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Westward development at South Hill. (WQ.115/2026)	95
18.28	Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding Jersey's ferry service. (WQ.116/2026)	95
18.29	Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the condition of Jersey's road surfaces. (WQ.118/2026)	96
18.30	Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding SEND and inclusion funding. (WQ.119/2026)	97
18.31	Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Childcare Funding Scheme. (WQ.120/2026)	100
18.32	Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding LibertyBus fleet renewal. (WQ.121/2026)	101
18.33	Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding swimming safety measures at Victoria Marine Lake. (WQ.122/2026)	101
18.34	Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for the Environment regarding Les Mielles Golf and Country Club site. (WQ.123/2026) ...	102
18.35	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the coordination of roadworks, road closures and traffic management arrangements to minimise congestion. (WQ.124/2026)	103
18.36	Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding public transport access to the new hospital. WQ.125/2026)	105
18.37	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding coordination of roadworks, road closures and traffic management arrangements between the Parishes and Government. (WQ.126/2026)	106
18.38	Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Social Security regarding a comprehensive review of the Long-Term Care Scheme. (WQ.127.2026)	107
18.39	Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding consultation and planning for the proposed new town school on the former Jersey Gas site. (WQ.128/2026)	108

18.40 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).....	109
18.41 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Social Security regarding analysis of the operation, costs, effectiveness and public understanding of the Long-Term Care Scheme. (WQ.130/2026).....	111
18.42 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the financial and distributional impact of reducing excise duty on road fuel. (WQ.131/2026)	112
18.43 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding free admission to the Jersey Museum. (WQ.132/2026)	112
18.44 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)	113
18.45 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Chief Minister regarding the development of individual Ministerial Plans and engagement with Scrutiny on Government priorities. (WQ.134/2026)	114
18.46 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding the transfer of prisoners from H.M.P. La Moye to United Kingdom prisons. (WQ.135/2026).....	114
18.47 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding progress in responding to United Nations recommendations on tackling child poverty in Jersey (WQ.136/2026)	115
18.48 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding plans to improve access to children's sport and active play opportunities. (WQ.137/2026).....	116
18.49 Connétable I Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Social Security regarding eligibility criteria and discretionary support arrangements for the 2026 Back to School Bonus. (WQ.138/2026)	117
18.50 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chief Minister regarding ministerial responsibilities following the creation of a Minister for Planning and Regulation. (WQ.139/2026)	118
18.51 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding trainee nurses and other public sector trainees. (WQ.140/2026).....	119
18.52 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding assessments of infrastructure upgrades required across the States property estate to prepare for future heatwaves. (WQ.141/2026).....	120
18.53 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the cost and household impact of removing GST from food and essential grocery items. (WQ.142/2026).....	121
19. Oral Questions.....	122
19.1 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the Victoria Marine Lake. (OQ.58/2026)	122
Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for Infrastructure):	122
19.1.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:	122
19.1.2 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	122
19.1.3 Connétable A. Howell of Trinity:	123

19.1.4	Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	123
19.1.5	Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:	123
19.1.6	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	124
19.1.7	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	124
19.1.8	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	124
19.1.9	Deputy M. Tadier:	125
19.1.10	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	125
19.1.11	The Connétable of St. Helier:	125
19.2	Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Chief Minister regarding the Automatic Voter Registration Project. (OQ.53/2026)	126
	Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):	126
19.2.1	The Connétable of St. Martin:	127
19.2.2	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	127
19.2.3	Deputy T.A. Coles:	127
19.2.4	Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	127
19.2.5	Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	128
19.2.6	The Connétable of St. John:	128
19.2.7	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	128
19.2.8	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	128
19.3	Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding charging a separate stamp duty on residential mortgages from the stamp duty charged on property purchases. (OQ.56/2026)...	129
	Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):	129
19.3.1	Deputy H.L. Jeune:	129
19.3.2	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	129
19.3.3	Deputy T.A. Coles:	129
19.3.4	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	130
19.3.5	Deputy M. Tadier:	130
19.3.6	Deputy H.L. Jeune:	130
19.4	Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the number of referrals received by the Children and Families Hub. (OQ55/2026).....	131
	Connétable R.P. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):	131
19.4.1	Deputy V. Li:	131
19.5	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Chief Minister regarding Palestine. (OQ.60/2026).....	132
	Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):	132
19.5.1	Deputy T.A. Coles:	132
19.5.2	Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central:	132
19.5.3	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	133
19.5.4	Deputy M. Tadier:	133
19.6	Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding the reference to child poverty in Jersey within the United Nations Economic and Social Council's concluding observations on the seventh periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. (OQ.52/2026)	134

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):.....	134
19.6.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	134
19.6.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	135
19.6.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:	135
19.6.4 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	135
19.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding an education-specific Human Capital Strategy. (OQ.62/2026).....	135
Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning):	135
19.7.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:	136
19.8 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chief Minister regarding what renewable energy, incentives and Government actions shall be prioritised. (OQ.57/2026).....	136
Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):.....	136
19.8.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	136
19.9 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding project priorities during the term. (OQ.61/2026).....	137
Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for Infrastructure):	137
19.9.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	137
19.10 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Extension of Time Dangerous Building Notice issued in respect of 106 and 108 Rouge Bouillon. (OQ.59/2026)	138
Senator Sir M.J. Boleat (The Minister for Planning and Regulation):	138
19.10.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:.....	138
19.10.2 Connétable A. Howell of Trinity:	139
19.10.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	139
19.10.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	139
19.10.5 The Connétable of St. Helier:.....	139
19.11 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding election costs. (OQ.54/2026)	140
Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean (The Minister for Treasury and Resources):	140
19.11.1 The Connétable of St. Martin:.....	140
19.11.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:	140
19.11.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:.....	140
19.11.4 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	141
19.11.5 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	141
19.11.6 The Connétable of St. John:	141
19.11.7 The Connétable of St. Martin:.....	141
20. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for the Environment	142
20.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North:.....	142
Senator M.R. Le Hegarat (The Minister for the Environment):	142
20.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	142
20.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	142

20.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	142
20.3.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	143
20.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	143
20.4.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	143
20.5 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	144
20.5.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:.....	144
20.6 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:.....	144
20.6.1 The Connétable of St. Mary:.....	144
20.7 Deputy A. Maltman of St Mary, St Ouen and St Peter:	144
20.7.1 Deputy A. Maltman:	145
20.8 Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement:	145
20.9 Deputy M. Tadier:	145
20.9.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	145
21. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Health and Social Services.	146
21.1 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	146
Senator T.J.A. Binet (The Minister for Health and Social Services):.....	146
21.1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	146
21.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	146
21.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	146
21.3 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:.....	147
21.3.1 The Connétable of St. John:.....	147
21.4 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	147
21.4.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	148
21.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	148
21.5.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:	148
21.6 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	148
21.6.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:	148
21.7 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	149
21.7.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:.....	149
21.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	149
21.8.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	149
21.9 Deputy M. Tadier:	149
21.9.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	150
21.10 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	150
22. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister	150
22.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	150
Senator L.J. Farnham (The Chief Minister):.....	150
22.1.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:.....	151
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	151
23. Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):.....	151
ADJOURNMENT	151

[9:30]

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

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

I believe a response to my Written Question ... and though we have been in correspondence about 139, I have further concerns about 133 that contravenes Standing Order 12(2A). I do not believe it answers directly my question. It is regarding the financial impact of R.106/2026, the order that will be put forward, about the financial impact of transfer for the Minister for Planning and Regulation and the Minister for ...

The Bailiff:

That is Written Question 123?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

133.

The Bailiff:

I will ensure you get a ruling by the time set out in the Standing Orders. Connétable of St. Peter, your light was on. Not anymore.

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

In relation to P.62, which has been lodged, I was going to ask the Assembly whether they would consider debating that item, of course with the permission of the proposer himself, given the order of the Order Paper. If we do not do that, the first item would be to ask the Assembly to appoint a Minister for Planning and Regulation, so I thought, out of respect for the Assembly and the proposition, we should debate that as the first item.

The Bailiff:

So the proposition you make is that P.62 be debated now?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition that we take P.62 now?

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

Sir, could we hear the views of the proposer, please?

The Bailiff:

It is a matter for him.

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

If it helps, I am easy whichever way. I am happy to do it now, I am happy to do it after Questions, however the Assembly feels comfortable.

The Bailiff:

We only get to Questions after we deal with appointments. Deputy Tadier, your light was on momentarily.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I do not remember a situation where we have done propositions before Questions, but I may be wrong.

The Bailiff:

Nor do I, but the Assembly is the master of its own procedure, so if Members vote for it then it will happen.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do not know if it is appropriate to speak now or if it is just ...

The Bailiff:

In relation to whether we take P.62 first, that is the only thing we are debating now.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think we are in danger of setting some worrying precedents for governmental convenience. Questions have been tabled, there is an expectation, and certainly it has not been any different in my 18 years here, and even longer I think for others who have been here before, we do Questions first and then when they are done we move on to States business. I think it is entirely appropriate that this be the first item of business, but it is already a shortened lodging period. So if we were to observe normal protocol with the 3-week lodging period this would be debated in September, everyone would have a chance to properly reflect and consult with our constituents, which we should be doing. It seems to me that Government is already rushing this through, and to ask for an extra couple of hours to set a precedent, which has never been done before, would, I think, be highly unusual.

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I also have a concern with putting this proposition first, because, for example, we have with Questions without notice, we have the Minister for the Environment and those were the times - and the Chief Minister both - where we could be asking those kind of questions, detailed questions, that we need to help us in understanding a bit more about the proposition. I would probably propose that if we seek to do the proposition now, to ask that the appointment for the Minister for Planning and Regulation goes after, so the last point of order of today rather than the first so that we do Questions first.

The Bailiff:

If you wish to propose that you can propose that after this has been dealt with. That is a different proposition, but you can propose that. Does anyone else wish to speak on this matter whether or not we debate P.62 now?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

May I seek a point of clarification? Unless I have misread the Order Paper, I understood we were going to deal with the appointments before Questions.

The Bailiff:

That is right, yes. Are you asking me a question or making a speech? The Order Paper is what the Order Paper is.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, but what the clarification is, that the election of the Minister for Planning and Regulation was due to be the first item.

The Bailiff:

Yes.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The rationale behind my request is so we give the proposer the respect of debating his proposition, otherwise I would be minded to sign the order, in which case his proposition would not be available.

The Bailiff:

This is not a point of order, though. You are making a ...

Senator L.J. Farnham:

No, Sir, a point of clarification. My clarification, it seemed that some Members were under the impression that we were doing Questions first, but we are not.

The Bailiff:

No, we are not.

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

I just rise to support what Deputy Tadier said in the form of precedent-setting. My understanding, and perhaps you can let me know if I am correct, Sir, that it would be precedent-setting perhaps to move the proposition now but what Deputy Jeune has suggested, which would be to move the appointment after the debate on the proposition, would not in fact be setting different precedent to what has happened previously.

The Bailiff:

You are right, certainly it is unusual to deal with the proposition before we have Appointments or Questions but the Assembly can determine its own procedure and, as you say, if it is wished, then the election for the new Minister in question could be postponed until after Questions. That is equally possible as well.

Deputy F.G. Voisin of St. Helier North:

I would have thought that if we want to move on with appointing the Minister then we should deal with this proposition now. It would be illogical surely to bypass the election of the Minister for Planning and Regulation so that we can have a debate about whether we are actually going to create the ministerial role in the first place. Let us have this debate, get it agreed or not, and then we can deal with the appointments.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else want to speak on the proposition before the Assembly now, whether or not we determine P.62 first? If no one else wishes to speak, I call upon the Chief Minister to reply.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I thank Members for their comments and reiterate the rationale behind this request was, as Deputy Voisin stated, to deal with this so we can get on with the appointment or otherwise, depending on which way the Assembly votes. I make the proposition and ask for the appel, please.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting on the proposal to debate P.62 now. If all Members have the chance to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting.

POUR: 36

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. Clement
 Connétable of St. Ouen
 Connétable of Trinity
 Connétable of Grouville
 Connétable of St. Saviour
 Connétable of St. Lawrence
 Deputy C.F. Labey
 Deputy F. G. Voisin
 Deputy R.E. Binet
 Deputy A.F. Curtis
 Deputy C.D. Curtis
 Deputy M.R. Ferey
 Deputy J. Renouf
 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson
 Deputy B. Ward
 Deputy K.M. Wilson
 Deputy S.J. Gleave
 Deputy V. Li
 Deputy A. Maltman

CONTRE: 8

Deputy M. Tadier
 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet
 Deputy C.S. Alves
 Deputy M.B. Andrews
 Deputy L.V. Feltham
 Deputy H.L. Jeune
 Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée
 Deputy L.D. Carpenter

ABSTAINED: 1

Deputy T.A. Coles

Deputy G.A. Raimondo

Deputy C.J. Rebindaine

Deputy P.J. Romeril

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Reduction of lodging period

The Bailiff:

Deputy Coles, before we begin the debate proper, do you wish to make the proposition under Standing Order 26(7) that the lodging period be reduced to allow P.62 to be debated at this sitting?

[9:45]

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier Central:

Yes, please, Sir. Do I say a couple of words now?

The Bailiff:

Yes, if you wish to.

1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

As the Chief Minister has already highlighted, this would have been a Ministerial Order that he would have signed and had to be enacted within 2 weeks. Of course, that 2-week period does not allow for proper process to lodge propositions, because that does require 3 weeks. As the Minister alluded to, he could have signed this Order, which would have meant the debate would have come back in at least 3 sittings' time, so with an annulment request, which is a different debate and a different proposition. At least, if we can debate this one today, then we are more flexible with our approach. So, I hope the Assembly can agree that we can shorten the lodging period.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition that the lodging period is reduced?

1.1.1 Senator L.J. Farnham:

I take on board the point about the 2 weeks for the order, which was within the required notice. Our hands were tied by the timings of the election, the appointment of Ministers and, of course, the final sitting before the summer recess, and I was keen to ensure the Council of Ministers was fully constituted before the summer recess as we need to get on with the work that lies ahead of us. I hope that provides a useful explanation to Members.

1.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I am not sure I will be supporting the vote to reduce the lodging period because I think this has only been done because Deputy Coles is trying to accommodate already some very bad practice that we are seeing from this Council of Ministers. They have not even been constituted yet properly ... well, they have been voted in the other week, and I think we are gaining an attempt here to ride roughshod over procedure. We have seen that already exemplified this morning, and the 2-week lodging period for the Ministerial Order has not even elapsed. What the Chief Minister should have done is that he should have lodged the Ministerial Order, let it sit over the summer and allowed Deputy Coles to also have his proposition, which would have sat over the summer so that there could be proper public scrutiny. The Scrutiny Panel for Environment and Housing has not even been formed yet, yet we are actually creating a completely new Ministry; so much for small government of course. But that is a matter for perhaps the main debate, and we expect this

Assembly to do its job of proper general scrutiny. I, for one, am not going to support the lodging period being reduced, even though it is being done by my party colleague for the right reasons, to accommodate a Government which clearly does not respect the democratic process and the democratic norms and, quite frankly, a shame on some of those Ministers who should know better who are towing this line from a very early stage.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the proposition to reduce the lodging period? If no one else wishes to speak, I ask Deputy Coles to reply.

1.1.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I do not really have much to conclude with, but I do hope the Assembly can agree to shorten the lodging period because I would rather get this debate out of the way now and allow either the Council of Ministers to carry on or them to actually start the work that the debate requires.

The Bailiff:

Is the appel called for?

Deputy T.A. Coles:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for, Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting.

POUR: 43

CONTRE: 4

ABSTAINED: 0

Senator L.J. Farnham

Connétable of St. Saviour

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean

Deputy M. Tadier

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat

Deputy M.B. Andrews

Senator T.J.A. Binet

Deputy B. Ward

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. Clement

Connétable of St. Ouen

Connétable of Trinity
Connétable of Grouville
Connétable of St. Lawrence
Deputy C.F. Labey
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet
Deputy C.S. Alves
Deputy K.F. Morel
Deputy F. G. Voisin
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 K.M. Wilson
Deputy L.D. Carpenter
Deputy S.J. Gleave
Deputy V. Li
Deputy A. Maltman
Deputy R.J. Parker
Deputy G.A. Raimondo
Deputy C.J. Rebindaine
Deputy P.J. Romeril

2. Take No Action on the Draft States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order 202- (P.62/2026)

The Bailiff:

We move on to Take No Action on the Draft States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order lodged by Deputy Coles. The main respondent is the Chief Minister. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to request the Chief Minister to take no action to make or enact the Draft States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order 202- as appended to the Notice under Article 29A(3) of the States of Jersey Law 2005: Changes to Ministerial Offices 2026 (R.106/2026) until – (a) a report has been presented by the Chief Minister

to the States which includes – (i) details of any additional costs and staffing implications of establishing the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation; (ii) clarification of the lines of officer accountability to the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation and whether any of these officers will also be accountable to other Ministers; (iii) the reasoning behind the transfer of responsibilities for items listed in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Amendment Order and an explanation of the alternatives (if any) that were considered; (iv) details of any consideration the Chief Minister gave to merging other Ministerial roles before creating the position of Minister for Planning and Regulation; and (b) the States has debated and voted on the establishment of the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation, in light of the information provided within (a).

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

That was a lively start to our first debate in this new Assembly, so I thank everybody for their patience and agreeing that we can take this now. I also will acknowledge that obviously the Chief Minister has produced the comments paper, but that obviously came in late yesterday so I have not really had a chance to prep and plan responses to that. I may do that more in my summing up of this debate. Some Members of this Assembly will already know, and those who do not know will probably figure out soon, that I am a bit of a stickler for following process. This is probably why I ended up chairing the Machinery of Government Sub-Committee at P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) for the final 2 years of the last Assembly. This sub-committee looked at the Democratic Accountability and Governance Report and recommendations to see how they are being implemented, as well as looking at the machinery of our Government and the Assembly, making recommendations and propositions about how we can make improvements. Because of this, my first reaction when hearing the Chief Minister had decided to create a new Ministry was the D.A.G.S. (Democratic Accountability and Governance Sub-Committee) Report. The first recommendation of the D.A.G.S. Report says that each department should have one Minister who is ultimately accountable for the whole of the department. Where the scope of the department is such that it is felt that additional Ministers are required, there should be a lead Minister and a non-C.O.M. (Council of Ministers) Minister with the responsibility of specific areas of the department. That would mean creating an Assistant Minister. There have been questions around the Department of Infrastructure and Environment for a while, as it has 2 Ministers and one chief officer. But of course, the name suggests there are quite clear lines of that definition about who is responsible for what area. It also helps that the director of regulation has statutory protections in place should the regulator need to take on the other department. The problem from here is that R.106 did not provide the details of how the department structure is going to change to account for the additional Minister. Which Minister is going to have ultimate accountability? Of course, with the department restructure the budget will also need to be considered. What staffing and resources will be required? What projects will need to be stopped to allow for the new Minister to start to achieve what they want to achieve? This is before we even start to ask the question around the legislation that will come under ministerial responsibility. When we were in the last Assembly, as in the last meeting of the Assembly, we appointed the Minister for the Environment, Senator Mary Le Hegarat, and in answering a question from Deputy Alex Curtis in relation to the Agricultural Land (Control of Sale and Leases) Law 1974, the Minister for the Environment ended by saying: “I think it is the Environment Department’s remit to ensure that when land is being sold or transferred that all the rules are applied.” Now, I am sure you probably miss Deputy Rob Ward but I hope this will help soften it. I am going to paraphrase George Michael, and apologise that it is not Billy Bragg, because: “Last sitting the Chief Minister gave her this law and the very next day he took it away, and this sitting to save some from tears, he’s given it to someone he thinks is special.” **[Laughter]** **[Approbation]** Though I jest, it does demonstrate the problem. Legislation is being moved from one Minister to another, but it had not been communicated before the appointments were made. R.106 also indicates that the responsibility for other legislation is being

moved from the remit of Sustainable Economic Development to both the Minister for the Environment and the potential new Minister for Planning and Regulation. This brings in a few questions to my mind. Has all the legislation been considered and discussed before making this decision? It seems that some of this has been a bit rushed and not thought through properly. We have seen that Senator Boleat has been given delegated functions already, so there is nothing stopping the Senator starting work already but as an Assistant Minister. Then why not have an Assistant Minister crossing portfolios with delegated functions? This has clearly been considered with other matters, as Senator Kersten has delegated functions for sport from multiple ministerial portfolios. So why does the new position of Minister for Planning and Regulation have to exist? The Chief Minister has 12 Ministers ... there is something quite biblical about that; we do pray for his sake that he does not find out who Judas is within the first couple of years. That is 12 potential areas of political accountability, not including the Chief Minister himself, where legislation on portfolios could be redeployed to deliver on the Common Strategic Policy. Maybe part of the issue lies in Standing Orders and maybe it is in the States of Jersey Law. Maybe it is something to whoever chairs the Machinery of Government Sub-committee will consider in this term, perhaps. But I simply do not understand the rush to create this position. It is not clear why this is necessary. It is not clear why it is okay for one remit to be covered by an Assistant Minister, but another needs to be a Minister. I think it is best that we address a question that some may be thinking, that why did I not question the Chief Minister in the last term when he decided to split Education and Children? Well, the Care Inquiry recommended that a Children's Minister should be created, and, until the split, it was an addition to another portfolio. Given this Island's historic failings, we needed to do better for our young people, be that their journey through care, mental health issues, or simply to allow that every child has a chance. When we look back at why the Department of Environment, and therefore the Minister for the Environment, was created, and in that creation held the Planning Department. It was to ensure that a balance between our environment and development was maintained. Jersey is a beautiful island, as I am sure we all agree. The problem with islands though, especially small ones, is that there is a finite amount of space and land, and we need to balance this space with building homes and appropriate places for businesses of many different types. This challenge gets tougher when one of our main business types on this Island is agriculture, so we need farmland. We need to balance our impact on wildlife and ecosystems. I hope everybody is aware to the risk of human life if all bees disappeared. Bees do not exist in isolation, they are part of a wider ecosystem. It remains unclear to me, when the Minister for the Environment talks about being a statutory consultee to planning, what this means. There are many parts of the Environment Department that already act as statutory consultees, from land control to historic environments. This acts to balance the policies of the Bridging Island Plan and the consultees across the Island. A new Island Plan, or at least a review of some of the policies, is needed. But does this need a new Minister to achieve that? I have talked about the connection between environment and planning, but what about regulation? This is an area that definitely needs to be looked into. There have always been concerns around the regulators sitting in Government, meant to be holding Government to account while being in the same department, under the same chief officer who has the department that is probably one of the largest pollution risks to this Island. That is not to say that the Department of Infrastructure does not do a good job of preventing these issues and controlling them. As I mentioned earlier, with the director of regulation and statutory protections, if they need to prosecute, these glass walls are well in place. However, the question of those making the rules are also enforcing the rules. The States of Jersey Police do not do this. If there is a consideration of splitting regulation, why not give wider consideration to splitting the role of rule maker with enforcement? Again, something which R.106 does not make clear. Article 26A of the States of Jersey Law gives the Chief Minister powers to create Ministers, abolish Ministers, and make provisions for Ministers' functions. But should we, as an Assembly, accept the large and more fundamental changes without prior scrutiny and

parliamentary process? The initial report is light on detail. My requests, outlined in my proposition, are reasonable.

[10:00]

With delegated functions, this request does not hold up any work. I urge Members to support this proposition to provide clarity to the Assembly and transparency to the public. I make my proposition.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition?

2.1.1 Senator L.J. Farnham:

I welcome the opportunity to respond to this proposition because it raises an important question about how we organise government to best serve Islanders. At its heart this debate is not about creating another layer of bureaucracy or undertaking a major reorganisation of government. It is about ensuring that ministerial responsibilities reflect the increasing scale, complexity and importance of 2 distinct areas of public policy. The proposition before us, brought by Deputy Cole, suggests that the creation of a Minister for Planning and Regulation should be delayed until further reports have been prepared. The Council of Ministers do not believe that this is necessary, and I therefore ask Members to reject the proposition. The proposition to create the new Ministry has followed the statutory process set out in the States of Jersey Law. Notice was given on 29th June, and Members have had the required notice period. The proposed amendment order has been published, together with the legislation affected. Members can retain their established powers under the Legislation Law, should they wish, to challenge the order once made. This process is neither new nor exceptional. Indeed, it is precisely, as the Deputy alluded to, the same process that was followed when the office of Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning was created in 2024. Then we had 4 weeks, I think, because of the timing of the change of Government and the dates for the established Assembly sittings. This, we only have 2 weeks. Planning and environment protection have evolved significantly over recent years. Planning today is central to delivering many of the priorities Islanders have asked us to address. It was a key and regular topic for discussion during the recent election, because it influences the delivery of homes. It influences our infrastructure, business confidence, investment right across the community. It influences economic growth. At the same time, the environmental portfolio has expanded considerably. It now encompasses biodiversity, biosecurity, agriculture, fisheries, marine resources, climate adaptation, water and air quality, P.F.A.S. (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances), monitoring and scientific oversight, countryside management, Jersey Met., animal welfare and veterinary services, our natural heritage, and, very importantly, our international environmental responsibilities. These are each substantial portfolios in their own right. The Council of Ministers therefore believes that they each require dedicated ministerial leadership. I refer to a proposition brought by the then Deputy Paul Le Claire in 2009 that actually asked the Assembly to consider splitting the roles of Ministers for similar reasons, but also the inference there was that planning was advantaged in the joint roles, as they were then, and the environment were disadvantaged. Now it seems to be the other way around. It seems that the proposer may think, and others may think, and public discourse in certain areas may think, that the environment will be disadvantaged now, which is not the case, as I will explain. It does not weaken environmental protections. I believe exactly the opposite. For many years, successive Ministers have carried responsibility for both planning and the environment within a single portfolio. I believe separating these 2 responsibilities provide greater clarity, greater transparency, and stronger democratic accountability. It allows the Minister for the Environment to devote her full attention to the increasingly complex environmental challenges facing our Island. Equally, a dedicated Minister for Planning and Regulation will be able to focus

fully on improving the planning service. Members will know that planning is often cited by Islanders and businesses alike as an area where we need to improve. We need to reduce unnecessary delays. We need to modernise the regulation. We need to improve customer service and make the whole process less expensive for Islanders and businesses. I would also like to confirm that there are no additional resource implications arising from the establishment of this ministerial officer, or at least none we can establish at this time. Of course, I would remind Members, we will have the Budget process coming up in the near future. If there are to be any changes we can deal with that during that process, but officials do not anticipate that currently. No new department is being created, no new directorate is being established, the existing organisational structure remains exactly as it is today. But what does change is the political accountability, which becomes clearer. The proposition also asks about officer accountability. Again, the answer is straightforward. The proposer aligns ministerial responsibility with the department's existing operational arrangements. It does not reorganise the department. It simply provides 2 Ministers with clearly defined responsibilities, each accountable to this Assembly for their respective portfolios. The transfer of legislation has similarly been approached on a logical basis. Legislation has been allocated according to function. Legislation relating to planning and wider regulatory responsibilities sits with the Minister for Planning and Regulation. Legislation concerning the natural environment, agriculture, fisheries and environmental protection will remain with the Minister for the Environment. Attached to the comments, I have appended a list of all the pieces of legislation that will sit within the relative Ministry, if approved by this Assembly. The proposer asks whether the ministerial structures were considered. The answer is yes. Every incoming Government and Chief Minister reviews and applies careful thought to ministerial portfolios. That has happened under successive administrations since ministerial Government was introduced in 2005. From time to time, new ministerial offices have been created because priorities have changed. External Relations, for example, International Development, Children and Families, Education and Lifelong Learning, each reflected changing circumstances and the need at the time for greater ministerial focus. Following careful consideration, the Council of Ministers concluded that separating planning and regulation from environment represented the most effective governance arrangement. Conversely, we did not consider it appropriate to merge the remaining environmental responsibilities with the Sustainable Economic Development Department, as also mentioned by the Deputy, because both are major portfolios and both require dedicated leadership. To combine them would dilute ministerial focus rather than strengthen it. Ultimately, this debate comes down to one simple question: do we believe Government works better when Ministers have clear, manageable and accountable portfolios? I believe it does. As Government has evolved, planning, regulation and environmental responsibilities have grown considerably in both breadth and complexity. This proposal is therefore not about creating more government, it is about creating better government. It strengthens environmental leadership. It strengthens planning performance. It improves accountability. It supports sustainable economic growth. It will provide clearer ministerial focus. It does so without reorganising the department or creating additional resource implications. In closing, I would like to confirm to Members that I firmly believe this is a measured and proportionate evolution of our ministerial structure. It reflects recognised principles of good governance and ministerial accountability. For those reasons, I ask Members to reject P.62 and allow the creation of the Minister for Planning and Regulation, so that both Ministers for Planning and the Environment, can begin the important work for which they have been selected.

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

I support Deputy Coles's proposition. This is not a proposition against the principle of a Minister for Planning and Regulation. It is a proposition that says, before we make this permanent show us the workings. That is a reasonable thing for this Assembly, I think, to ask. We must remember as

a starting point that if Deputy Coles had not brought this proposition we would not have the level of detail we have in front of us in the comments paper. Yet the Minister for Planning and Regulation's role has substantially changed since R.106 was published, and I would say there is still very much unanswered questions and details to be had. I have concerns to the answers I was given in my Written Questions - Written Question 133 and Written Question 139 - which tried to dig deeper into the analysis behind the split, as all we have is R.103 and R.109. This was as chair of Scrutiny because my panel has not been formed and therefore I cannot write specific questions to the Chief Minister, letters to the Chief Minister or to the Minister for the Environment to understand in detail further what is happening. Therefore I had to write Written Questions, and I believe those answers were not comprehensive enough. I would invite Members, if they have not seen the answers for themselves, to see the little content of the answers that were given to me. Yet since R.106 was published, as I have just spoken about, the scope of the transfer has changed significantly. The Chief Minister says in his speech just now that the Members had time to review this, but I would question when did we have time? We had R.106, yes, but only yesterday, about 4 o'clock, did we actually see the final divisions between the laws and also a little bit more information behind that. That is very little time to do any analysis or be able to ask any further questions on that. For example, in detail, 8 pieces of legislation have been pulled back from the transfer to Planning and Regulation that was mentioned in R.106, and now they will stay with the Environment. That is 8 pieces of legislation, and not little legislation; these are quite substantial legislation. For example, as Deputy Coles has already said, the Agricultural Land (Control of Sales and Leases), the Protection of Agricultural Land, Pesticides, the Plant Health, the Weeds Law, EU legislation, export of flowers and potatoes. Those were all considered in R.106 to be important; important enough to give to the Minister for Planning and Regulation. Now they have changed and it will be back with the Minister for the Environment. This is essentially the entire agricultural and biosecurity block reversed between when we received the report and the final comments paper, which again I might add that if we had not got this proposition we would not know that, and we would be going into supporting the Minister for Planning and Regulation appointment without actually knowing that those 8 substantial laws have been pulled back and staying with the Minister for the Environment. I am not saying that the analysis of whether it was right or wrong depending on which, for myself, but I would like to understand why it was deemed necessary to give the Minister for Planning and Regulation those specific laws and what analysis was done behind that when that split was first given, and then what is the analysis now for why that law is now left with the Minister for the Environment. What are the workings and evidence-based scrutiny behind understanding that split? The legislation says, and this was said in the report, that the allocation was the nature of the function it governs. I know the Chief Minister has already said this in his speech, so why then again was this analysis of the nature of the functions it governs sound in June but has changed substantially a few weeks later? I also raised a few weeks ago that there was actually a discrepancy between Report 106 and Report 109, which set up Senator Boleat's position as Assistant Minister to the Minister for the Environment, and at least that has now been resolved. This included the Water Law, Water Pollution Law and Water Resources.

[10:15]

This will all now stay with Environment, and I welcome that clarity and this means, of course, the Minister for the Environment will work on P.F.A.S. as a priority. But again this gives the example that there seemed to be no evidence-based analysis behind the splits, because we saw that there were 3 laws that had been assigned to the Assistant Minister but then fell away and was not going to be assigned to the Minister for Planning and Regulation. Now, of course, they all have changed again. But I would say not only of these, there are so many questions to the split and trying to get information behind why there is a split because of these changes that happened, and again we would not know that if we did not have the comments paper. There are still no answers specifically

about the overlapping functions especially around enforcement. Who has final responsibility, especially when it comes to contaminated land or water pollution or breaking the Wildlife Law? There is very little information about how enforcement will work and that overall accountability. I want to give an example, the Waste Management Law 2005, that law that governs licensing of waste sites and the polluter-pays cost principle for waste-related pollution has been transferred to the Minister for Planning and Regulation. But the Water Pollution Law, Water Resources Law and Water Law all remain with the Minister for the Environment. If contaminated waste from a site regulated under one law reaches water regulated under another law, which Minister leads? The answer I have been given with my Written Question is that the Ministers and officials will work together, as it is routinely done. But I do not believe this is good enough when 2 relevant laws now sit in different departments. I want to know, for Scrutiny's sake, which Minister will lead enforcement action where contamination from a licensed waste site under the former is found to affect water quality regulated under the latter. These are the kinds of questions that I think we should be going to the crux of before we decide about the split.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Would the Member give way for a point of clarification?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes, of course.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Does she think that these questions might be helpfully answered by the Attorney General during the course of this debate and if so, would she be minded to put some of those to him?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Absolutely, I would be happy to but at the moment the Attorney General is not here ... fantastic.
[Laughter]

The Bailiff:

Perhaps a message could be sent to the Attorney General, Greffier.

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Sir, he is back.

Mr. M. Jowitt K.C., H.M. Attorney General:

From what I have been listening to, these are questions for the Minister, they are not questions for me as to how the work is divided up between departments. That is not a legal question.

The Bailiff:

Have you finished your speech?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

No, Sir. Those I think are questions therefore then I would like to hear the Minister for the Environment or potential Minister for Planning and Regulation to answer within this debate, which would be useful because I am sure that they have thought about this and they have talked about this, and they would be able to answer my questions.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Sorry, there is one more point of clarification and I do not want to make a habit of this.

The Bailiff:

Are you prepared to give way?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Does the Member believe that it would be helpful to know what the legal responsibility is and the statutory basis is for whom ultimately the buck stops with?

The Bailiff:

I think these are questions you might want to ask the Attorney yourself. But, Deputy Jeune, do you want to continue your speech?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes, and I think that it would be useful if the Deputy asks the Attorney General himself those at the end of this, but I think, as we can see, there are a lot of unanswered questions that I would like to get to the bottom of. Also related to funding, and I know the Chief Minister touches on this and also in the comments paper, but within my Written Question around funding, there is no evidence that the change is generally budget neutral, which was the answer to my question around the budget and how that will work. It was given to me that this is budget neutral. But there is not a clear analysis behind that to understand why it is budget neutral. It is just given as a fact, but without actually giving that explanation further. That is a question that I have asked the Bailiff to rule on further in the next ... to be able to come back to me on the Written Question related to that. But what I would say is that we hear that from the Budget for 2027 we will then have a split of separate heads of expenditure for the first time. I welcome this because it will clearly show how little this Island currently spends on protecting the environment. It is a figure that is presently hidden within a combined budget, and so I welcome that transparency because we really will be able to see just how little is being spent on the environment if we take out, of course, the agricultural transfers from the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. The Chief Minister's Written Answer to my Written Question said accountability for international agreements follows the legislation; so transferred law, transferred accountability, retained law, retained accountability. I would like to understand, which was not answered - and maybe this is for Deputy Tadier's question to the Attorney General - what are the mechanisms if one Minister's responsibility and decisions actively impacts the statutory responsibility of the other? What happens if a planning application was pushed through by the Minister of Planning and Regulation but it will have a negative impact on our water quality, our Wildlife Law or an impact on the international Ramsar sites, for example? I would also like to understand why the Public Health and Safety (Rented Dwellings) Law has gone to Planning and Regulation. The entire justification for this specific transfer, the generic sentence says "guided by the nature of the function it governs", but there is no paragraph anywhere addressing why this law, which protects tenants from unsafe housing conditions, sits better with a planning and building control Minister than anywhere connected to housing policy. Why, for example, could that law not have gone to the Minister for Housing? But as we are splitting up the laws, maybe to answer the Chief Minister's point, if the laws are being split up now why not think of them in a deeper way than just splitting between the 2. Of course, also a lot of this is taking a lot from the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development as well. So in fact this split is splitting 3 Ministers down, though we are focusing now on 2, where a lot is being taken out of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development's role as well. The comments paper points to the earlier split of Children's Services from Education as proof that this kind of ministerial reorganisation can be done cleanly, but I think that that comparison does not hold because there is

very specific, distinct statutory function between children and education, but the environment brief is nothing like that in scale. It is much more and is wide-ranging, and all of this has to be enforced. Now that sits within both Environment and also ... it is very unclear where enforcement sits. I think Deputy Coles has pointed this out in his speech. What I am trying to say, and by the interruptions that my speech has generated, is that I think there are a lot of unanswered questions. With supporting Deputy Coles's proposition, I am not saying that having a new Minister for Planning and Regulation is a bad idea. Members may conclude that at the end this is the right structure, but what we are being asked right now is to let it happen without the costing, the staffing, the accountability lines, the funding assessments, all these questions to be answered clearly by Scrutiny as well as consultation, of course, that has been raised already. That is a situation where I think we have not got clarity, and again, as the interruptions show, there has not been clarity with this split. There has not been an assessment done behind the split. There seems to be changes all the time to the split. I, as chair of Scrutiny, would welcome the chance for my panel to be able to ask more detailed questions to this restructuring, because I think at the moment the Written Questions that I received were very vague. We only received the kind of detailed information in the comments paper. If we had not had this proposition, again we would not see any of this and we would just be passing a new Minister without any details whatsoever. So I would urge Members to ... this is not about opposing this new ministerial office but it is simply about giving us time to be able to scrutinise it before the Minister has been created.

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

I have sympathy for the Chief Minister here. On the one hand he wants to act and move and if he spends too long thinking about things and reporting on things he will be seen as being slow, and if he moves too fast and brings something immediately he will be thought to have said that things have not been consulted widely enough and worked on. I do not really feel that this is necessarily his fault. But I do have sympathy and will be supporting Deputy Coles, largely because I think we are in a position here that was foreseen years ago. It was foreseen 8 years ago that this is where we would end up when the powers under Article 29A are used in the States of Jersey Law. The Chief Minister referenced in his speech that forming and moving ministerial offices is not something new, and it is not, and he quite rightly referenced his use of the powers when he made the Minister for Children and Families separate from the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning. But the power for the Chief Minister to do that alone only came in with the Machinery of Government (Miscellaneous Amendments) Law, P.1/2018. At the time the power for the Chief Minister to do this by order was contentious and, in fact, it was discussed against. I turned to the further comments made by the then titled Chairmen's Committee in relation to the amendments to the States of Jersey Law, and one of the largest issues they had was that introducing Article 29A - that is the ability for the Chief Minister to make these changes himself or herself - removes and changes a balance of power away from the Assembly. Paragraph 34 of their further comments say that Articles 15 and 16 amend the current provisions to provide the Chief Minister to do this: "The current position is that the Chief Minister may move offices from one office to another, subject to the approval of the States" and that: "This would mean that the States Assembly would not be involved in the decision-making to move Ministers around, other than after the event through the powers to challenge Ministerial Orders", quite rightly highlighted by the Chief Minister in his comments using the Legislation (Jersey) Law. What we are seeing now is the issue rising ahead, which is this Assembly not feeling necessarily it has been brought along on that journey. I give no fault to the Chief Minister for using his powers; he has used the powers he has to use arguably. It is not necessarily within the States of Jersey Law now for him to bring it to the States Assembly as legislation, it is an order-making power. But I do think the fact that these Articles were changed in the States of Jersey Law are giving rise to changes quicker than needed and perhaps ... or at least changes brought along without the agreement of this Government, and I think this Assembly

will work best over the next 4 years when decisions can be made, led from the Government and the Assembly hand-in-hand, agreeing where the best change is. I feel I agree with paragraph 41 of those further comments which, in essence, said: “The panel is concerned that there has not been sufficient consultation with States Members as a whole, nor has the panel been given sufficient time to consider the impact of the changes” and they recommended that Articles 15 and 16 of the amendment, which now refer to Articles 29 and 29A, be withdrawn or otherwise rejected by the States. I think we would be in a better place if the former process was still in place. I appreciate the Chief Minister is using his powers as they are in the law, but I think we, as an Assembly, should consider reverting to a pre-2018 position on this so that the next time a shuffle, or as the Chief Minister rightly says, the Council must adapt to the changing demands of the portfolios of Ministers, it is done with this Assembly agreeing it, scrutinising proactively not reactively, and so I will support this. But I will urge the Chief Minister to consider amending the States of Jersey Law to ensure that perhaps the powers sit back with the States Assembly. Still the Chief Minister to bring that, to lead the charge to design the Council of Ministers’ best fit to deliver on the agenda of the Council, but I feel we are in this position not because of any one person but ultimately because the changes to the law are now bearing fruit. The one last comment I would make ... I am not going to comment about the suitability of portfolios, personally I see some real benefit and I have been quite excited to think about how a dedicated regulation Minister can champion appropriate and proportionate regulation. It is a very exciting place to think about consolidating non-planning regulation actually; the stuff that has not been necessarily mentioned. But I turn to page 3 of the Chief Minister’s comments on P.62, and they state, this is under the title “Better Governance”: “The same Minister is responsible for promoting development, protecting the environment, preparing planning policy and for determining planning applications.”

[10:30]

Then it concludes: “Separating these responsibilities creates greater transparency and provides clearer checks and balances within government decision-making”, and it reflects good governance. What I would say is I do not believe what is being proposed today does change that, and I believe that it is still the joint responsibility of Ministers to, most importantly, protect the environment. I say that because we have to go to one of the larger laws being transferred to the Minister for Planning and Regulation, which is the Planning and Building Law. I will point back just briefly to the purpose of the law, Article 2. The law is there: “to conserve, protect and improve Jersey’s natural beauty, natural resources and general amenities, its character, and its physical and natural environments.” And in that paragraph: “The reference to natural resources of Jersey includes its biodiversity; and the natural environment of Jersey includes the natural environment around Jersey.” So it will still very much be the responsibility of the Minister for Planning and Regulation, not to listen to the Minister for the Environment in how to protect the environment but to be the custodian himself or herself, whoever is appointed following this. I say this, I think the Chief Minister is in a bind, given he did use his powers quite rightly in the law. He has not done anything wrong at all, but I do still think it would be best to revisit Article 29 and 29A of the main States of Jersey Law so future decisions can be led by the Chief Minister but then ratified by the States Assembly proactively.

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

I am really grateful to follow Deputy Alex Curtis because he made some additional points, which I am going to build on. I think he was absolutely right to point out P.1/2018 because I was actually looking back further than that and looking at Clothier in the year 2000. If we are to go back to the foundational principles of the system of ministerial Government that we have, the Clothier Report said that the Scrutiny role is absolutely vital to the balanced machinery of government in this system. I do think that it is perhaps a quirk of the legislation and Standing Orders that we have,

that govern how our Assembly works, that the chair of Scrutiny is not able to call this in. Because if it were legislation she would be able to do so, and I think that Members should be mindful of the principles and the good governance that I believe would be appropriate around this. Even though it is not written into the Standing Orders, into the legislation, I think that the principle should still stand. When I was listening to the whole of the speech made by the chair of the Scrutiny Panel, she raised so many questions, more questions than I myself had thought of, and that indeed is the function of Scrutiny, is it not; to raise every single question and to explore every avenue and to raise questions on our behalf to a level of detail that we could not possibly do as individuals? I would like to let that function run its course. I think it is reasonable. I think that Deputy Coles has brought forward a very reasonable and moderate proposition today because it is not going to delay any work, because in fact the proposed Minister is perfectly able to carry out those functions as an Assistant Minister. So it is not actually going to delay anything, and I think that it would support the balance in our Assembly. That is something that is very important to me, and I know is and should be important to all Members, is having that balance between the Executive and the non-Executive. I will be supporting Deputy Coles's proposition today. Mindful of what Deputy Alex Curtis has raised, I think that P.P.C. should explore this and consider it, to see if any changes should be made.

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

Deputies Jeune, Deputy Alex Curtis and others have spoken very eloquently and laid out very clearly why they are supporting Deputy Coles's proposition. Before we go to the vote, I want to clarify that I am not against the principle at all and I am not against Senator Boleat becoming a Minister, but I am against this unholy rush that we seem to be having. Sorry, I have only just written it and I have got some on here. Proposition P.62 does not seek to permanently block the Chief Minister's vision, and nor does it debate the merits of a dedicated planning role. It simply enforces a necessary pause. It asks that we hit the brakes, demand a fully costed business case, and ensure that any major change to our ministerial offices is properly debated and voted on by this Assembly, rather than being pushed through by a Ministerial Order. Before we reorganise the machinery of government, we must understand the financial and operational consequences. I urge all Members of this Assembly to support proposition P.62, to stand up for proper parliamentary scrutiny and to protect the public purse.

2.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier:

I think we are playing a bit of itchy trigger fingers today. I can see some Ministers earnestly scribbling notes, but they may of course be notes to do with something else. But let us see if we can smoke some of them out, perhaps, if they do want to speak, because we are hearing remarkably little from Ministers on this as to why it is a good idea. Let us start off, first of all, with the current Minister for Infrastructure, my St. Brelade colleague. I noticed that in 2022, in his manifesto, one of his headline policies was that Planning and Environment should be split. He was of course in that role for 2 years and he was in the Assembly for 4 years. He did not bring that proposition. I would like to know whether he thinks it is still a good idea, whether he has concerns. He has been known as a strong champion for the environment. I noticed that one of his proposers or nominators in St. Brelade is a very well-established former Deputy who has been a strong champion for the environment, and he has published a letter in the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* in the last few weeks advising strong caution against this move, saying that he does not think it is the right way to be going about things and it is certainly rushed. He made a very compelling case actually about why the functions were put together in the first place. To say that the question is settled politically is, I think, not true. There are some very strong advocates over and above that who have made overtures in the public domain from groups, such as Friends of the Earth, also more locally-based groups advising caution, saying that we should not proceed with this today. The words that I heard

during the election is that while there was very much, I believe, a manufactured discourse from some of the candidates running that they wanted to deregulate and be pro-business and cut red tape, actually what I was hearing on the doorsteps in St. Brelade was a much more nuanced position, saying that people were looking at the environment and they very much valued the coastline, they very much valued the National Park, that they did not want undue development in what is increasingly becoming an urban area of Les Quennevais. I think that is true around the Island. I am concerned that the Council of Ministers is moving very quickly here to try and resolve a problem which they have identified, which has probably been misdiagnosed in the first place, and to which their solution is not the correct one. But let us also bring in a political element here because I think there does need to be the analysis that what we are seeing here is not just something which is being done for the rights and motivation of the environment but is actually politically expedient. I think what has happened, there is a strong argument to say that this is the case, certainly one interpretation is that we have had a Chief Minister who is effectively uncontested, and I think he has given too many sweets out. He has been handing the sweets out before the Ministers were appointed, and then when it has come to it he has realised that actually he does not have enough sweets because Mr. Troy's sweet shop only allows you to have a certain number of sweets that you can give out. He is already scrambling around saying: "We need to get a bigger sweet shop so that I can give more sweets out." We have already seen the consequence of the fact the Government does not need any more sweets, they have got this Assembly pretty much in their pocket, although I hope that will be increasingly not the case as we get some fine debates. I know that we have got some very capable debaters in here, because I have heard some of them during the hustings. I hope we hear from them during this first proper debate that we are having now. The Chief Minister, I think, is going down an avenue of what I think is taking Jersey back to pre-2008 or what Jersey was like in the 1980s and 1990s. There might be more women in the Assembly but we are seeing a job creation scheme, and it is very much business-as-usual jobs for the boys. He has not got enough jobs so he is creating more jobs and he is giving them to the members of the "old boys' network". We just need to look at the back row of the Council of Ministers. All of the top jobs have gone to the men even though we have had 4 very good Senatorial candidates elected. It is worth saying at this point that there seems to be this new doctrine that has come in that if you are a Senator you automatically get a ministerial role. Of course those ministerial roles will not always be equal. I am not sure how that has crept in because my understanding of it is, the way I look at it is, I think we have got some Senators who would have struggled to get in as Deputies in the Island, and my analysis is also that that is part of the reason that the Senatorial roles were brought back, because some of these Ministers had no constituencies to go to or to go back to, but that is just my analysis. I do not want to get into any territory that might be called *ad hominem*, but that is just one analysis. I think the politics of it does need to be analysed as an alternative motive for what we are seeing here. We see the Chief Minister, a man; we see the Minister for Treasury and Resources, a man; we see the Minister for External Relations job given to a man; we see the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development being given to a man, not even a Senator in this case. How could they give it to a lowly Deputy? I am sure he is very qualified. Of course the Deputy Chief Minister is a man, the Minister for Health and Social Services is a man. The poll topper of course is not a man, it is a woman, and she has been given her old job back as Justice and Home Affairs. We see other jobs being created, an Assistant Minister role for a newcomer. We also see that a Member that I really like, of course, who I am glad got in as well, even if she did knock out one of our party members, has been given a job that she clearly wants at Environment. Here is the rub, she is having most of that role removed from her today. That is what we are passing. So the Chief Minister says: "You can have that role, Senator Le Hegarat, but I am going to take all of the good stuff, the interesting stuff, away from you to start." Am I making this a feminist issue? I do not know; I am just stating some facts. If other Members in this Assembly want to interpret that in that way. The Chief Minister has tried

to spin this by saying that of course it is going to give more power to the Environment, so somehow by removing environmental powers and protections you are protecting the environment. Great. I mean it is not just going back to the early 2000s, it is going back to 1984 because we are hearing a great example of doublespeak here. So when the Minister says there will be stronger environmental leadership; creating a dedicated Minister for the Environment enables greater political focus upon biodiversity recovery, agriculture, fisheries, water, air quality, P.F.A.S., coastal protection and natural environment policy and countryside management, the Minister already had that before the changes were made. The point that I would make here is that the power is only effective to lead on those policies because of the regulatory powers that underpin them. So we risk adopting policies here which do not get implemented and this is, I think, a very real risk and I think there is an experience that shows that policies will only get implemented if the rules require it through regulation. So one question that I may ask to the Attorney General is what powers is the Minister for the Environment being left with here? I am not going to ask this question necessarily, I will leave those as rhetorical for the moment, but other Members may wish to consider these. Also, the fact that we are not just talking about environmental powers which are now being handed over to the Minister for Planning and Regulation, we are looking at things to do with the regulation of care. Why on earth would the regulation of care be being moved over to the Minister for Planning and Regulation; it is quite bizarre. And Environmental Health being moved over to the Minister for Planning and Regulation, it has already been said by the Scrutiny Panel. Now what we should be doing in this Assembly is not simply rubberstamping anything that this Council of Ministers wants. What we should be saying is: "Look, make a case for this if you think it is the right thing to do let us have a proper consultative period where we can look at these issues and let us talk to the wider community, let us talk to those many champions in the community, not just those who we supposedly heard from at election time saying there is far too much regulation we need to get rid of it." I am accepting that there might be some things that need to be done in terms of streamlining in our planning process that make it more sensible, and arguably this is perhaps a question that will come to the Minister when he puts himself forward about the balance between private rights for those who want to develop versus those that have much more of an environmental and public impact. Of course those balances are always there to be struck, but I think we need that wider discourse with the community that has not happened. I think it would be a great example of leadership if the Chief Minister were to say, rather than encouraging his Council to reject this proposition: "Okay, I will take that forward, I will use the summer recess as an opportunity to give a fuller report to present back to this Assembly", which I am sure the chair of the Scrutiny Panel would welcome once she has a fully constituted Scrutiny Panel.

[10:45]

They can look at that report, that they can do it in real time and, as we know in the past, Scrutiny has worked very quickly to be able to provide their comments and say: "Actually, you can go ahead with this, but we need to be making sure as an Assembly that we have taken these areas into consideration." Because of course, what it all boils down to, and what I remember former Senator Ferguson saying, is that it is the law of unintended consequences. It is fine to say that there is no additional cost here, but we do not know about what those additional costs are until we realise that there may be future implication. So at the moment we are being told - and the Attorney General said this is a political issue - that there is a political decision to be made about who does what. But I can imagine a scenario where we have a very strong and vocal champion for the environment. I will give you one example. It may well be - and I am not putting words into anyone's mouth, this is hypothetical - that we have a big question mark that is arising over what to do with all these dilapidated greenhouses in the countryside. A Minister for the Environment may say: "Look, we need to either get rid of these greenhouses and put them back to nature or we need to actually enforce the dilapidated buildings regulations, which require those farmers to put them back into

the state that they should have been, into active glasshouses.” That Minister for the Environment’s viewpoint might be that they should be turned into community allotments or whatever. She might be very strong at saying that but the Minister for Planning and Regulation will now have all the laws and be saying; “That is very good, Senator Le Hegarat, but actually I think we just need to cut red tape, that is what I was elected on” and before you know it there are going to be lots of building in those areas. Now, that is fine, those are political decisions that need to be made, but I think suggesting that this is going to actually enhance environmental protections is nothing less than, I think, offensive to those who care about the environment. I think we would do very well to support what Deputy Coles is proposing here fully and to let the Council of Ministers come back, show they are working so that we can have some proper consensus around this very far-reaching issue.

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

I feel it is a case of *déjà vu*, a new Assembly but where do we start? We start by talking about ourselves once more. Sadly, I have to disagree with the previous speaker, my fellow St. John parishioner, as I do not believe this has got anything to do with gender. The public who participated in the recent election have, I believe, an expectation that we will all roll our sleeves up and get on with things. I suspect many who did not participate in the recent election did not take part as they think we do not get on and do things, so why bother? I see what the Chief Minister is proposing as a good example of simply getting on with things. I fully respect the chair of the Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel, and I have to disagree with her and would ask her to look at this proposal with a different lens. Speaking from personal experience, the chair is more than capable of holding a Minister to account, whether that is on water, waste, pollution, *et cetera*, whoever the responsible Minister is. The Chief Minister referred to a proposal from 2009 when a split in the functions was first proposed, and there are many reasons to put more focus on both environment and planning. Many Members, and probably thousands of Islanders, could give us a whole range of issues with both of these areas, and this is not a reflection on the previous Minister or Ministers, rather it is a reflection on the process. We are not being asked to change the Island Plan this morning. The way I see it, we are being asked to put more focus on both planning and environment, and I for one welcome this. Any work that is done to review regulation should, in my view, be a way of delivering efficiencies rather than actually costing us and Islanders more money. I am very hopeful that the proposed changes will put more emphasis on both reviewing the planning process as well as putting more emphasis on enforcement. Both areas have significant room for improvement, in my opinion, and so I am happy to support the Chief Minister’s proposal to split the role and will vote against the proposition today.

2.1.8 Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I find it very interesting this morning because with one hand we say we fully accept what the Chief Minister has done is right and then on the other hand say we do not like it. So for me that is already a contradictory fact. In relation to the changes that were made, myself, when I got the list, I looked at the proposed changes and I straight away said, as the Minister for the Environment, I would like these pieces of legislation. I had consultation also with my colleague who is going to work in the department with me and we agreed the things that we wanted and we have what we want. The interesting part in relation to Deputy Tadier’s comments about all the good jobs going to the male colleagues, I do not agree. Those of you, and particularly I think Deputy Tadier, and he probably actually knew by saying what he said he would get me off my seat, because it is quite characteristic I only speak when there is a need to, and at this stage there is a need to. Now I think that this is an exceptionally good idea. I have a history, as you all know, and I am not an expert on the environment, as maybe one of my colleagues has a lot more brain power than I do, however, I am passionate, I am fully supported of agriculture and fisheries, so for me I have the dream job. Now,

I am sitting next to my colleague, trust me, if you sat around the Council of Ministers' table with me in the last 2½ years, you know that I am as feisty as anybody and I will fight my corner. So that is the first point. In relation to the department and the split of it, have we all forgotten about the Target Operating Model? We got rid of all of the chief executives in the different departments and we threw it under one person, and that is what we still have. However, what we do have in those departments is the staff that do those jobs. Those staff will still be doing those jobs because they will sit, maybe not in the same part of the department but they will still be doing the same jobs. So they all work together. Waste, water, all of those teams already work together, they already discuss all of these issues. Yes, there will be different Ministers in charge of waste and water, however, what that means is that as a Council of Ministers we will have to come back and have a discussion about all of these things and, in actual fact, will that not be better for us as a Council of Ministers to be working more closely together than we were before, because there is always room for improvement. In relation to what people are talking about, the reason that I have the legislation that I have is because, as I said, it is what sits with the environment, agriculture and fisheries. That is why I and my colleague, Deputy Morel, have said - and the officers we have spoken to as well - we want this law. I specifically answered the question Deputy Curtis asked me about land law. I am passionate about land law. So for me I want it. It is as simple as that. For me I do not see this male/female designation. I am not interested, if I am honest. For me, I have a job that I want and I, for the next 4 years, will do my utmost to ensure that all of those areas are protected. In relation to some of the regulations that were under this remit before, they have gone to Planning and Regulation. Guess why? Because that is where they have gone. We seem to be totally focusing on planning, but all of the other regulations which we, as an Assembly, have created over years are strangling us. Rightly, as people have said, in the last few years we have created a whole load of different things, we have created a whole load of regulations and we cannot do business, we cannot do anything because we have over-regulated ourselves to the size of a country, and we are not; we are a small Island. Trust me, we will not be building multi big houses on the Five Mile Road on a golf course ... I will not say what I was going to say because it would be inappropriate what I was going to say. The other thing I would like to point out is I do not always like to look to those north. I prefer the ones to that side but I do not like always looking to the things north. If you look north, the U.K. (United Kingdom), do they have planning and environment together? No, they do not, they have them totally separate. Northern Ireland have them separate. Northern Ireland has rural economy, environment, agriculture and fisheries. One - me - would like to see us actually start to progress and support these industries a lot more by having them together in that environment. The other point about should environment and agriculture and fisheries not gone ... or environment gone to the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development; absolutely not. On one hand we are saying: "Oh no, we cannot put planning and environment separately" and on the other hand we are then saying: "Well, if you are going to split them why can they not go over there." That does not make sense to me. They sit where they should sit, and for those of us that are old enough will know what the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries looked like at Howard Davis Farm all those years ago. What we had was agriculture and fisheries and all of those types of things in one location, and what we did was we threw everything to do with business of any description into a bucket and said: "Over here", and that is what we had done when we put all of those roles within the role of the economic development. In actual fact, one has to say you cannot manage all of those different things and, to me, by changing the remit and withdrawing agriculture and fisheries, splitting this role is a perfect option. I am fully supportive of the changes and I will not be voting for this proposition.

The Bailiff:

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

2.1.9 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I am glad to follow Senator Le Hégarat because there is so much stuff there that she mentioned that was really good and really important. This idea that you take a look at everybody's portfolio, re-establish where everything sits better and bringing them together, because that is absolutely the right thing we need to do. But you need to think about it, you need to address everything, but when you do something so quickly, are we doing it right? Have we missed something? Have we considered something not completely in the round? The Senator also mentions about big country and how we have regulated ourselves in the same way as we do a big country. She then goes on to point out about England and Ireland and how they split planning and environments, which are big countries. Obviously Jersey is small, so maybe keeping the 2 things together is actually more cost effective and efficient because you are comparing apples and oranges sometimes. I am just going back over the regulation part because there is a big question over regulation and why it is needed and why it is important, and maybe this is more of a thought of a warning, that if we do things too quickly and we cut our regulation too much, we will find ourselves in a position where we cannot deal with big countries anymore. As many will know that the U.K. E.U. (European Union) reset negotiations are going to start soon, and this will have a really big impact on our economy with regards to our fishers being able to have fish in Granville and other ports along Normandy as well as access through from the Common Travel Area into the E.U. There are so many things on the line. I mentioned this because it fits within the Minister for the Environment's portfolio, or does it? Because I am not necessarily sure, where that law currently sits, whether there is going to be another review and whether that sits under Regulation, whether that sits under Environment, because that is going to be a big negotiation that is going to require resources to ensure that Islanders who have needs to export things to the E.U. are able to do so and, as some Members of the Assembly pushed for, the cheap German supermarkets. Maybe it will be cheaper to import their goods from the E.U., which you cannot do quite so easily as you can from the U.K. I have just looked through some of the notes that I have written down, and of course sweet shops came up. I am sure most of us were wishing we all had a gobstopper right now, or at least I had one, so I will not go on for too much longer. But there is the talk around the improving of the planning service, and I feel this is a little bit disrespectful to the former Minister, the former Deputy Steve Luce, who when he took over the last 2 years we saw an accelerated line of approvals come through our planning service because he brought improvements, while also bringing forward the Food Law, the Animal Welfare Law. The former Deputy did a lot of good work in a short period of time as one person looking after that department.

[11:00]

I believe Deputy Jeune made some really good points, which I do not necessarily want to repeat them, but there are some that confused me in the schedule that the Minister made the point in the comments paper. Things like the Food Law and the High Hedges law. High hedges obviously they do more than just block out light from one person to another, and I know they are about height but they also hold our biodiversity. So if those 2 things are separate, are we at risk of cutting down a hedge which actually holds a rare bird species, rare bat species or just does something that improves our biodiversity, which improves our agriculture, which keeps our lives going. The Food Law, sitting within Planning and Regulation. The team that look after that is called Environmental Health. There is the confusion. Are they going to then be enforced by Environmental Health, which sits under the Minister for Planning and Regulation? Or would that be still something that sits under the remit of the Minister for the Environment? Because the big question that keeps being outstanding is around enforcement. It is good to have people who look at individual laws and come up with individual policies and can actually dedicate their time to that without being drawn too thin, but it has got to be done properly. As mentioned with the States of Jersey Law and it

being done by Order ... like I have said, there is nothing disrespectful to the Chief Minister, my proposition is worded in such a way because it is his right to make these orders. The way to challenge that Order is with an annulment and, of course, that feels a little bit more heavy-handed. That is really asking to put the full brakes on and hit it hard. Where I have just asked a series of questions of Senator Boleat, who is Assistant Minister with delegated functions, I am not preventing any work from carrying on. In the comments paper, it talks about the consideration of mergers of different portfolios. Of course, yes, in my report, there is mention about Sustainable Economic Development and the Environment when you consider what is left. But there is also a consideration that actually, where you have moved something, somebody has a bit more space. Maybe something else can be moved somewhere else. There is room for full assessment of all ministerial portfolios, because that also sits within the Chief Minister's gift. He could redesign all his portfolios so they work the best, but you need to take time to do that. So I appreciate he has to present his slate of Ministers, then the Assembly adopts those, and then that can change. I think having a review of this particular division of legislation could open the door to see more - more potential, more ways - for the Chief Minister to deliver on his Common Strategic Policy that we will see after the summer, because that is what Governments are here to do, is to deliver and to deliver efficiently and effectively. But if we rush things we get things wrong, then we have conflict internally and that becomes a problem. This does not stop any work, as I have said, so I would be grateful if Members could support this. Let us have a look at legislation, let the Chief Minister and his teams look at this properly, provide the rest of the Assembly the transparency of what is going to be done. Of course, the last thing I should mention before I sit down, when we talk about cost, we do not all say ... when people think cost, they automatically go to financials, but not every cost is financial. If we move a research and project officer from one project to another, the cost is that first project loses a resource because it moves to do something else. So that is a cost in time, that is a cost in delivery, but it is not a financial cost. That is one of the things when I say about cost and staff and resources that comes out of that. What is going to be delayed? What is going to be cancelled? What is not going to be delivered so that somebody else can deliver something else? What are the priorities? That is what is not clear from this report, and so that is what I ask the Chief Minister to deliver. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask Greffier to close the voting.

POUR: 15

Connétable of St. Martin
 Connétable of St. Clement
 Connétable of St. Ouen
 Connétable of Grouville
 Connétable of St. Saviour
 Deputy M. Tadier
 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet
 Deputy C.S. Alves
 Deputy T.A. Coles
 Deputy A.F. Curtis

CONTRE: 31

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. Peter

ABSTAINED: 0

Deputy L.V. Feltham	Connétable of St. Brelade
Deputy H.L. Jeune	Connétable of St. Helier
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée	Connétable of St. John
Deputy K.M. Wilson	Connétable of St. Lawrence
Deputy L.D. Carpenter	Deputy C.F. Labey
	Deputy K.F. Morel
	Deputy F. G. Voisin
	Deputy M.B. Andrews
	Deputy R.E. Binet
	Deputy C.D. Curtis
	Deputy M.R. Ferey
	Deputy J. Renouf
	Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson
	Deputy B. Ward
	Deputy S.J. Gleave
	Deputy V. Li
	Deputy A. Maltman
	Deputy R.J. Parker
	Deputy G.A. Raimondo
	Deputy C.J. Rebindaine
	Deputy P.J. Romeril

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS

3. Appointment of the Minister for Planning and Regulation

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the appointments.

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

In line with Article 29A, following the result of that vote, I have now signed the order enabling the next item on the agenda to proceed, namely the election of the Minister for Planning and Regulation.

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the selection of the Minister for Planning and Regulation. In accordance with Standing Order 117(2E), I ask the Chief Minister to make his nomination for the position of Minister for Planning and Regulation. I remind Members that neither nomination nor seconding may be the pretext for any substantive speech. Chief Minister, do you have a nomination for this appointment.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, thank you. I would like to nominate Senator Mark Boleat for the position of Minister for Planning and Regulation.

The Bailiff:

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

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

Yes, Sir, I would like to nominate Deputy Tadier.

The Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? In that case, we will then have a period of speeches for up to 10 minutes and then questions for up to 20 minutes. I invite Deputy Tadier to leave the Chamber for the speech and questions involving Senator Boleat. Thank you, Deputy. Senator Boleat, you have 10 minutes to address the Assembly, followed by questions for up to 20 minutes.

3.1 Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I enjoyed the last debate, I think. I felt at times like being a patient on the operating table with eminent physicians discussing what, if anything, to do with me. But I am pleased we have got that over. I thank the Chief Minister for nominating me to this new position as Minister for Planning and Regulation. I am aware that there have been and will continue to be discussions about the appropriate delineation of functions, and it is quite right that time should be taken to decide exactly where responsibilities lie. But I have no doubt that the principle of seeking to bring together several regulatory functions under one Minister and in one department so as to help ensure consistency and economies of scale is the right one. Each Member will have their own views on what they want to achieve in their term of office. For some, that will be new laws or propositions, and I respect that. In my case, it may mean fewer laws and fewer propositions. I strongly believe that Jersey must have planning and regulatory systems appropriate for Jersey, not imported wholesale from the U.K. or anywhere else. But we can learn from others, and that is where I think I can help ensure that Jersey benefits from doing so. I was a member of the City of London's Planning Committee for around 10 years, and deputy chairman of its Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, in which capacity I was delighted to host visits from the then Connétable of St. Helier and the Minister for the Environment to share experiences and ideas. I also had experience of planning as a director of a major house builder, a member of Mayor Sadiq Khan's Homes for Londoners' Board, and chair of the Housing and Finance Institute, for which I wrote a paper entitled *The Housing Problem in London - a broken planning system*. Locally, I have been chair of both Andium Homes and the Jersey Development Company. Similarly, on regulation, in Jersey, I have chaired the Competition Authority, and in the U.K., I set up the system for regulating claims management companies. I was also a member of the Regulatory Policy Committee, which was charged with validating impact assessments that accompany proposed new laws and regulations. Is that relevant to Jersey? I think having an impact assessment, not on States manpower, employment and expenditure but on people and businesses, would be a really good development, and I hope we can make progress on that. How would I see my role in Planning? I must do what the law requires, which includes considering reports by inspectors who have heard appeals and ensuring that the Bridging Island Plan and relevant laws and policies are complied with. But there is a wider role to support the private sector and the public interest to ensure that the planning system is fit for purpose and does not become a barrier to economic growth. I was open in my election campaign that I regarded the current system as an obstacle to economic growth. That does not mean ripping up the system and removing protection, but it does mean having policies that are proportionate and appropriate, and which have due regard to the impact that they will have. This is particularly true in respect of residential properties. Sadly, planning and housing is an area where data to inform policy are inadequate; something I will seek to remedy. But we know that about three-quarters of homes sold every year are existing homes. A developer cannot simply

build whatever they like in the knowledge that somebody will have to buy it. Developers have gone bust because they produced homes that people do not want to buy. We should therefore be wary about loading requirements on to developers of new homes which people are not willing to pay for. The effect may not be that we have better homes, it may be that we have fewer homes. I am pleased to say that work is in train to simplify the planning system, building on the work that Deputy Luce did in the last Assembly. In particular, the voluminous documentation that must be provided with planning applications will be reduced. The Bridging Island Plan has an end date of 2025, but the law is such that the plan remains in operation until there is another plan. So I will be taking forward work to develop a new plan in which, of course, all Members of the Assembly will be fully involved. In the meantime, the Assembly has agreed to allow amendments to be made to the existing plan, which I will be working on alongside the Scrutiny Panel during the process, rather than simply expecting the panel to comment on proposals. The Assembly will, of course, have the final word. Turning to the wider regulation brief, I should start by quoting the Chief Minister, who told this Assembly: “We are regulating like a big country and we are not a big country.” I should add the thoughtful comments from the Island’s chief executive in his speech to the Chamber of Commerce. He pointed out that while each regulatory measure could be justified at the time it was introduced, it was the totality of measures, frequently overlapping if not conflicting, that causes problems. The 2023 *Barriers to Business* report noted that Jersey currently has 1,368 active laws dating back to 1771. Sixty per cent of respondents in its survey stated that regulation has had a negative impact on their business. Starting a business in Jersey is a complex process - I know, I have done 2 of them - made even more intimidating by the lengthy 12-step process outlined on the Government’s website. This involves registering with different parts of Government and that does not include the Parishes, the Office of the Information Commissioner or the Financial Services Commission. A recent social media post summed up the position quite well: “Having recently set up a business I cannot stress how unnecessarily difficult the processes made by bureaucracy, disorganisation, and the endless hoops to jump through.”

[11:15]

It went on: “There is the sheer number of registrations and forms, each department firing out its own I.D.s (identification) and reference numbers. Parish, J.O.I.C. (Jersey Office of the Information Commissioner), Manpower, T.I.N. (Taxation Identification Numbers), Social, J.F.S.C. (Jersey Financial Services Commission), *et cetera*. OneGov, if I am allowed to mention that, yet none of them seem to speak to each other.” It concluded with a request for a small win. “If you are a Government department and you have a P.D.F. (Portable Document Format) that needs filling out, please make sure that the fields are editable.” This is basic. It should be the norm. I made my views known on regulation during the campaign. Of course, regulation must be proportionate. No one disagrees with that, they just disagree on what proportionate is. But take the requirements that a business has to go through when it wants to employ somebody off-Island. That business has done a business case, that is what a business does, and it has worked out that that is what it needs to do. Yet it then has to produce another business case to a Government department, which will be considered by people who are not in business. That is before they attempt to complete the associated forms which come with a warning that the person filling it in should set aside an hour and a half to complete it because it cannot be saved. Of course, these are individual examples of how we can bring positive change but they are also part of a whole, where everything I will seek to do will be focused on improving things for the people of Jersey, whether helping them run their businesses, improve their homes or have better jobs. In everything I do, I will, as I said during my election campaign, work collaboratively with all Members of the Assembly and, as important, with businesses, charities and interest groups that have got something constructive to contribute to the policy-making process. I ask for the support of Members for this position. **[Approbation]**

The Bailiff:

We now move to a period of questions of up to 20 minutes. The first question from Deputy Ward.

3.1.1 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

I will be doing this question to both candidates. On reading P.62, the comments paper, which sets out the responsibilities of the 2 separated roles, however there is an item of responsibility that fell under the previous Minister for the Environment's duties which does not seem to be itemised or identified in either of the 2 roles. This being the Jersey Care Commission, which was under the old system of responsibilities, plus the Care Law. Will the candidate for Minister of Planning and Regulation explain where does this health-related commission sit and is it appropriate for care and health-regulated laws to fall under this proposed Planning and Regulation remit, and if not where?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I am grateful for the question. I think the law fits within the Regulatory Department, and indeed earlier this morning I had a preliminary meeting with the chair and chief executive of the Care Commission. I thought it was a very productive meeting. That function currently belongs in the wider Environment Department. I can see little logic in it belonging to a department concerned with the environment. So that is something that I believe has been transferred, the appropriate law. If you had asked a longer question I could have looked it up, but I am afraid the question was not long enough to do so. But I believe that rests with the new department.

The Bailiff:

Supplementary?

Deputy B. Ward:

Not at this time, but thank you for your response.

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

Does the Senator support the polluter-pays principle as one that should underpin the licensing, fees and enforcement approach of his department; so the polluter-pays principle?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

The polluter-pays should be the starting point for any discussion. The issue is the polluter does not like paying, and the polluter can have substantial political power, so ultimately it is a matter for this Assembly. But certainly as a principle that would be the starting point. What the end point will be will depend on political discussions.

3.1.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Senator for his answers. I suppose his answer pre-empted my follow-up question, which is how would the Senator weigh the proportionality against the principle that environmental costs should sit with the polluter pays rather than the taxpayer or the ratepayers? How would the Senator weigh that proportionality for that principle when he says that it is about political; how would he weigh that?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I tried to pre-empt the question, but clearly failed to do so in its entirety. I think that is very difficult. In terms of developing policy, I am a firm believer that you take all interests into account but, most importantly, you do not listen most to the person who shouts loudest or the person who has got the most lobbying power. That is something I think all political organisations fall into that trap, that because somebody has sent 35 emails, that view is as worthy as somebody who sent none

but has an equally valid view, or because there is a media campaign we should respond to it. So I think that requires politicians to look at the facts, to look at who will be impacted and to take the right decision that in many cases is going to be an unpopular decision. If you do not want to take unpopular decisions, do not become a Government Minister.

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

Will the candidate support the continued work of the Planning Committee, made-up of elected States Members, as part of a planning system that considers and determines matters under relevant planning law?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I am an enthusiastic supporter of the Planning Committee. As I mentioned earlier, I did serve for 10 years on a planning committee in the City of London. It was a committee of 35 members. I would say to this Assembly, a committee of 35 members is not a great committee. But I did learn a fair bit about planning and I saw the value of planning committees. I think what is particularly important, very relevant to the work of this committee, we all know that the Bridging Island Plan is not fit for purpose and it will remain not fit for purpose until we replace it. The Planning Committee is the committee that has the power to decide something that is against the Island Plan because it is in the wider interest that it does so. That, I think, is a vital role for the committee to play, to look at something which is not in accordance with the plan, which is clearly desirable. I commend what the committee did on the Strive proposal for example, a good case of where the committee is looking at a proposition in the round for the benefit of the whole Island, not simply slavishly saying: "Because the plan says no, we cannot do it."

3.1.5 Deputy A. F. Curtis:

A recent letter to the editor of the *J.E.P.* highlighted the committee and perhaps suggested it is not a valid role, and I would suggest painted it in a more negative light. Does the candidate consider that the committee can play a very positive role and should be presented in a positive role, in particular the fact that it provides a zero-cost review process for applicants who have had refused applications, and that actually it is important to champion the positive work that the committee can do as an enabler?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

Yes.

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

I rise after Deputy Ward's question. The Regulation of Care Law 2014 does sit within the proposed Minister's remit. Does he agree that the separation from regulator and service provider is an essential part of regulation?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I am grateful to the Deputy for clarifying my responsibilities. I have been involved in regulation for far more years than I care to consider, and I have been looking at Jersey for many years. Where you draw the line can be very arbitrary and the one thing I have learned in working in politics over many years is that structures matter a lot less than people. The right people can make a poor structure work, the wrong people will make a bad structure not work. Now already, since the Council of Ministers was established, I have worked with my colleague, Senator Le Hegarat, perfectly well. We have sat together considering matters, I have had discussions with other Ministers on specific matters. The Ministerial Code of Conduct requires that where something cuts across more than one department Ministers work together, and that is exactly what I will be

doing. Now some of the things I might want to do on regulation do not fall within my responsibility. They may fall within the responsibility of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, and he will be receiving a few emails from me suggesting where we might discuss such matters. So it is about people working together, and that is absolutely what I am committed to doing, regardless of what the structure says.

3.1.7 Deputy T.A. Coles:

The question was originally about enforcement, because sometimes we have to get to that point where somebody breaks the rules and they have to be held to account for that. So, with the right glass walls and the right glass petitions, does the Minister then agree or not whether or not the enforcement should be separated from the rule maker?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

There are any number of examples where rulemaking and enforcement sit in the same organisation. I think the Jersey Financial Services Commission would be one where it makes up the rules and it enforces them. Where that happens then there needs to be some form of appeal procedure. However you look at it, there are pros and cons of having rulemaking and enforcement in the same organisation or having them in different organisations; either can be made to work with the right people. So there are some enforcement responsibilities, quite a few that come with the responsibility for being the Minister for Planning and Regulation, and indeed there is a question about one of them for later today. So I do not see a problem with them being in the same organisation, nor do I see a problem with them being in different organisations. Either can work.

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

Will the candidate give his view on maintaining public access to our coastlines?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

As an avid walker before my knees decided it was not a good idea, absolutely. I think our coastline is one of Jersey's great advantages. It is something we must protect. It is not always possible to do it, but as a starting point I would absolutely support that. Again, learning from the City of London - and I do not wish to keep emphasising that, it does not go down well with some people - we spent 20 or 30 years building the path alongside the Thames, and it took that length of time. You had to do it with individual developments, so I think preserving access to the coastline is absolutely essential.

3.1.9 Deputy C.S. Alves:

How does the Senator think he will go about protecting it if there is a conflict or there is some dispute on that? How will he manage that?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

That depends a bit on the nature of the dispute. If it is a planning application that threatens the coastline, that will be a matter for the Planning Committee, which will take the appropriate decision. I think you can never say never. There may be circumstances in which the coastline cannot be adequately protected, but my starting point is that absolutely it should be protected. If something comes to me for a decision and the Minister for Planning and Regulation has to take decisions in that sort of judicial capacity - not quite as important as your judicial capacity, Sir - but you have to look at all of the evidence and take the appropriate decision, and that is what I would seek to do

3.1.10 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement:

Speaking about structures that do not work, what do you see as the future for our derelict and dangerous greenhouses?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

That is a subject on which I have an interest because I live within a mile of 3 of them. One of them I am happy to say in the Parish of Grouville, but the other 2 are in St. Clement. I have to say that derelict greenhouse sites, in my view, do not enhance our natural environment. It is a difficult issue. The Bridging Island Plan is clear that they must be returned to agricultural use but the fact is some of them are not going to be returned to agricultural use. There is supplementary planning guidance that covers this at present. I think there is a case for reviewing that guidance. I am not saying changing it but for reviewing it, and that is something I would wish to do in conjunction with the panel to see whether it is appropriate, because I do not think it is appropriate that these sites, which have been derelict for 20 years, I think I am right in saying, should not continue.

3.1.11 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North:

The Senator will recall that during his leadership in the City, the Square Mile has adopted the 20 miles per hour speed limit and prioritised the pedestrian safety in the dense urban environment, not unlike St. Helier. Will he bring the same approach to Jersey by making safe schools and safe school access a material planning consideration in the new Island Plan?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I think safety, particularly for children going to school, is vitally important. It is difficult in a small Island where you have roads. I frequently walk all the way from Pontac to one of the excellent caf  s at Gorey, that is one of the Island's main roads and on part of that road, particularly in the Parish of Grouville, there are no pavements at all.

[11:30]

What I do observe is that drivers on the whole being very careful or perhaps they are just worried about me when they see me walking. In terms of doing it to schools, yes, I am very old, as some Members of the Assembly will know, and the prospect of being driven to school did not apply when I was young because people did not have cars. Amazingly, children got to school and got back and they were not abducted on the way there or back. Now it seems that children have to be delivered door to door. I would sincerely hope that we can move away from that and having safe routes - and I know some work has been done with some schools - is absolutely vital. But it is hard work because the starting point is our road system, which was largely designed by General Conway with a view to fighting the French. He could have designed them for other purposes but that is what happened and those roads are not ideal for other purposes. We have to make the best we can with the road system we have.

3.1.12 Deputy V. Li:

Can he assure our parents in St. Helier North that children and young people walking to school in Jersey will receive the same consideration he gave to the commuters in the City?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

We did not actually have any children in the City, which made it easier. The number was tiny and we had one primary school. But we did many things in the City, including making streets pedestrian only. We introduced the wrong way cycling up streets, which was incredibly controversial. I did point out that we are only introducing it in streets where it happened anyway, and we were merely legalising it. Nobody died as a result. But the City solved that problem

because the traffic moves so slowly, pedestrians go faster than the cars anyway. I do not think we should be trying to do that in Jersey, although we seem to be doing our best at times.

The Bailiff:

I am going to call upon Members who have not asked a question before coming to ones who have already asked a question, who want to ask a second question.

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

What will the candidate do to protect mature trees which cannot be simply replaced with new planting?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I think the law does that. The law is very clear about trees. Unfortunately, we cannot protect against Storm Ciarán, which I think did more damage to our trees than any developers could have done. I think we have a planning system that properly protects trees but, again, that is always a question of balance. There will be time when there are other considerations that mean that a mature tree may have to be removed, but the planning system is there to consider those matters and I am sure that the Planning Committee will absolutely, in looking at those issues, wish to protect not only mature trees but all trees where it is possible to do so. It is only in exceptional cases where that would not happen.

3.1.14 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Given I think there is a political consensus that actually our legislation does not adequately protect trees, would the candidate, if elected, agree to look at this to see where the legislation could be strengthened in this area.

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I think we have supplementary planning guidance on that. Absolutely I will look at that.

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

The Senator mentioned earlier that the current Bridging Island Plan is not fit for purpose. Can you give some indication as to what his plans are to make it fit for purpose?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I cannot tell a lie, I have not read the entire plan but I read enough of the beginning of it to know that the assumptions on which it were based turned out to be not correct at all, and if the assumptions are not correct the plan is unlikely to be correct. My observation, reading the plan, is that it was predominantly a plan about protecting the past, not about preparing the Island for the future. There are very few references to economy and a lot about preserving what we have got. Now, I am all in favour of preservation, I live in an 18th century farmhouse that has been not just preserved but beautifully modernised as well. So we do have to preserve everything that is great about Jersey but that does not mean preserving everything. We do have policies in some areas where the wish to preserve prevents things happening. I will give an example of St. Saviour's Hospital. The development brief for that says it is a heritage project but nobody is willing to pay for a heritage project. Therefore, we have a derelict building instead. So we do have to balance the heritage requirements against other requirements. I think, walking around the Island when I can, I observed some farm buildings that can best be described as near derelict, but they could be turned into really nice housing, but you cannot do that if there is a wish to preserve everything that was there. Now, equally, there are many old farms that have been beautifully modernised into excellent housing that look really attractive from the outside. But if you attempt to require too many or too much preservation of what is there, the risk is someone is going to say: "I cannot

afford doing it.” I have had chapter and verse on a few people of what they have tried to do, and they have given up because the cost was simply not worth it. If the planners would rather I have a derelict building than a modern building, that is what is going to happen. I do not want to see that continue.

3.1.16 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Is the Minister then suggesting that there will be a change in the philosophy that he will engage with to develop a system that is sometimes process-led to one that is more focused on enabling sustainable growth? Could he also then explain, if that is the case, how he will aim to broker or address the tensions between local planning in Parishes and more strategic planning decisions?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I thank the Deputy; I think that is a really good question. I have already made it clear to officers that the job of the planning system is to assist businesses that want to develop their business and to help people who want to improve their homes. In doing so, of course, it has to protect things that need protecting but the emphasis should be on helping and assisting, and this applies to regulators across the board. I have had experience of regulation and I can tell you the biggest changes I have seen in regulation is when the regulator changes, i.e. the person changes. I will give a direct example. When I became chair of the Competition Authority we had 2 senior officers who loved looking at international ...

The Bailiff:

Senator, your time is up.

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

My time is up, Sir, I have only had ...

The Bailiff:

I need to be quite strict when there are 2 candidates.

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I will do as I am told.

The Bailiff:

Your time is up. So, can I invite you now to withdraw from the Chamber and ask someone to locate Deputy Tadier. Deputy, when you are ready you can start your speech.

3.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

[Je vais peut-être commencer en français, Monsieur, car aujourd'hui c'est le 14 juillet, alors c'est le jour de la Bastille – la fête de la Révolution en France. Alors, d'abord je voudrais saluer tout le monde et souhaiter à tous une bonne fête nationale française.]

I would like to start in French, Sir, because today is 14th July, Bastille Day, the day that celebrates the French Revolution, and so I would like to wish everyone a happy French National Day.

Before people continue with their panicked looks on the faces from new Members, it is, of course, a longstanding tradition that any Member of this Assembly can address our Assembly in French. I do so for 2 reasons. The first is because today is 14th July. It is La Bastille, Bastille Day, so I wish everybody in the Assembly and anyone listening a *bonne fête*, Sir, including yourself. The second is that I decided while I was out of the room to ask the internet what was great about the French planning system. We have probably heard something about the U.K. planning system, I suspect, from the previous Member who has a lot of experience of it. We know, obviously, about

our own planning system but what might be good about the French planning system? The answer I was given is that it has an integrated spatial strategy, that French communes are highly encouraged to develop unified local plans that co-ordinate economic development, ecology and public transport, and that it provides a holistic approach that does not ensure growth happens in a vacuum. They are also very big on architectural preservation. Now this should not come as a surprise because when we have been to some of the great French cities, and in fact not just the cities but the smaller villages, we notice how the French take care about their system to make sure that there are different *quartiers*, different quarters, in the town, that their buildings are very well-preserved and they value their culture. So the French system is excellent at safeguarding cultural heritage. Through specialised zoning, regional authorities preserve the distinct vernacular of architecture. I am not sure if that is quite the case in Jersey. When I walk through town and if I am ever with a group of tourists, I say there is some great architecture in St. Helier, in particular, but you have to look up, because when you look at the lower levels of our shops, they are not very consistent, there seems to be a mismatch. There have been examples where bad planning behaviour has actually created a complete hodgepodge of unsympathetic vernacular throughout St. Helier. The other thing that I looked at was that there was a question asked by my opponent ... sorry, rather referencing my opponent in the London Assembly. This was asked in 2011 by Navin Shah, a member of the Assembly to the Mayor and the question was this, he said: "Sir Mark Boleat, chair of The Housing and Finance Institute, has recently called for a complete overhaul, of what he calls, deeply flawed planning system which gives far too much attention to 'articulate groups who make a lot of noise'. He is asking to hugely reduce influence of residents and calling for Australian-style streamlined planning panels. Do you agree with these proposals for London?" The answer was: "I do not believe that the planning system in London is deeply flawed, but I have to be clear that the delivery of new homes can be speeded up." Why do I mention that? Well, first of all, I do not know what my opponent said, of course, because I was not in the room, so I can only speculate. I am sure that he talked about his vast experience in the City of London, and also what he saw as a deeply flawed planning system, and maybe some of his plans in Jersey to fight what he calls over-regulation. There might have also been comments that the electorate were very clear during the election that they wanted to see a streamlined planning system, that there was too much red tape. Did the red tape come anywhere up during the previous speech on the bingo card? I suspect it would. We do need to, of course, talk about the area of deregulation and appropriate regulation. But the first point I would make is that the context that we see ourselves here in Jersey is not that of the U.K. The U.K. has allowed itself to have quite a lot of quangos. Things like Ofwat, for example, do not exist in Jersey. So there were lots of powers which do fall to the Minister for Planning and Regulation now, as it is, which will need to be done in-house. So there is a completely different starting context.

[11:45]

There is a wider context here as well, in the sense that Jersey, I think, historically should be very proud of itself. It has always managed to achieve, certainly in recent history, and we are looking pretty much since the development of the Island Development Committee, as it was then, also under the stewardship of the great and late Colin Powell. He was obviously known as being one of the economic architects of Jersey, but he is somebody who did have a hand in our planning system. What served Jersey very well is that when we get a balance between the countryside, the town and the coastal protection, all in balance and all in moderation, that is when Jersey works well. We have seen what some other islands not too far away can do in terms of ribbon development. Jersey has always managed to, I think, on the whole, through its planning system, make sure that it has got a good balance when it comes to not overdevelopment, but protecting certainly its countryside and protecting its coastline. An area that I would like to focus on, and this did come up during my election experience, one of enforcement. Let us look at perhaps the

other side of the coin to deregulation, but actually there are some very good examples of poor enforcement, if that is not tautological or an oxymoron indeed. I think I can give you a couple of examples. What was coming up on the doorstep is when people flout planning law, planning enforcement, it breeds a very contempt for the system. They will see on the one hand ... and this was an actual example knocking on doors around La Moye. I see the planning notice on a residential home, a 3-bedroom home, bulk standard, but very nice in the La Moye area. I read it, I actually took a photo of it, and they needed to put a notice up for 28 days because they want to put a pagoda up in their back garden. I had to double-check what a pagoda was because I thought it was some kind of cuisine but, no, it is a type of structure, a bit like a gazebo, in your back garden. They are having to do that even though it is of a certain height and it is only really going to affect them, it is not going to affect any of the neighbours, the process has to be gone through. But only perhaps less than a mile away from where they live we get a very high-profile example of somebody who ... as they would say on the doorstep in their own vernacular, but translated into parliamentary language, we have this property owner who is taking the mickey that there has been a structure put on the coastal area which is not allowed and it is not being removed, it has come to the end of the 28-day period. There are other encroachments and other enforcement issues that need to be removed. Of course, the owner says: "No, I am not removing it", it simply stays there. So we do have this 2-tier system whereby enforcement for whatever reason is not being done. Now it is delicate because I know this is a live issue, but it is a live issue which has come up at the election and I have been very careful not to name the individual or the area specifically where it is. But it is a very well-known case. I think if there is a rebalancing that needs to take place it does fundamentally need to, of course, take into account the fact that Article 1, Protocol 1 of the Human Rights both in Jersey and in Europe has a presumption that people should have enjoyment of their own properties, but it does seem to depend on who you are. So for the little person who wants to make moderate development within their own curtilage, it seems that arguably there is over-regulation there. I do wonder what would have happened if they would have just pushed ahead with the pagoda. I would find it very difficult to argue with somebody saying: "Why on earth should I try and get permission when others do not have to? After all it is not going to be enforced." One tangible step I would take in that area would be to say that if you have an enforcement order against you which you have not complied with, you cannot submit a new planning application until that enforcement order has been dealt with. That is something that I would want to bring forward, and I know how the maths are stacked here but if that is not something that I am able to do because I am not in the job, I certainly hope that all of this Assembly would put that pressure on the Minister for Planning and Regulation to bring that forward. The problem is I am not convinced that is something he would do because my opponent has form in actually pushing for deregulation. We heard the attributed comments to him that were raised in the London Assembly but we also know that he has talked elsewhere about the deregulation of the taxi service. I know it is not immediately what we are talking about here today but it does seem to me that we would be putting somebody in post who has got form, both in terms of his previous political experience and his rhetoric, for calling for greater deregulation. I do not think that is something that is needed in the Jersey system wholesale. I think there will be specific examples when we can do better. For example, and I probably do have to declare an interest here in that some of my our shared property with myself and my wife, part of it is an outhouse that we have got, which for some reason is a listed building. I do not want to speak specifically about myself but it has got a low-level listing. I do think that in Jersey there does probably need to be a general review about which buildings are listed and how they got listed because, of course, it is great that you can appeal a listing but you have to do that within 28 days of the listing having been made and it may well be that you acquire a listed building later, at which point then you have got to rely on a much more arduous process to question whether that should have been listed in the first place. We see a very high-profile example of that, do we not, with the recent ...

Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:

Sir, much as I enjoy listening to the Deputy, I understood it was a 10-minute speech?

The Bailiff:

Goodness gracious, is it really? Thank you for drawing that to our attention. That is 3 people who should have noticed that did not. Or maybe 50, but certainly 3. I apologise, thank you for drawing that to our attention. Yes, we now move to a period of questions for the Deputy. Who wants to ask the first question?

3.2.1 Deputy B. Ward:

I am asking the same question to both candidates. On reading the comments paper that we received yesterday, it sets out the responsibilities of the 2 separated areas. However, there is an item of responsibility that fell under the previous Minister for the Environment's duties which does not seem to be itemised or identified in either of the 2 proposed roles. This being the Jersey Care Commission, which was under the old system and responsibilities, and the Care Law. Will the candidate for the Minister for Planning and Regulation explain where does this health-related commission sit, and is it appropriate for care and health-related laws too fall under this proposed remit and, if not, where would it be?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Thank you, that is a very good question. It was point 5 of my speech, which I would have probably got to in about half an hour. I apologise if I went over, I do not know if the lack of pulling me up was because everyone was so enthralled or because they were asleep, but I will presume it is the former. It is a very good question; regulation of care is fundamental for me. I have seen first-hand experience of the need for good care, especially for the elderly, although it is not exclusively for the elderly. I have seen reports produced by the Care Commission where they have gone in and there has been some terrible care received in Jersey, much to the real chagrin of the families involved. They do a great job. I think it is an interesting one, is it not, because the argument is should it come under Health. Health cannot regulate themselves but it is not Health regulating themselves either; this is outsourced care effectively. There is a much more fundamental problem in Jersey, that I think we have an over-reliance on privatisation in our elderly care. I think that leads to a risk of profit over people. That is why it needs to have firm and strong regulation. I do not think it is necessarily a problem with it having sat at environment previously. I do think that moving it to planning automatically with the Planning and Regulation does give an opportunity for it to be reviewed about where it should best sit. The bottom line is, though, I do want to see extra funding being made available for enforcement and for regulation to be administered properly. I imagine that might be something which sets me apart from my opponent here, because I do not favour automatically, ideologically small government. I favour right-sized government.

The Bailiff:

Supplementary?

Deputy B. Ward:

No, Sir, but I would just like to thank the candidate for the response.

3.2.2 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Will the candidate support the continued work of the Planning Committee that is made-up of elected States Members as part of a planning system for considering and determining matters under planning law?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think the Planning Applications Panel does a great job in very many ways. They are the unsung heroes of the system. It is a thankless task, is the expression I was looking for. I am not going to get drawn into whether I think it is the best system to have entirely elected Members on the planning system but that is the system we have got and I do not have a compelling case to change it.

3.2.3 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Very quickly, I would note that it was renamed in legislation from the Planning Applications Panel to the Planning Committee, and I would ask whether the candidate considers that it should actually be recognised for its positive work it can do providing free recourse? Does he consider it important that there are good routes to review of applications, especially those refused by applicants, so that they can actually have an affordable way of trying to get their case through?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am happy to do that, and it reminds me of when the Deputy was standing for his position I asked a question about the balance of proof, if you like. So while I am on my feet and to answer yes to that, I would also like to highlight the fact that is something I would like to look at. Actually I think the balance of burden of proof in rejecting an application should be on the States, not on the individual, and where there is a tied vote, say if it was 2-2, I think because of the human rights implications it is up to the States to prove that it should not be built. It could be argued that there should be a presumption in favour of building. That is something which the right of the Assembly might wish to consider as a good idea as well, and maybe vote for me to do that.

3.2.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Does the Deputy support the polluter-pay principle as one that should underpin the licensing fees and enforcement approach of the planning and regulation hub?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Polluter pays, I think that we should be probably moving to an area where we think about a more holistic and comprehensive ecocide law. I think that the environment needs to be at the heart of everything we do. I think there has been some very bad practice over the years and it is difficult to know who you would identify as the pollutant. I think it is definitely something we should look at. We have got very high nitrate levels still in Jersey. I think the conversation around nitrates has largely been forgotten. When we have a Government which continually will issue derogations to its water company that it should actually be enforcing, I think that is a big problem. So I think along with the user-pays pollutants, I think Government actually needs to start holding to account the utilities in a way which would be very uncomfortable for any Minister who is doing his job, in this case, properly.

3.2.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Deputy for his answer. It is also quite a detailed answer, giving some examples. I suppose the question then, how would he - if he was Minister for Planning and Regulation - go about that within the Council of Ministers who want to cut red tape and also try to encourage economic growth, which potentially could be put above and beyond that issue of polluter-pay principle.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I would just make the case that economic growth needs to be sustainable. If we do not have a functioning agricultural system in 30 or 50 years' time and we do not have increasing food security, then it is all at the altar of Mammon, so to speak, but the public will not thank us. Ultimately, it is

up to this Assembly to give its not just implied consent but, in many cases, its actual consent to what Government has in its programme. If this Assembly is a deregulatory, *laissez-faire*, neo-liberal Assembly, it will want to make sure that it has that appropriate Minister in place. Part of me standing for election is to give the history books the opportunity to say that perhaps when fundamental change has happened in Jersey's planning system, the Assembly knew what they were doing and they had a choice. They had a choice between somebody - and I hope I am wrong in this - who will potentially be throwing the baby out with the bathwater when it comes to our planning system. Because I think we have got a very balanced system at the moment, and we tinker with that at our peril.

3.2.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

What will the candidate do to protect mature trees on the Island, which cannot simply be replaced with new planting?

[12:00]

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do not have evidence at the moment that the current strategy when it comes to trees is flawed. If there are issues, we need to take a longer-term view of where trees are planted and how they are maintained. What is often the case is that we see historically - sometimes by accident but sometimes deliberately - inappropriate trees are being planted in the wrong places. Of course, when they become rooted then become very large, they can have unintended consequences. So I think we do need to have ... I would certainly want to sit down with the charity that looks after trees. It used to be called Men of the Trees; it is called Jersey Trees for Life now. They do a great job. I remember during the Great Storm of 1987, along La Route Orange. When there was a big storm and I was still in shorts - probably not in October though on that day - that there was some great work done about planting and young people. We were all involved in that. I think people do care about trees. I want to make sure that is still proportionate and that it is a sensible policy.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

If the candidate is elected to this role, would he agree to look at the legislation in this area with a view to strengthening protection of mature trees?

Deputy M. Tadier:

That would be one of the potential workstreams. I would suggest that rather than me as a hypothetical future Minister doing that work, it might be better if the Scrutiny Panel maybe looked at it and presented something, if indeed we cannot convince the actual Minister to do the work.

3.2.7 Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South:

If elected, how would the candidate work with other Ministers and the Constables to solve the current issues regarding the Victoria Marine Lake, which is presently a listed structure?

Deputy M. Tadier:

That is fortuitous. That was the issue that I was trying to address in the eleventh minute of my speech. It is quite fundamental. On the one hand, we have got to remember that we ... the Marine Lake was listed only a couple of years ago. For me, that seemed like a very strange thing to do. I am not saying it was right or wrong but it seemed to happen in a vacuum. First of all - this could be given as an example - why was the Marine Lake listed, which needs to be protected? But the actual political question about what needs to happen to the Marine Lake was not solved. It could be that the Marine Lake needs to just be removed completely because that might be a cheaper and safer solution to what needs to be done there, but the listing potentially aggravates that. I think

that is a very good example where the planning system and the heritage aspect is not working together with what might be ultimately in the public interest. So to answer the question shortly, of course there needs to be some joined-up working. But first of all, if there is no money available to maintain it as a listed structure, the first question might be to look at delisting it and then having a question about what to do with it. But that will not be popular with everyone.

3.2.8 Deputy C.S. Alves:

I am going to ask the same question I asked the last candidate, which is what is the candidate's view on maintaining public access to our coastlines?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think it is vital. We know that the public feel very strongly about the coastline. I remember the first line in the sand. I remember the second line in the sand. I remember a couple of years ago, when I organised - and kindly some of my local Deputies assisted with that - that there was also a strong feeling about what was going on at La Braye and around that area. People do come out to show their support for the coastline. The Chief Minister now, of course, when he ... I do not think he was Chief Minister at the time, he may have been. He brought the Grève de Lecq acquisition, and it was co-funded through the National Trust. The public are very savvy when it comes to this issue. I think we need to listen to the public on that issue.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

What strategies or how does he think he would help protect any challenges that there might be to this?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Again, I refer to a previous answer that we need to first of all enforce good practice in Jersey. Where there are examples of that being flouted, it needs to be enforced properly so that people will respect the decisions, not just in word but the fact that we value our coastline in practice. I think we need to continue to value the work that is done by third-sector organisations. The coastal network that we have of cliff paths, of steps, do not happen by chance. They are done in large parts by groups like the National Trust. They are a big economic driver, as well as providing things for our local community to do. So I think it is a real balance. There is already an economic balance and benefit in Jersey when we do things properly through a balanced planning system that we take for granted and perhaps should not do.

3.2.9 Deputy V. Li:

This is the same question that I asked the other candidate. Would the candidate consider making safe schools and safe school access a material planning consideration in the new Island Plan?

Deputy M. Tadier:

There are already some safeguards around that, and I think those are considerations. There is also the opportunity to do these things through planning gains, of course. That may also be appropriate. But ultimately, yes is the answer. We need to make sure that those powers are only strengthened and that they are always at the forefront. I am a big supporter of things like that 20-minute village, I think it is called. Safe routes for walking and cycling. They need to be joined up, ultimately. There is no point in having a partial cycle network if there are certain areas of road which are very dangerous and young families, in particular, or the elderly do not wish to traverse because they cannot get there. So we have to do all that we can. It is not entirely the job for the Minister for Planning and Regulation, but the Minister will need to work in a joined-up way with his ministerial colleagues.

Deputy V. Li:

I think the candidate has already briefed his opinions on that. My question is, can he assure the parents in St. Helier North that, as a Minister, children and young people walking to the school will come first in every planning decision?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I can advise that I would want due consideration to be given to what the Deputy is asking. The issue is, of course, there are a multitude of considerations that need to be taken into account. If somebody has been elected on cutting red tape and prioritising economic gain as opposed to necessarily doing what is best for the local community, there might be tensions there. I think ultimately people get what they voted for.

3.2.10 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

The candidate referred to evidence presented in the U.K. Parliament by his opponent in this process. Looking at that evidence, his opponent refers to inherent tensions between local planning and strategic planning decisions. What will be his approach when it comes to brokering solutions in this scenario, in the interest of supporting economic growth and protecting our heritage and environment?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am glad for the opportunity. I did refer to that. What struck me and worries me is that there was this reference to articulate groups who make a lot of noise having too much influence on the planning system. If that is a correct attribution of what the Member is quoted to have said, I think that is very dismissive, first of all, of those types of groups. We are talking about groups like the National Trust. We are talking about groups like Save Our Shoreline, Friends of the Earth. There will be local community groups, of course, which may be on a constituency basis, which all have a very direct interest and they care about the Island holistically. I do not know if this is the point to mention it, but I would certainly want to protect the third-party appeals mechanism and system. I think it is vitally important in Jersey that the third-party appeal system exists, that it is proportionate, because we live often cheek by jowl in Jersey. We do not have the vast swaths of land where people can be protected from the worst vagaries of bad planning decisions. I do not know if that answers the Member's question but happy to take a supplementary.

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

From a system that can sometimes appear process-led to one that is more focused on enabling sustainable development and economic growth, what are his particular views on how this can be improved?

Deputy M. Tadier:

We have already seen the development and the evolution of pre-planning advice being given. I think that is much better than it used to be in the past. That is a system which initially can provide written or verbal feedback. Once people fully realise how that can be used, that can be developed. The more work that can be done in earlier stage ... I will give one example; again, it was in La Moye. I had somebody who is an architect, I came across him. He had a really fruitful experience of dealing with the Planning Department where traditionally others have said: "I find it really difficult." This was somebody who worked in the area of historic buildings. He just had a really refreshing way of looking at it. He did not see the Planning Department as an enemy, he saw them as somebody to be worked with. I think if that mentality is shared on both sides - and sadly, it is not always the case - where there is proportionate regulation but also conversations can happen, I think that is where we get the best out of our planning system.

3.2.11 The Connétable of St. Clement:

The same question to the second candidate. What would the future be for our derelict and dangerous greenhouses under your direction?

Deputy M. Tadier:

There was a vote that took place in 2022, early, brought by then Deputy Moore, which did not pass. Essentially, we need to use the powers that we have. Whether it is a broken wall that I have seen in St. Brelade for the last 10 to 15 years not being fixed or a derelict greenhouse, there are currently provisions in the law which allows the Minister - or it is delegated to his chief officer - to enforce that. So you go to the land owner and say: "You can either put those back into use and build them again as greenhouses - because there are people in the community who would quite happily take on an allotment greenhouse - or you return them to as they were." Sometimes, in many cases, these farmers might have received subsidies to help construct that. That is taxpayers' money going to these dilapidated greenhouses. There is a quote from Deputy Ash during the debate, where he said that if ... I do not know if I can read it out. But he talked about the fact that this would encourage bad practice. There are also quotes from Senator Ferguson. So Deputy Ash said that this will lead to more development in St. Clement by the back door. He says: "Part of Government should be ... to drive good behaviours ... This does nothing to drive good behaviours. This effectively says: 'Let your greenhouse get into a terrible state and then cash in to the tune of several million pounds'."

The Bailiff:

That is the ...?

Deputy M. Tadier:

The former Deputy of St. Clement.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. That is 20 minutes brought to an end. Could someone locate Senator Boleat before we move to the vote? Members are asked to return to their seats. Any Member wishing to vote for Senator Boleat should press the pour button. Any Member wishing to vote for Deputy Tadier should press the contre button. Members may abstain in the usual way, if they wish. I will ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting.

POUR:

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

CONTRE:

Deputy M. Tadier
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet
Deputy C.S. Alves
Deputy T.A. Coles
Deputy L.V. Feltham
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M Porée
Deputy L.D. Carpenter

ABSTAINED:

Deputy A.F. Curtis
Deputy H.L. Jeune

Connétable of St. Peter
Connétable of St. Brelade
Connétable of St. Helier
Connétable of St. John
Connétable of St. Clement
Connétable of St. Ouen
Connétable of Trinity
Connétable of Grouville
Connétable of St. Saviour
Connétable of St. Lawrence
Deputy C.F. Labey
Deputy K.F. Morel
Deputy F.G Voisin
Deputy M.B. Andrews
Deputy R.E. Binet
Deputy M.R. Ferey
Deputy J. Renouf
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson
Deputy B. Ward
Deputy K.M. Wilson
Deputy S.J. Gleave
Deputy V. Li
Deputy A Maltman
Deputy R.J. Parker
Deputy G.A. Raimondo
Deputy C.J. Rebindaine
Deputy P.J. Romeril

4. Appointment of the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee

The Bailiff:

We now go on to the appointment of the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee. Under Standing Order 121, the Assembly is due to appoint a president of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee. I invite Members to make nominations for the president of the committee from among the chairs of the Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee.

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

I would like to nominate Deputy Wilson as president for the Scrutiny Liaison Committee.

The Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I invite Deputy Wilson to address the Assembly for up to 10 minutes, following which there will be a period of questions for up to 20 minutes.

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

I will keep it brief. For me Scrutiny is the complete and total control mechanism in the Assembly, and one of the things that I would like to do through the presidency is to make sure that what we will do is have a higher standard to the Scrutiny process that will enable Ministers to do their work well. For me, one of the things that is critical is the relationship between Ministers and the panels, and in that regard, understanding the agenda between us and agreeing on the way in which we work together will be critical. There are 5 very capable leaders of each of the Scrutiny Panels, and I do not underestimate the task of trying to co-ordinate the ambition and the purpose behind each of those panels, but one of the things I can assure the Assembly is that we will be measured and we will be considered in the way that we approach our work, and that we will conduct ourselves in a professional way. One of the things that I think is really important to call upon is the need for mutual respect in terms of Ministers' ambitions for delivery, but also the respect that is given to the Scrutiny process so that the public feel that they can trust the way in which the Assembly works. I would also like to, on this occasion, say that there has been a really good balance in terms of the way in which the Members have put themselves forward for leading each of those panels. So I hope the Assembly will benefit from the richness of the difference and the diversity of what we have in terms of contribution. One of the key areas that we will need to address immediately is the legacy report that was previously undertaken by the previous S.L.C. (Scrutiny Liaison Committee), and we are in the process at the moment of trying to come together as an S.L.C. to agree that work programme and undertake the timeframe for delivery around that. I can assure you that as an S.L.C. we will also be good communicators of what it is we want to achieve, and we will widen our Scrutiny process to make sure that there is good representation from the public in all of the work that we do on our Scrutiny Panels. I would also like to express my thanks to my panel members for the confidence and the trust they have placed in me to carry out this significant leadership role. Thank you. **[Approbation]**

The Bailiff:

Are there any questions for Deputy Wilson?

4.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Can I just preface it by thanking the Deputy for being an excellent vice-chair on my Scrutiny Panel over the last term. The question I have relating to that is, what experience has she learnt from that role that she will put into good practice when it comes to leading S.L.C.?

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

I think I was able to fulfil my role as the vice-chair because I had a good chair, so thank you for that. What I have learnt is that preparation is everything. In actual fact, I had a conversation with the chief executive yesterday in relation to P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee), and one of the things that we have agreed is that in order to raise the bar and raise the standard of the way in which the Public Accounts Committee will operate will be to improve on that communication and to also prepare well. We talked about the fact that very often papers, propositions, laws were delivered late, and that put an enormous pressure on the Scrutiny Panels to have to do the work. I think if we are going to be candid, that we have had a debate this morning about that very thing. For me, the most important thing is to make sure that we can respect the process. They are there for a reason. The other thing is that the makeup of the panels I think is going to be critical, and I know panel chairs have been able to harness the support of lots of Assembly Members from

different areas. I think again that is another learning point, is to keep them apolitical, to bring all of the talents to the panels, to focus on the issues. Clearly politics will play a part in between, but we must never lose sight of the fact that we are here to serve. We are here for the purpose of the public. They are the voice, or we are their voice, and when I talk about respect, I talk about the need to respect that public voice. That is what I have learnt through the Scrutiny process so far, that there have been some issues with that as we have gone forward. I would clearly like to work with colleagues to raise the standard on that so that we can have trust and confidence, not only in the Government, but also in the Scrutiny process itself.

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

Would the candidate detail how she would continue to innovate within Scrutiny? As Scrutiny has become, I think, increasingly creative and innovative and inclusive over the years, and with things such as review panels, co-opting Members for specific reviews, holding single issue hearings *et cetera*, would she try to carry on those things and embed them, and has she got any new ideas for what she might do?

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Yes, I would want to continue to make more progress on the best of what we have done already. We have not really had a proper debate on the way in which artificial intelligence will inform the Scrutiny process, but we have got capability there that will allow us to refine and focus our Scrutiny so that it is using the evidence and the intelligence rather than just rely also on opinion. So they are the kinds of things. I would also like to see more public engagement in the Scrutiny Panels and Scrutiny process, and I would like to spend more time talking to the general public in the form of community meetings or whatever out in the community, to be able to engage information from the public before Scrutiny concludes its work. So to use that mechanism for informing people a lot more robustly than what we have done at the moment. I think we have to move away from transaction. We have got to focus on outcomes. One of the other things that I think is important is to maybe work with the panels and explore ways in which we can ask more strategically-focused questions that will again allow us to have much more strategic debate in the Assembly as a result of that Scrutiny process.

4.1.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Deputy for her answer. I am also interested in what kind of direction she would give to the other chairs in terms of following up on previous reviews, especially where there might not be that corporate memory if it is a new Member. One of the reviews I am thinking of is the Family Friendly Review which we worked on together, but of course there are many others.

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

I mean, as an S.L.C., I think we are going to have to prioritise our work. We are going to have to look across all of the Scrutiny programmes of work to see where there are common themes, where we can avoid duplication of efforts, where we can work with joint panels, cross panels. We have already had a conversation around the Corporate Services Panel in terms of how we might approach the Common Strategic Policy. I think there are really good examples like that that we could use to build upon. But for me, it is really about being collegiates and having that strategic intention focused on outcomes rather than tactical activity all of the time.

4.1.4 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I would like to ask the Deputy a question that I asked of Scrutiny members a couple of weeks ago, but from the perspective of Scrutiny Panels and their budgets, and having control of their budgets,

does the Deputy have any thoughts about whether the politicians on Scrutiny should have greater control over those budgets, or does she think that the current situations work perfectly well?

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

I think the Deputy will know that I am always looking for improvement in some of the ways in which we do things. I think if we are going to have a more cross-governmental approach to the way in which we scrutinise, then that gives us an opportunity to look at how we use money. I am aware in relation to Deputy Tadier's question before, that it has been a bit of a bunfight for money in relation to review processes. I think the design of our review process gives us an opportunity to think about how we might spend money differently and allocate money differently. I think to ring-fence this I do not think you get the value out of it in the way that we see.

4.1.5 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I thank the Deputy for her answer. Would the Deputy agree with the statement that Scrutiny politicians should be in charge of the Scrutiny budgets?

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

It is a very interesting question and, to be quite honest, I want to give that some more thought. I think if you are in charge of delivery, which again, Scrutiny will be, then it would follow that I think if there is a resource allocated to that, that you also have to account for the way in which you make your decisions about how you are going to scrutinise. But I also think that there is a conversation to be had as to where the public feel that that money is best spent, and that is why I do not think we should get into a scenario whereby we become quite insular in terms of our focus around how we spend our Scrutiny money to do the reviews that we will be doing, but that we open that to a much more consultative, engaging way so that we can make sure that we are delivering value for money.

The Bailiff:

Are there any more questions for Deputy Wilson? If not, then I can announce that Deputy Wilson has been appointed as president of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee. **[Approbation]**

5. Appointment of the Members of the Privileges and Procedures Committee

The Bailiff:

In accordance with Standing Order 122, the Assembly is due to appoint members of the Privileges and Procedures Committee. I invite the chair, Deputy Alves, to make 3 nominations from elected Members who are not Ministers or Assistant Ministers.

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

I would like to nominate Deputy Louise Doublet, Deputy Tom Coles and the Connétable of St. John.

The Bailiff:

Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? If there are no other nominations, then I declare that Deputy Doublet, Deputy Coles and the Connétable of St. John are appointed members of P.P.C. **[Approbation]** In accordance with Standing Order 122(5), I invite the Chair of P.P.C. to nominate a further 2 members from the Ministers and Assistant Ministers to P.P.C.

5.2 Deputy C.S. Alves:

After consultation with the Chief Minister, I would like to nominate Senator Serena Kersten and Deputy Kirsten Morel.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations?

[12:30]

In that case, I can announce that Senator Kersten and Deputy Morel have been elected as members of P.P.C. **[Approbation]** We now move on to the appointment of members of the Public Accounts Committee in accordance with Standing Order 123.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Sorry, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy Alves.

Deputy C.S. Alves:

We need the S.L.C. (Scrutiny Liaison Committee) rep as well.

The Bailiff:

Oh, have I skipped something? I do apologise. Yes, I have. I invite the chair of P.P.C. to nominate a further member from among the membership of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee.

5.3 Deputy C.S. Alves:

I would like to nominate Deputy Karen Wilson.

The Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I declare that Deputy Wilson is appointed a member of P.P.C. **[Approbation]**

6. Appointment of the elected Members of the Public Accounts Committee

The Bailiff:

I now move on to Standing Order 123, members of the Public Accounts Committee who are elected Members. Standing Order 124 deals with unelected members appointed for the Public Accounts Committee, which requires notice to be given 14 days before the meeting of the person to be nominated, which therefore cannot happen at this meeting, but under Standing Order 123(1) I invite Deputy Wilson to make her nominations for membership of the Public Accounts Committee.

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

It gives me great pleasure to nominate Constable Troy, Deputy Carpenter and Deputy Li as members of the panel.

The Bailiff:

Are there any other nominations? In that case, I declare that the Connétable of St. Clement, Deputy Carpenter and Deputy Li are appointed as members of the Public Accounts Committee. **[Approbation]**

7. Appointment of the Members of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

The Bailiff:

In accordance with Standing Order 125, the Assembly is to appoint members of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. In accordance with Standing Order 125(1), I invite the Chair, Deputy Feltham, to indicate the number of the members she is seeking for the panel. The maximum is 5. How many members are you seeking, Deputy Feltham?

7.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (Chair, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel):

That will be 4 members.

The Bailiff:

4 members.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Plus myself, of course.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. I invite you to make your nominations.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I nominate Deputy Leck, Deputy Rebindaine, Deputy Carpenter and Deputy Jeune.

The Bailiff:

Are there any other nominations? **[Seconded]** Seconded, thank you. Are there any other nominations? In that case, I declare that Deputy Leck, Deputy Rebindaine, Deputy Carpenter and Deputy Jeune have been appointed as members of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

8. Appointment of the Members of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel

The Bailiff:

I now move on to members of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel. In accordance with Standing Order 125(1), I invite the chair, Deputy Gleave, of the panel to indicate the number of members she is seeking for that panel.

8.1 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South (Chair, Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

4.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Can I please have your nominations?

Deputy S.J. Gleave:

Yes, I would like to propose Deputy Rebindaine, Connétable Johnson, Deputy Leck and Deputy Raimondo.

The Bailiff:

So that was Deputy Rebindaine, Connétable of St. Mary, Deputy Raimondo. Who was the fourth one?

Deputy S.J. Gleave:

Deputy Leck.

The Bailiff:

Deputy Leck, yes. Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I declare Deputy Rebindaine, the Connétable of St. Mary, Deputy Leck and Deputy Raimondo appointed as members of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

9. Appointment of the Members of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel

The Bailiff:

I move on to the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. In accordance with Standing Order 125, I invite the Chair, Deputy Li, to indicate the number of members she is seeking for that panel.

9.1 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

4, thank you.

The Bailiff:

4. Please may I have your nominations?

Deputy V. Li:

I would like to nominate the following Members: Connétable Labey, Connétable Palmer ...

The Bailiff:

Sorry, forgive me. Can you give me their names and their titles? Sorry.

Deputy V. Li:

Connétable Labey.

The Bailiff:

Connétable of Grouville, yes.

Deputy V. Li:

Connétable of St. Lawrence, Tina Palmer; Connétable of St. Saviour, David Curtis.

The Bailiff:

Yes. Just use their titles, Connétable of St. Saviour, St. Lawrence and so on.

Deputy V. Li:

And Deputy Rebindaine.

The Bailiff:

Deputy Rebindaine. Thank you very much. Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I declare that the Connétable of Grouville, the Connétable of St. Lawrence, the Connétable of St. Saviour and Deputy Rebindaine are appointed as members of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

10. Appointment of the Members of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel:

The Bailiff:

We now move on to members of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel. In accordance with Standing Order 125, I invite the chair, Deputy Jeune, to indicate the number of members she is seeking for this panel.

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

4.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Deputy Jeune, please make your nominations.

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes. I would like to nominate the Connétable of St. Saviour, Deputy Coles, Deputy Curtis and Deputy Maltman.

The Bailiff:

That is Deputy Alex Curtis, yes?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes, sorry.

The Bailiff:

Deputy Coles, and who was the last one?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Deputy Maltman, Arlene Maltman.

The Bailiff:

Yes, thank you very much. Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I declare that Deputy Coles, the Connétable of St. Saviour, Deputy Alex Curtis and Deputy Maltman are duly appointed to membership of that panel. **[Approbation]**

11. Appointment of the Members of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel

The Bailiff:

I move on to membership of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. I invite the chair, Deputy Porée, to indicate the number of members she is seeking for this panel.

11.1 Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée of St. Helier South (Chair, Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):

I am currently seeking 3 panel members.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much.

Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée:

Their names are Deputy Carpenter, Deputy Raimondo and Deputy Leck.

The Bailiff:

The last one was Deputy Leck, was it?

Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée:

Yes, it is.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Are those nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I can declare that Deputy Carpenter, Deputy Raimondo and Deputy Leck are appointed as members of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. **[Approbation]**

12. Appointment of Members of the Planning Committee

The Bailiff:

I move on to membership of the Planning Committee. I invite the chair, Deputy Alex Curtis, to indicate the number of members he is seeking for this committee.

12.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement (Chair, Planning Committee):

Today I am proposing 8 members and they are Deputy Coles, the Connétable of Grouville ...

The Bailiff:

Got to be a bit slower if I am going to write all this down. Would you mind?

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

I thought you might want it a bit slower. I have got 8.

The Bailiff:

I am struggling to keep up.

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Where are you at, Sir?

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy Coles, Connétable of Grouville.

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

The Connétable of St. Ouen, Deputy Maltman, the Connétable of St. John, Deputy Gleave, the Connétable of St. Brelade and the Connétable of St. Martin.

The Bailiff:

All right, there we are. Are the nominations seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, I declare that Deputy Coles, the Connétable of Grouville, the Connétable of St. Ouen, Deputy Maltman, the Connétable of St. John, Deputy Gleave, the Connétable of St. Brelade and the Connétable of St. Martin are elected for membership of the Planning Committee. **[Approbation]**

13. Appointment of 2 States Commissioners of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission

The Bailiff:

In accordance with Standing Order 126, the Assembly is due to appoint 2 States Commissioners of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission. Under Standing Order 126, I invite the chair, Deputy Labey, of the commission, to make her nominations.

13.1 Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin (Chair, Jersey Overseas Aid Commission):

I would like to nominate Senator Mary Le Hegarat and Deputy Arlene Maltman.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Are there any other nominations?

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

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

The Bailiff:

The procedure is slightly different for these elections. The procedure for these elections is different from the Standing Orders that apply to the election of the other panels. This procedure is set out in Standing Order 126 and it provides that I shall invite the chair of the commission to propose 2 elected Members that he or she recommends and then the States shall decide whether to appoint each of the elected Members that have been proposed. There is no provision in this Standing Order for there to be nominations of other members and there is simply a separate vote on each proposed candidate. It is simply different from the other procedures that apply to these Scrutiny Panels. It does not indicate whether the vote should be secret or public, so we will assume it is a public vote. I think in the circumstances, the appropriate way for me to proceed is simply to have a separate vote on the 2 Members who have been proposed by the chair of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Before we move to the vote, I am wondering if we could propose the adjournment. It might also give you time to consider, because I am wondering whether it is the interpretation, the presumption that it would be an open vote rather than a secret vote. As I understand it, the votes used to be in secret until there were propositions brought to make them public ...

The Bailiff:

That is right.

Deputy M. Tadier:

... and because nothing has been brought in this case, the assumption should be made that they remain secret, I would have thought, despite the fact that I like as much openness and honesty as possible.

The Bailiff:

No. I am happy to reflect on it, but we were just going so quickly, I was not expecting to reach this stage until this afternoon. But yes, I am happy to look at Standing Order 126 over the adjournment. If Members are content to adjourn now, we will adjourn until 2.15 p.m.

[12:43]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:26]

Senator M.E. Millar:

May I just pass on apologies from Senator Miles? She has to attend a planning appeal at 2.00 p.m. and she will be here as soon as she can be.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. So returning to the appointment of 2 States Commissioners of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission, having regard to precedent, the surrounding Standing Orders and the general presumption, we are going to proceed with a secret ballot; 2 ballots in relation to the 2 nominated members. The first nominated member was Senator Le Hegarat, and Members will be given a gold slip **[Laughter]** - there we are, golden ticket - in which you will be able to write pour, contre or to abstain. Those golden tickets are being passed around soon.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

You better make sure you get them all back.

The Bailiff:

Well, yes, we will. Then subsequently there will be some white tickets, and on those are for Deputy Maltman, and again, pour, contre or abstain. Yes, Deputy Jeune.

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

Apologies, I was wondering if you could explain what happens when the votes are counted. Is there like a threshold to meet, or even if there was only one vote cast, does somebody ... they will still be in?

The Bailiff:

I think it is a simple majority of pours over contre, a simple majority, because they are both being separately considered by the Assembly. The gold slips are for Senator Le Hegarat and the white ones for Deputy Maltman. They have both been given out at the same time. You do not have to write your name down because it is a secret ballot, and you simply put pour or contre or abstain on the gold ticket for Senator Le Hegarat and the white ticket in respect of Deputy Maltman.

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

Can I just ask for some clarification?

[14:30]

Is this the way that it works: that as long as they both get a majority, they are therefore both elected and we do not have the option to vote for the Constable of St. Martin?

The Bailiff:

That is absolutely right. There is no provision for other nominations and if either or both of the candidates were to be rejected, then I would need to - either today or on another occasion - invite the Chair of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission to make other nominations.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I flag a point of order? It is probably for future reference, rather than for an immediate ruling, but the ballot slips we have been given say: "Please write your chosen candidate's name below" which I think at the very least ...

The Bailiff:

That is unnecessary. I did not see, I thought they were simply coloured bits of paper, so simply write pour or contre on the gold tickets and pour or contre on the white tickets, as I indicated when they were given out.

Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:

Sorry for the confusion. You did ask if there were any further nominations, so I took the opportunity to nominate the Constable of St. Martin. I understand that is not possible to do, so I do not understand why we are not just approving the 2 people who have been appointed.

The Bailiff:

Because there needs to be a decision of the States under Standing Order 126(2) whether to appoint each of the elected Members. A decision can only be done in a public or private way, and secret ballot is the way these things are normally done. So we have discussed it at sufficient length to be satisfied this is the best way of proceeding. Of course Standing Orders can be amended subsequently by this Assembly to make things different, if that was thought appropriate. Have we all had the chance to cast our - well, your - votes? In that case, the voting slips can now be collected by the usher and they will be counted by the Assistant Greffier. There we are. **[Laughter]** You are all happy, there is no stuffed papers? They can all go in the same boxes, can they not? It does not matter, yes. That is why they are different colours. It is a shame the journalist has gone; he has missed the best part of the day. Yes, the Viscount has kindly attended to assist the Greffier with the counting. Have all Members now cast their votes and placed them in the ballot boxes? I am grateful. Thank you very much. They will then be counted.

14. Appointment of 2 Members of the States Employment Board

The Bailiff:

If Members are content, we will get on with the next item while the counting takes place, and that is members of the States Employment Board in accordance with the Employment of States of Jersey Employees (Jersey) Law 2005. I invite the chair, the Chief Minister, of the States Employment Board to make his 2 nominations for members who are not Ministers or Assistant Ministers.

14.1 Senator L.J. Farnham (Chair, States Employment Board):

I would like to nominate the Connétable of St. Lawrence, C-O-N-N-E **[Laughter]** Sorry, Sir.

The Bailiff:

He did tell me that joke was coming, so **[Laughter]** that is why I am not laughing quite so much. I have got over it.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

And the Connétable of St. Brelade. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. All right, are there any other nominations? In that case, I declare that the Connétable of St. Lawrence and the Connétable of St. Brelade have been appointed as members of the States Employment Board. **[Approbation]**

15. Election of a Member to represent the States of Jersey in the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly

The Bailiff:

The Assembly is now due to elect a member and an associate member to represent the States of Jersey on the British-Irish Parliamentary Association. I invite nominations from the Assembly first for election of a member of the British-Irish Parliamentary Association. I remind Members that Ministers and Assistant Ministers cannot be nominated for these roles, only non-Executive Members.

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

I would like to nominate Deputy Jeune.

The Bailiff:

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

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

I would like to nominate Deputy Coles.

The Bailiff:

Is that nomination seconded? **[Seconded]** Yes, thank you. Are there any other nominations? Thank you. We will now proceed to a secret ballot in relation to the member. Have we got another colour there? **[Laughter]** What do we call that, lilac or mauve or purple? Lilac, all right. So Members will shortly be provided with a ballot paper, and please write down the surname of the Member who you wish to elect as a member of the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly. You do not need to include your own name on the ballot unless you are the candidate, in which case, you should. So to remind you, the candidates are Deputy Jeune and Deputy Coles. I think we need to wait for the outcome of this vote as of course the unsuccessful candidate may wish to put themselves forward for the associate membership so we need to I think probably wait for the outcome of this vote. The balance will now be collected.

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

I note that Senator Miles has just arrived in the Chamber. Would it be in order for her to have a ballot considering they are being collected?

The Bailiff:

I suppose so, yes. **[Laughter]** The voting is not formally closed. Senator Miles, it is Deputy Jeune or Deputy Coles for membership of the British-Irish Parliamentary Association. We cannot obviously proceed with the election of the associate member until we know the result of the election for member. We could, if Members are content, move on to the appointment of members of the Bailiff's Consultative Panel, if that was not too many balls in the air at once. Are Members content to do that? Yes, all right.

16. Appointment of Members of the Bailiff's Consultative Panel.

The Bailiff:

There are 5 appointments to be made to the Bailiff's Consultative Panel. I can remind Members the panel consists and comprises of some *ex-officio* members including the Chief Minister and the chair of P.P.C. and 5 members appointed by the Assembly *via* a secret ballot. Nominations do not need to be made in the count for today. Each nomination must be seconded and I invite nominations to the Bailiff's Consultative Panel.

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

I would like to propose the Constable of St. Helier.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]**

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

I would like to propose Deputy Alex Curtis of St Clement.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]**

16.3 Senator H.M. Miles:

I would like to propose Deputy Stephenson.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]**

16.4 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

I would like to propose Deputy Doublet, please.

The Bailiff:

Was that seconded? **[Seconded]**

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

I would like to propose Deputy Tadier from St. Brelade.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]**

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

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

The Bailiff:

She has been nominated already. **[Laughter]** She has been nominated already, has she?
[Laughter] She cannot fill 2 spaces.

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

I would like to nominate Deputy Morel.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other nominations? All right, well, we have 6 nominations for the 5 posts. I would like to remind you the Connétable of St. Helier, Deputy Alex Curtis, Deputy Stephenson, Deputy Doublet, Deputy Tadier and Deputy Morel. So we will have a secret ballot and, in a moment, the Usher will provide the ballot papers to each Member. Members should write down the names of the candidate you wish to select, up to a maximum of 5. So 5 names should be written down. To remind you again, the Connétable of St. Helier, Deputy Alex Curtis, Deputy Stephenson, Deputy Doublet, Deputy Tadier and Deputy Morel.

[14:45]

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

It must be nice to be so popular, Sir. Everyone wants to work with you.

The Bailiff:

Well, obviously, I will need all the advice I can get, presumably. **[Laughter]** Are all Members ready for their papers to be collected? Anyone still writing? The Chief Minister has been scribbling away rather slowly. **[Laughter]** Yes, I can now announce some outcomes of earlier ballots in relation to States Commissioners of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission. For Senator Le Hegarat there were 37 votes pour, 8 votes contre and 1 abstention. Accordingly, she has been

appointed. In relation to Deputy Maltman, there were 37 votes pour, 8 votes contre and 1 abstention also so she has also been appointed as a States Commissioner. **[Approbation]** As to the contest for the Member to represent the States on the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly, the outcome of the election was Deputy Jeune, 31 votes and Deputy Coles, 16 votes. Accordingly, Deputy Jeune has been elected as a member of the British-Irish Parliamentary Association. **[Approbation]**

17. Election of an Associate Member to represent the States of Jersey in the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly

The Bailiff:

I now invite nomination for the election of an associate member of the of British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly.

17.1 Connétable M. O'D. Troy of St. Clement:

I would like to propose Constable Karen Shenton-Stone.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]**

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

I would like to propose Deputy Coles.

The Bailiff:

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

17.3 Deputy P.J. Romeril of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I would like to nominate Deputy Raimondo.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Thank you very much. Are there any other nominations? Accordingly, we move to a secret ballot. Yes, thank you very much, when we have an Usher to hand. To remind you, the candidates are the Connétable of St. Martin, Deputy Coles and Deputy Raimondo. You are just voting for one. If Members have all cast their votes, you can now collect the votes. Thank you. Have all Members cast their votes? The counting may take some time, I do not know, so if Members are content, we will go back to the Order Paper and then come on to Questions. Yes, so there is nothing under G or H. Under I, a number of Written Questions have been proposed to which answers have been given. We now move on to Oral Questions with Notice and I invite the Connétable of St. Helier to put the first question to the Minister for Infrastructure. Connétable of St. Helier.

QUESTIONS

18. Written Questions

Due to the provisions of Standing Order 39(2)(a), this meeting includes the responses to some Written Questions that were submitted during the previous term of the States Assembly. Written Questions one to 27 include questions submitted by people who were no longer States Members at the time of the meeting, but who were States Members at the time their question was submitted. Furthermore, the holders of some Ministerial offices were different at the time these Written Questions were submitted and answered from those who held office at the time of this meeting.

18.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Strategic Reserve Fund, including investment income, withdrawals and allocations to the new health facility. (WQ.86/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister provide an update on the Strategic Reserve Fund to include, but not be limited to, the following –

- (a) the investment income received each year from establishment to date;
- (b) details of any withdrawals since inception to date, to include the dates, amounts, and purposes of the withdrawals; and
- (c) details of any funds that have been allocated to the new health facility, and if any such funds have been assigned, specify who authorised each transfer, on what date and the sums involved?”

Answer

The Strategic Reserve was established in 1986 as a “long-term buffer” against downturns in the Island’s Economy. Over the 40 years it has existed, the States has paid in £256 million, and taken out £316

million – with the balance of the fund derived from accumulated investment returns.

Performance of the Strategic Reserve is reported in the Annual Accounts. The Treasury department does not hold copies of the Annual Accounts from before 2000. Figures have been compiled from other held information for earlier years, and these have not been validated against the published accounts. The Accounting Standards used by the States have also changed over the period, but total return on assets has been used. 2025 figures are currently being audited, and are not included.

Withdrawals from the Strategic Reserve are approved in line with the Public Finances Law – typically approved through the relevant Budget or Government Plan¹. These are available online from 2004.

In their “Advice for the 2020-23 Government Plan”, the Fiscal Policy Panel first recommended that the Strategic Reserve should be greater than 30% of GDP. With the objective to grow the fund no withdrawals have been made since that advice was issued, other than for the development of the new Hospital and the reinstatement of the States Grant in 2024 (an amendment to Government Plan 2024-2027). Recent spend on the Hospital has been funded by borrowing, with proceeds transferred into the Strategic Reserve and then drawn down. As a result, there is no net withdrawal from the fund for these amounts.

¹ In 2021 P.80/2021 amended an approved Government Plan to include additional transfers

It remains the Government's policy that we should look to grow the Strategic Reserve until it is of sufficient size, in line with this advice.

A summary of movements in the fund balance since inception is shown in the table below.

Year	Opening Balance	Transfers In	Transfers Out	Investment Income	Closing Balance
1986	-	10.1	-	-	10.1
1987	10.1	10.0	-	0.6	20.7
1988	20.7	40.0	-	4.1	64.8
1989	64.8	30.0	-	8.0	102.8
1990	102.8	20.0	-	14.2	137.0
1991	137.0	10.0	-	15.6	162.6
1992	162.6	-	-	15.3	177.9
1993	177.9	17.1	-	16.5	211.5
1994	211.5	-	(5.0)	23.1	229.6
1995	229.6	-	(7.0)	15.5	238.1
1996	238.1	-	(15.0)	25.9	249.0
1997	249.0	-	(5.0)	28.3	272.3
1998	272.3	-	(17.5)	37.3	292.1
1999	292.1	3.0	(10.5)	22.9	307.5
2000	307.5	4.0	-	23.2	334.7
2001	334.7	23.0	-	10.2	367.9
2002	367.9	-	-	14.3	382.2
2003	382.2	-	-	14.8	397.0
2004	397.0	-	-	21.2	418.2
2005	418.2	-	-	37.9	456.1
2006	456.1	-	-	21.1	477.2
2007	477.2	10.0	-	22.9	510.1
2008	510.1	-	-	(2.5)	507.6
2009	507.6	-	-	42.3	549.9
2010	549.9	-	-	36.9	586.8
2011	586.8	-	-	7.5	594.3
2012	594.3	-	-	56.9	651.2
2013	651.2	-	-	91.9	743.1
2014	743.1	-	(10.2)	53.6	786.5
2015	786.5	-	(36.7)	21.6	771.4
2016	771.4	-	(56.7)	104.9	819.6
2017	819.6	-	(50.3)	70.8	840.1
2018	840.1	-	(8.1)	(25.0)	807.0

2019	807.0	-	-	106.5	913.5
2020	913.5	-	(6.1)	69.0	976.4
2021	976.4	21.0	(23.0)	86.4	1,060.8
2022	1,060.8	14.0	(14.5)	(68.4)	991.9
2023	991.9	43.6	(42.8)	98.8	1,091.5
2024	1,091.5	20.6	(45.6)	116.4	1,182.9
Total		276.4	(354.0)	1,260.5	

Transfers out of the fund are set out below.

Year	Reason for Transfer	Transfer £m
1994	Capital Fund	5.0
1995	Capital Fund	7.0
1996	Capital Fund	5.0
1996	Tourism Investment Fund	10.0
1997	Capital Fund	5.0
1998	Capital Fund	10.0
1998	Tourism Investment Fund	2.5
1998	ICT Fund	5.0
1999	ICT Fund	5.0
1999	Tourism Investment Fund	5.5
2014	Future Hospital	10.2
2015	Independent Care Enquiry	10.0
2015	Hospital Replacement Project	22.7
2015	Redundancies	4.0
2016	Capital Programme	25.7
2016	Redundancies	16.0
2016	Economic and Productivity Growth Provision	5.0
2016	Consolidated Fund Working Balance	5.0
2016	Independent Care Enquiry	4.0
2016	Les Quennevais School	1.0
2017	Les Quennevais School	39.0
2017	Capital Programme	16.3
2017	Economic and Productivity Growth Provision (Repayment)	(5.0)
2018	Hospital Project	8.1
2020	Hospital Construction Fund	6.1

2021	Financing Costs	2.0
2022	Hospital Financing Costs	0.5
2023	Hospital Financing Costs	3.4
2024	Hospital Financing Costs	5.1
2024	Reinstate States Grant to Social Security Fund	20.0

The following transfers relating to the development of healthcare facilities, were funded through borrowing. Proceeds are transferred into the Strategic Reserve and then drawn down. As a result, there is no net withdrawal from the fund for these amounts.

Year	Reason for Transfer	Transfer £m
2021	Our Hospital	21.0
2022	Capital Repayment (Our Hospital)	11.3
2022	Hospital Project Costs	2.7
2023	Capital Repayment (Our Hospital)	1.0
2023	Hospital Project Costs	38.3
2024	Capital Repayment (Our Hospital)	0.3
2024	Hospital Project Costs	20.2

18.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding Jersey Employment Trust and additional funding arrangements beyond 2026. (WQ.87/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister advise what discussions, if any, she has had with the Jersey Employment Trust since providing additional funding for 2026, whether funding above the base grant has been agreed beyond 2026, and if so, will she provide details of this agreement?”

Answer

The Chief Minister and I have met with Board representatives and officers have continued to work with JET to move towards a sustainable funding model going forwards.

Given the forthcoming elections, and the annual budgeting process, it is not possible for me as Minister to agree funding above the base grant beyond 2026, however officers will continue to work with JET on this. For any additional funding above the base grant, a bid will need to be included as part of the 2027 budget process. As part of this process, JET have been asked to provide a detailed business plan by June 2026 to inform any business case for future additional funding.

18.3 Deputy K.M. Wilson of the Chief Minister regarding fuel stock levels, supply continuity and fuel contingency planning. (WQ.88/2026)

Question

“Will the Chief Minister advise –

- (a) the current level of available fuel stocks in the Island for both road and essential services;
- (b) whether there are any concerns regarding future supply continuity;
- (c) if any discussions have taken place between Government and the UK or other jurisdictions on fuel supply contingency planning; and
- (d) what discussions, if any, have taken place between Government and the Island’s providers of sea and air links?”

Answer

- (a) Fuel stocks for both road and essential services remain stable and are at regular levels for this time of year.
- (b) Energy supply companies have advised the Government that there are no current or anticipated concerns regarding supply chains into Jersey or on-island fuel stocks. The Emergencies Council is continuing to monitor the situation and seek regular updates.
- (c) Government officials are in contact with the Ministry of Justice in the UK to ensure that Jersey is linked into any cross-government discussions on fuel supply contingency planning already under way and in the future.
- (d) Officers are in regular dialogue with air and sea transport partners.

18.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding trees on private land falling onto public roads or footpaths. (WQ.89/2026)

Question

“In relation to trees on private land falling onto public roads or footpaths, will the Minister advise –

- (a) the procedure that should be followed;
- (b) who is responsible for and carries out the clearing of the road or footpath;
- (c) who bears the cost for clearing and under what circumstances the landowner is liable for those costs;
- (d) where costs are recoverable from the landowner, what procedure is followed, and how frequently are such costs successfully reclaimed;

- (e) the amount the Government has spent on clearing fallen trees from public roads and footpaths in each of the last five years;
- (f) of the amount provided in (e), how much has been recovered from landowners; and
- (g) whether the Government and/or Parishes undertake any proactive inspection or issue advice to landowners where trees appear poorly maintained or present a risk to public roads or footpaths, and if so, what powers (if any) exist to require any action to be taken?"

Answer

Storm felled trees are the principal cause for "*trees on private land falling onto public roads or footpaths*". Accidental felling caused by an identifiable person are so few as to be inconsequential. The importance of this differentiation is set out in the main response.

Consequentially, this answer is presented in the specific context of trees felled by storms onto public roads or footpaths. It explains the immediate safety response, responsibilities and cost recovery on the Government's main road network, for which the Minister for Infrastructure is responsible, as set out in the States' Voies de Grande Communication, Acte 1934.

(a) the procedure that should be followed

The immediate priority is public safety, then restoring and maintaining access for emergency responders and other road users.

Where a storm brings a tree down onto a public road or footpath, the Minister for Infrastructure will act through the Department to make the area safe and clear the obstruction so that people can pass. This approach reflects the general duties and powers contained in the Loi (1914) sur la Voirie and the Roads Administration (Jersey) Law 1960.

Where a tree presents an immediate danger or blocks the highway, clearance is undertaken straight away, without prior notice to the occupier, to restore safety and maintain accessibility. Where multiple roads are blocked the work is triaged and prioritised by strategic importance of the route to be provided.

Any follow up with a landowner would be via direct contact from the Department or through the Parish and its 'Branchage' powers under the Loi (1914) sur la Voirie. Occupiers must keep vegetation clear of roads and footpaths.

(b) who is responsible for and carries out the clearing of the road or footpath

On the States' main road network, the Minister for Infrastructure is responsible and arranges and undertakes clearance to restore and maintain safe passage.

(c) who bears the cost for clearing and under what circumstances the landowner is liable for those costs

Storm-felled trees are not treated as "accident debris" caused by an identifiable person. As such, the automatic cost-recovery route that applies following an accident is generally not available for storms under current highways legislation.

On the main road network, the Minister will clear the obstruction for safety. Any recovery from landowners would depend upon demonstrating negligence (for example, where a clearly dangerous tree had been left unaddressed) or on non-compliance with a prior formal safety notice by the highway authority or other body or person.

(d) where costs are recoverable from the landowner, what procedure is followed, and how frequently are such costs successfully reclaimed

See answer to (c) above. For storm events there is generally no cost recovery route for main roads.

(e) the amount the Government has spent on clearing fallen trees from public roads and footpaths in each of the last five years

For isolated business-as-usual events these costs cannot easily be disaggregated from other departmental activities. However, for major storm events the department's procedures provide for a dedicated cost collector to be set up with the government's accounting system.

This information can be used to illustrate the scale of all in costs for a major storm event. For Storm Goretti, earlier this year, the Department's response costs were in the order of £150,000. These costs were unbudgeted and have had to be absorbed from within existing Departmental budgets.

(f) of the amount provided in (e), how much has been recovered from landowners

See answer to (c) above, for storm events there is generally no cost recovery route for main roads.

(g) whether the Government and/or Parishes undertake any proactive inspection or issue advice to landowners where trees appear poorly maintained or present a risk to public roads or footpaths, and if so, what powers (if any) exist to require any action to be taken?

The Government of Jersey does not operate a general routine inspection regime for privately-owned trees adjoining the main road network. However, where visibility at corners or bends presents a safety concern, the Roads Administration (Jersey) Law 1960 enables the highway authority to require hedges, trees or banks to be altered to remove the hazard.

The parishes enforce 'branchage' duties on all roads, including main roads, these are not necessarily restricted to the twice yearly *Visites du Branchage*, and can require removal of obstructions and undertaking of works in default with recovery of costs as a civil debt.

The Health and Safety Inspectorate published advice to duty holders (relating to workplaces) in October 2025 "Managing the risks associated with diseased or storm damaged trees" advising them of their responsibilities under the Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law in relation to trees.

Whilst this law would not generally apply to private dwellings, private landowners are encouraged to be aware of, and review, the condition of trees on their land, especially those bordering publicly accessible areas such as roads and footways, where the landowner would owe a duty of care to adjacent land users.

Parish by-roads

This response addresses the States' main road network. The legal position on parish by-roads is similar in principle but differs procedurally. Parishes enforce *branchage* duties typically through the twice-yearly *Visites du Branchage*, but these powers can be exercised at any time to require removal of obstructions and undertake works in default with recovery of costs as a civil debt. Parish *branchage* powers relate to any public road in the parish, including main roads. Members should be aware that those parish processes sit alongside the powers outlined above.

18.5 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) assessments. (WQ.90/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister advise the number of children tested for Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) since the diagnosis service started in 2023, and detail the outcomes for children who are assessed as having the disorder?”

Answer

To date, we have had two children who were able to receive an early diagnosis of FASD with sentinel features, owing to the presence of all three characteristic facial features and a small head circumference. Currently, nine children have been assessed by Dr Howden and remain under FASD follow-up. They are progressing through the neurodevelopmental domain assessments, a process that typically takes several years. For children without the full set of sentinel facial features and reduced head circumference, cognitive domain assessments cannot be reliably completed until approximately seven years of age.

We have received two new referrals this year that are awaiting assessment. Realistically, our capacity allows for approximately six children to be assessed per year, due to the extensive, multidisciplinary evaluations required.

FASD ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT

Assessment

In order for an FASD assessment to take place, there must be clear evidence of prenatal alcohol exposure. This evidence must be obtained either through direct maternal disclosure or from documentation by a relevant professional (for example, a midwife, social worker, police officer, or neonatal nurse). Reports from third parties such as an ex-partner are not sufficient. In addition, there must be an indication of neurodevelopmental differences to meet the criteria for assessment.

Children and young people can be referred into the FASD clinic via the Children and Family Hub.

Assessments are currently carried out for FASD via the Neurodevelopmental Service.

The initial assessments take place in the FASD clinic which operates at the Child Development Centre, Enid Quenault.

The initial appointment will take place to determine the next steps in relation to the assessment. If the child or young person displays all of the facial features for FASD, it is possible that a diagnosis can be achieved at that point, they would still be offered multidisciplinary assessment to establish their strengths and needs profile.

90% of children and young people do not have all the facial features, those that don't, will need the full multi-disciplinary assessment which include the following domains:

(The column on the right are the assessments that are applicable for that domain. If a child has already had a relevant assessment this would not need to be repeated.)

Brain Structure	Neurology	Assessment
Motor Skills	Physio	(Movement-abc 2); 3 years–16 years 11 months - beery-buktenika developmental test of visual-motor Integration, 6th edition; 3–7 years (short form) 7–100 years (full form) - bruininks oseretsky test of motor proficiency, 2nd edition (bot-2); 4 years–21 years 11 months - Bayley scales of infant and toddler development, 3rd Edition (Bayley-iii); 1–42 months - Griffiths scales of child development, third edition; Birth–6 years.
Cognition	Psychology	<6 years - Wechsler preschool and primary scale of intelligence (WPPSI-iv); 2 years 6 months–7 years 7 months - Stanford-Binet intelligence scales (sb-5); 2–85 years - differential abilities scales (das-ii); 2 years 6 Months–17 years 11 months - Wechsler non-verbal scale of ability-ii (WNV-ii); up to 21 years. >6 years - Wechsler intelligence scales for children (WISC-V ANZ);

		6 years–16 years 11 months - Stanford-Binet intelligence scales (sb-5); up to 85 years - Wechsler adult intelligence scale (WAIS-iv); 16–90 Years - differential abilities scales (das-ii); up to 17 years - universal nonverbal intelligence test (non-verbal test); 5 years–21 years 11 months - Wechsler non-verbal scale of ability (WNV); 4–21 Years - naglieri nonverbal ability test – second edition (nnat-2); 4–18 years.
Language	Speech and language (salt)	Clinical evaluation of language fundamentals (celf-4); 5 years–21 years 11 months - pre-school language scales, 5th ed (pls-5); Birth–7 years 11 months.
Academic achievement	Psychology	Wechsler individual achievement test (wiat ii); 4 years–adult - woodcock–johnson achievement test (wjat-iii); 4 years–adult.
Memory	Psychology	Developmental neuropsychological assessment (nepsy-ii), memory and learning sub-tests; 3–16 years - wide range assessment of memory and learning, 2nd Edition (wraml-ii); 5–90 years - children’s memory scale (cms); 5–16 years.
Attention	ADHD	ADHD assessment
Executive Functioning, Including Impulsive Control and Hyperactivity	ADHD	ADHD assessment
Affect regulation	Psychology/ Psychiatry	Spence Children’s Anxiety Scales (SCAS); 8–15 years - Behaviour Assessment System for Children-III; 2–21 years - Beck Youth Inventories, 2nd Edition (BYI-II); 7–18 years - Children’s Depression Inventory 2 (CDI-2); 7–17 years - Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children 2nd Edition (MASC 2).

Adaptive Behaviour, Social Skills, or Social Communication	Autism ADHD	AUTISM assessment ODD assessment
--	----------------	-------------------------------------

The doctor may also require the child or young person to have a physical assessment, genetic testing, and brain imagery.

TREATMENT

There's no cure or specific treatment for FASD. The physical and mental conditions caused by alcohol exposure before birth are lifelong. But early intervention services may help lessen some of the challenges of FASD and may help prevent some secondary disabilities

Children with FASD can have impairments in learning, memory, behaviour, social interactions, or combinations of these impairments.

Treatment services for people with FASD are most effective when they address a person's specific impairments and build upon their strengths.

Anyone diagnosed with FASD in Jersey, will have their own unique care plan, related to their specific needs. Their care plan will be specific to them.

The following services may be offered to a child with FASD:

Early Years: Therapeutic interventions from an Occupational Therapist, Speech and language Therapist, support from the Early Years Inclusion Team, Family Nursing and Home Care.

Education: The school SENCO raises any children with specific needs at their monthly MAST meeting (Multi agency support team) where they will come up with a plan of support for the child in Education.

CAMHS: Can offer individualised interventions dependant on their needs, early intervention, specialist input, psychiatry, ADHD treatment, Physiotherapist, Parent Infant psychotherapist.

Family: Children's service may be involved dependant on the child and family's needs. This may be in the form of a Family Partnership/Support Worker and or social worker. If it is a young person with FASD they may be supported by the Jersey Youth Service Targeted Youth Support team.

Courses:

New Forest Parenting Programme (for ADHD), Early Bird, Early Bird Plus and Teen life (for Autism), Neurodivergent siblings course (for any neurodivergent condition).

Those working with the child and family will work together to come up with the most suitable plan of intervention for a child or young person with FASD and their family. This support and intervention may be lifelong, again this is dependent on the child's needs.

Having recently attended a UK FASD conference, we have formed a connection with Salford university who are currently piloting a parent/carers course for those supporting children with FASD, supported by the Medical Research Council, that is specific for families and carers of children (aged 5 – 10) with FASD.

We have recently formed a connection with Frank Laine, founder and chairman of the Silkworth charity group. We shall be working with him and his team in 2026 to explore support for those with FASD further.

18.6 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding visa vignettes, wet ink passport stamps and EU Settled Status confirmation letters. (WQ.91/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister advise how many Jersey residents currently hold –

- (a) a visa vignette placed in their passport;
- (b) a wet ink stamp placed in their passport; and
- (c) an EU Settled Status confirmation letter?”

Answer

Jersey forms part of the Common Travel Area (CTA) meaning that individuals may move freely into and out of the Island without routine immigration checks across the United Kingdom, Guernsey, Isle of Man and the Republic of Ireland.

As a result, it is not possible to advise the number of people resident in Jersey holding a visa, immigration leave, or EU Settled Status permission. This is because:

- An individual living in Jersey may hold immigration permissions granted outside the Island for which no immigration record is held in Jersey.
- No collated records exist of individuals who continue to reside in Jersey, have moved elsewhere within the CTA, or have left the CTA.

For context, in the 5-year period 2021-2025:

- a) Approximately 9,000 applications for entry clearance were received by the Customs and Immigration Service, the vast majority of whom would have had a visa vignette placed in their passport when applying from overseas. This figure includes immigration routes such as short and long-term work permits, work permit dependents, spouses / partners but excludes visitors.
- b) Approximately 6,000 applications for variation or extension of immigration permission were received by the Customs and Immigration Service, the vast majority of whom would have had a wet ink stamp placed in their passport.
- c) Approximately 16,500 EU settled status or pre-settled status letters have been issued since the scheme was launched in 2019,

18.7 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the use of additional Budget funding to increase teachers’ planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time. (WQ.93/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister advise what proportion of the additional funding approved in the [Budget \(Government Plan\) 2026-2029](#) for teachers’ planning, preparation, and assessment (PPA) time has been used since January 2026 to reduce weekly teaching hours in order to increase PPA time; and what proportion has been allocated from now until September 2026 for this to continue?”

Answer

The full value approved in Budget (Government Plan) 2026–2029 has been allocated to school budgets in 2026 and on a recurring basis thereafter. Head Teachers have been asked to implement the PPA changes soonest and no later than September 2026. Based on the ability to implement these changes schools may be at different stages of implementation during the spring and summer terms and we will be measuring readiness for the new academic year in the summer term.

18.8 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding the transfer of funds from the Social Security Reserve Fund to the Social Security Fund in 2026. (WQ.94/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister explain why a transfer of £114,259,000 from the Social Security Reserve Fund to the Social Security Fund 2026 was authorised by Ministerial Decision ([MD-SOSEC-2026-309](#)), when the Government Budget approved a transfer of £64,259,000?”

Answer

The report accompanying the Ministerial Decision confirms that the Social Security Minister has full authority to make transfers of income from the Reserve Fund into the Social Security Fund and that the proposed transfers are transfers of income. The Budget document notes the transfer in respect of 2026. The transfer in respect of 2025 was included in the estimates provided of opening balances for 2026 of the two funds.

The full details of the transfer are set out in the MD report as follows:

“As outlined in the Budget 2026 - 2029, it was approved to reduce the States Grant to the Social Security Fund (SSF) in 2025 by £50,000,000. This reduction means that the SSF requires additional cash balance to complete its ongoing operational purpose of completing social benefit payments. Therefore, a transfer from the Social Security Reserve Fund (SS(R)F) of £50,000,000 is required to address the impact of the reduced States Grant.

Budget 2026 – 2029 also approved a further reduction of £64,259,000 in the States Grant in 2026 and matching and compensating transfer from SS(R)F was noted. It is proposed to complete this in two transfers.

This report seeks to enable the Minister to consider a recommendation to:

- *Approve the transfer of:*
 - o £50,000,000 of liquid assets from the SS(R)F to the SSF with immediate notice given to have effect as soon as possible*
 - o £37,500,000 of liquid assets from the SS(R)F to the SSF with immediate notice given to have effect as soon as possible*
 - o £26,759,000 of liquid assets from the SS(R)F to the SSF with notice given to have effect in August 2026.*

These actions would draw on the Reserve Fund’s liquid assets during 2026. The transfer required will result in a reduction in the value of the Social Security (Reserve) and an equivalent increase in value of the Social Security Fund.

The Social Security Reserve Fund held financial assets valued at £2.62 billion as of 31 January 2026.”

18.9 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding Jersey’s technology industry. (WQ. 95/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister detail what steps, if any, have been taken to further develop the existing tech industry in Jersey, including any actions to support the relocation of entrepreneurs to the Island and, if no steps have been taken, will he explain why not?”

Answer

Development of the existing tech industry

As the Government’s key delivery partner, the work of Digital Jersey Ltd. has been central to driving growth and diversification of the Island’s economy since 2012. Digital Jersey focuses on three core areas in its current strategic and annual operating plans: driving economic growth and productivity through tech adoption; development of a thriving digital ecosystem through attracting new businesses and supporting tech start-ups; and enabling technology focused research and development.

Digital Jersey currently records over 400 digital and technology businesses operating on the Island and more than 3,000 people employed in digital-tech roles. In addition, Digital Jersey’s membership base has continued to grow and now encompasses a large proportion of Jersey’s tech businesses and digital professionals - supporting collaboration, scale-up activity and inward engagement within the tech industry on Island.

Support for relocation of entrepreneurs and tech businesses

Under the ‘Locate Jersey’ brand, Government promotes the Island for inward investment and relocation of entrepreneurs across multiple sectors. Officers work in partnership with Digital Jersey to attract new tech business to the Island and there have been 18 successful tech sector businesses approved to relocate over the last 3 years and as a result, we are seeing the development of a biopharmaceuticals hub and have also seen a business that plans to manufacture hi-tech materials, grow within the island.

This accounts for 32% of all business approvals and covers businesses operating in areas such as AI, Fintech/Digital Assets, Cybersecurity, Regtech and proprietary development.

Government undertakes practical steps to support these relocations, providing application guidance and advice, and ongoing relationship management and aftercare. Digital Jersey works closely alongside Locate Jersey to provide specialist support to those relocating companies including access to incubator and coworking space at the Digital Jersey Hub, business planning and staff permissions assistance, community networks and introductions to local partners.

Business support and productivity measures

Support for technology firms also sits within the wider business support work delivered through Jersey Business. In November 2024, the Government announced a £30 million package of business investment across the economy and support schemes, including productivity, skills and innovation grants to be made available.

£5.3million of this funding is for the Better Business Grants, which are delivered by Jersey Business. The grants are designed to support projects that improve productivity and skills, enabling employers to invest in their businesses through the adoption of digital tools, automation, software and systems changes, alongside workforce upskilling. This investment aims to raise competitiveness and output per worker, and, by consequence, support the growth of the digital ecosystem. From 2026, the number of businesses that are investing specifically in technology projects is being monitored. To date this year, 38.9% of projects approved for grant funding in 2026 are technology related projects.

Digital Jersey also delivers targeted initiatives to help drive innovation and support the local tech industry. These include supporting innovation “sandbox” projects and management of the *Impact Jersey* programme, which was agreed by States Members in 2022. The *Impact Jersey* programme was created to accelerate and strengthen Jersey’s technology ecosystem by awarding funding to the Island’s innovators and businesses with tech projects that can help tackle some key issues faced by the Island.

Clear strategic direction

More broadly, the technology sector is recognised as a key driver of productivity, innovation and diversification of the Island’s economy. The *Strategy for Sustainable Economic Development* and the *Future Economy Programme* set a clear ambition for the Government of Jersey for the Island to become a “consistently high-performing, environmentally sustainable and technologically advanced small island economy by 2040.” Annual delivery updates to the States Assembly have reported on progress against actions in the short-, medium- and long-term.

18.10 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minster for Housing regarding potential changes to the affordable housing rental cap and the impact on Andium Homes’ business model. (WQ.96/2026)

Question

“Will the Minister advise what considerations, if any, have been given to amending the rental cap of 80% of the market rate and, if considerations have been given, what is the expected impact on the Andium Homes business model?”

Answer

The [*Review of social housing rents*](#), which I published in January 2026, gave detailed consideration to the current social housing rents policy, under which rents are capped at up to 80% of market value, and to its implications for tenant affordability, fairness and equity, the financial viability of social housing providers and the sustainability of public finances.

The review also assessed options for a revised approach, including raising or lowering the existing cap to a different percentage of market value, or moving away from a market-based approach

altogether. A clear and robust set of evaluation criteria was applied to assess the potential strengths, limitations and risks associated with each option.

The review did not recommend an immediate change to the rental model. However, it clearly identified that any amendment to the 80% cap would have material implications for the business models of Andium Homes and the housing trusts, particularly in relation to rental income, borrowing capacity, long-term investment in social housing and overall financial resilience.

In publishing the review, I emphasised that it provides a strong evidence base to inform the next States Assembly's consideration of alternative rental models, should this be deemed necessary. In the meantime, I am progressing a number of short-term actions to improve the operation and effectiveness of the current social housing rents policy.

18.11 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the review of statutory youth service provision. (WQ.97/2026)

Question

“Further to the adoption of [P.28/2024 as amended](#), Youth Service Provision, and the conclusion of the report, ‘Review of the Statutory Youth Service ([R.59/2026](#)) that “*statutory status would not achieve the aim of the original proposition*”, will the Minister explain how the report delivered on the proposition’s stated intention, advising in particular –

- (a) the scope, nature and scale of consultation and engagement with key stakeholders, young people, the Youth Service, Parishes, front-line staff and Parish youth committees (such as Maufant Youth Centre) to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of statutory status;
- (b) what involvement, if any, there was from the current funders of the service (the Parishes and local charity committees);
- (c) the procedures employed to assess any practical implications, including Parish relationships and operational flexibility;
- (d) whether comparable statutory youth service models in the UK or abroad were reviewed and, if so, what lessons or risks were identified or considered; and
- (e) what mechanisms or safeguards are in place, or will be put in place, to ensure that the Youth Service continues to exist and thrive and is protected from future budget cuts?”

Answer

- (a) Moving a provision to a statutory service involves legal, financial and operational considerations that require specialist expertise. These factors can be complex, particularly for individuals, including children and young people who do not have relevant qualifications or professional expertise. Engagement was therefore focussed on areas appropriate to the knowledge and experience of those involved. Discussions focused on practical service issues that might change, such as what the service offers, who it supports, and how funding is used, rather than detailed legal matters.

- (b) The majority of funding for the service is provided by the Children, Young People, Education and Skills Department (CYPES), with the remainder mainly funded by individual parishes. The proposal was discussed with officers responsible for delivering the service and overseeing its finances. A meeting was also held with the Comité des Connétables as a major stakeholder with the Assistant Minister for Children and Families, alongside the Associate Director for Young People's Services and the Head of Youth Service. The purpose of the meeting was to present the review findings, respond to questions, and seek direction on whether the proposal was supported. The Comité was unanimous in its decision not to support the proposal.
- (c) [P.28/2024 as amended](#), required an evaluation of the potential benefits and disbenefits of making the Youth Service a statutory service, including practical implications of such a change. Procedures to support this assessment included engagement with young people, the Youth Service and parish representatives, alongside discussions with officers with relevant legal and financial expertise.

This engagement highlighted that a statutory provision could weaken the current parish partnership model which enables locally ring-fenced contributions to supplement core funding. This risks services becoming less responsive to parish needs. Additionally, funding based on a per-head formula would not reflect variations in youth population size across the island. As a result, rural parishes with a smaller youth population may lack sufficient resources to provide comparable provision under the proposed change.

- (d) UK legislation and practice were reviewed to inform consideration of the proposal. The risk associated with introducing a statutory provision in Jersey remain as set out in [R.59/2026](#), including reduced flexibility to respond to evolving needs and in tailoring provision to the different needs of each parish.
- (e) The Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law 2022 requires Ministers and other duty-bearers to consider children's rights when developing policies, budgets and propositions, meaning that any future decision to reduce funding or amend the service would require consideration of the impact on children and young people, including through a Children's Rights Impact Assessment.

In addition, the [Children, Young People and Families' Plan 2024–27](#) and the [Youth Justice Roadmap](#) set out a system-wide approach to supporting the wellbeing and positive development of children and young people. Delivery of these commitments relies on the continued availability of supportive services like the youth service and sets expectations for such services to be sufficiently resourced.

This is reflected in current statutory services where the Youth Service is explicitly named as a joint delivery partner. Examples include short breaks services for children and young people with disabilities, and statutory guidance that makes explicit reference to the Youth Service's role in the delivery of wellbeing and assessment plans.

18.12 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the DFDS service disruption following the Tarifa Jet collision. (WQ.98/2026)

Question

“Following the recent DFDS service disruption, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what immediate actions are being taken to support passengers affected by the cancellation of sailings since the Tarifa Jet collision on 29th March 2026;
- (b) whether DFDS is currently meeting its contractual performance and safety obligations and the threshold at which any breach would be determined;
- (c) what contractual penalties or enforcement mechanisms exist and whether any have been triggered;
- (d) what information is available on the cause of the Tarifa Jet collision;
- (e) what assurances have been given regarding vessel safety, maintenance standards and onboard conditions; and
- (f) what contingency measures within the DFDS contract ensure the continuity of ferry services during peak periods?”

Answer

- a) DFDS actions following the collision included mobilisation of contingency arrangements, re-scheduling sailings to best meet traveller and freight requirements, and subsequent communication of changes to passengers and other stakeholders.
Since Tuesday 7th April, the Levante Jet (which had been in dry dock for renovations) rejoined the fleet, enabling a return to scheduled Ropax and High-Speed services.
DFDS has also advised impacted passengers to retain receipts for appropriate out-of-pocket expenditure and submit a claim.
Day trip passengers have been fully refunded and been provided with a further free day trip to be taken at a later date.
- b) DFDS is meeting its contractual performance targets with regard to both operational performance and statutory safety obligations. Details around trigger events are contained in the Concession Agreement which the Government published in October 2025.
- c) Details around contractual penalties and enforcement mechanisms are contained in the Concession Agreement, and Explanatory Note, which the Government published in October 2025.
- d) The Harbour & Airports Authority is conducting a root cause analysis investigation and took steps in the immediate aftermath of the collision to secure relevant data and evidence for that investigation.
I cannot provide any further information ahead of the Authority completing its investigation.
- e) As an operator using Jersey’s territorial waters and harbour, DFDS is obliged to meet Jersey’s domestic legislation and a number of international conventions regarding safety, maintenance and conditions on board. These legal requirements are further reinforced as conditions within the Concession Agreement.
DFDS is also obliged to meet standards and obligations set by the relevant flag state and classification society applicable to each vessel.

- f) Details of the Operator’s contingency arrangements are contained with the Concession Agreement which the Government published in October 2025. DFDS is required to provide contingency vessels to maintain resilience and minimise disruption. Those contingency arrangements have been invoked to provide cover for MV Caesarea Trader (using MV Arrow) and MV Tarifa Jet (using MV Cote d’Albatre).

18.13 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding the establishment of electoral registers. (WQ.99/2026)

Question

Will the Chief Minister state, for each Parish, how many registerable individuals were provided to the Parishes for the purposes of establishing the electoral registers upon the commencement of the Elections (Electoral Registers) Amendment (Jersey) Law 2025 and (if available to the Chief Minister) how this compares to the numbers on the electoral registers before the commencement; and will the Chief Minister explain the methodology and data used to ensure that all eligible individuals were included in the list of registerable persons provided to the Parishes?

Answer

The Elections (Electoral Registers) Amendment (Jersey) Law 2025 was lodged by the Privileges and Procedures Committee in order to establish Automatic Voter Registration (AVR). The project to establish the new electoral register has been managed by the States Greffe, and ongoing support has been provided to the Parishes during implementation.

As a result of the AVR project, the total number of people registered to vote in Jersey’s forthcoming election has increased from 60,671 in 2022 to 79,615.

As of 13th April 2026, the total number of ‘registrable persons’ provided through the new Electoral Register System (ERS) to the Parishes for the electoral registers was 79,615 broken down by Parish as follows:

Parish	Number of registered voters at 2022 election (available on Vote.je)	Number of eligible individuals provided to Parishes for AVR (as at 13 April)
Grouville	3,684	4,140
St Brelade	8,043	8,174
St Clement	6,179	7,664
St Helier	16,837	28,820
St John	2,290	2,343
St Lawrence	3,741	4,101
St Martin	2,719	2,949
St Mary	1,374	1,375
St Ouen	2,813	3,024

St Peter	3,338	4,110
St Saviour	7,683	10,574
Trinity	1,970	2,341
Total	60,671	79,615

In terms of the methodology, ‘Registrable persons’ were determined by cross-referencing a number of existing data sources, including the Employment, Social Security and Housing Department’s ‘People Directory’, which provided title, name, date of birth and current residential address, plus benefits and contributions records and the Parish electoral registers.

18.14 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding efforts by the Ports of Jersey to attract additional freight forwarding companies to the Island. (WQ.100/2026)

Question

Will the Minister, as shareholder representative, advise what work and efforts have been undertaken by Ports of Jersey to attract additional freight forwarding companies to Jersey?

Answer

In both the maritime and aviation sectors, Ports of Jersey works with Government and the Ports Policy Ministerial Group (PPMG) to support freight activities in line with the Ports Policy Framework.

Ports of Jersey has supported the Economy Department over the past nine months to establish the foundations for a maritime freight sectoral policy, which can be progressed post-election pending PPMG agreement.

Ports of Jersey engage with shippers, freight forwarders and logistics providers to facilitate opportunities to support freight operations at the airport and harbour, with a focus on maintaining suitable facilities and operations for current operators and potential future demand.

Overall, Ports of Jersey’s role is to support Government through the PPMG, in line with the Ports Policy Framework, in developing policy positions and ensuring that the Island’s port infrastructure and operating environment support viable and competitive freight operations.

18.15 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding actions being taken to attract an additional freight forwarding company to Jersey. (WQ.101/2026)

Question

Will the Minister outline what action, if any, is being taken to attract an additional freight-forwarding company to Jersey?

Answer

The Government does not actively solicit any individual company to Jersey, but it is committed to creating the conditions for positive inward investment.

Choice of freight forwarding companies diminished significantly during Condor’s tenure where the significant volume-based discount reinforced a dominant market position for one operator and deterred new investment.

Additional actions to support competition in the freight forwarding sector includes the creation of freight corridors to warehousing outside the Port estate. This has been delivered in part by the corridor to the Rue des Pres trading estate to allow larger trailers to operate more efficiently.

In both the maritime and aviation sectors, the Economy Department works closely with Ports of Jersey and the Ports Policy Ministerial Group (PPMG) to support freight activity in line with the Ports Policy Framework.

Over the past nine months, the Economy Department has worked with Ports of Jersey to establish the foundations for a maritime freight sectoral policy. Subject to PPMG agreement, this work provides a basis for further development post-election.

18.16 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Jersey Graduate Teacher Training Programme. (WQ.102/2026)

Question

Will the Minister state how many applications were received for the Jersey Graduate Teacher Training Programme (JGTTP), and how many placements were awarded, for each of 2024, 2025 and 2026; and will he explain the criteria used to determine which applicants received a placement?

Answer

Year	Total number of applicants	Shortlisted for interview	Total places offered
2026	40	16	9
2025	27	14	8
2024	30	16	11
2023	34	25	16

The JGTTP is a relatively small programme with the core purposes of

- a) providing opportunity for on Island teacher training for candidates who cannot directly access teacher training in the UK and
- b) addressing specific subject, phase or immediate shortages identified by schools and colleges.

It is made clear to all applicants that a place on the course cannot be guaranteed, nor can employment at the end of the training year be guaranteed.

It should be noted that for the past two years, after an extended period of 100% local employment for locally trained JGTTP graduates, there are currently a small number of locally trained teachers who are still actively seeking teaching posts, both on island and in the UK. This reflects the competitive nature of the current job market.

When shortlisting, we consider several factors, including the quality and clarity of the application letter, the level of demand for the subject area, and the relevance of an applicant's school-based experience.

18.17 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) assessment provision in Jersey (WQ.103/2026)

Question

What assurance can the Minister provide regarding assessments for Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) in light of research from the University of Salford in 2021 that at least 1.8% to 3.6% of babies born in the UK each year have FASD, given that such a proportion (if applied to Jersey) suggests between 13 and 25 babies are born each year in the Island with the condition, but only 2 children have completed FASD assessments since the diagnosis service started in 2023?

Answer

As the number of completed assessments since the local diagnostic pathway was introduced in 2023 suggests, this is a reflection of service activity rather than population prevalence.

Whilst it is accepted that research from the University of Salford in 2021 indicates that at least 1.8% to 3.6% of babies born in the UK each year have FASD, given that the numbers result from research, it would not be the case that every actual case is identified, and this is much the same in Jersey.

This notwithstanding, the team at HCJ has been, and remains keen, to ensure that it will continue to keep demand and referral pathways under review, including levels of referral and service capacity, to ensure that assessment provision remains appropriate to demonstrated local need.

18.18 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding jury service in Jersey. (WQ.104/2026)

Question

In relation to jury service in Jersey, will the Minister –

- (a) detail what demographic statistics, including the gender split of juries, have been recorded or published since January 2022;
- (b) explain, if no such data are held, why this information is not collected and confirm whether she intends to begin collecting this data; and
- (c) if no such data exist, advise what assurance she can provide that juries remain representative of the demographics of the Island's population?

Answer

- (a) No demographic statistics have been recorded or published since January 2022.
- (b) This information is not collected because demographic characteristics do not form part of the jury selection process. Eligibility for jury service and the disqualifications from jury service are set out in Article 63 of the [Criminal Procedure \(Jersey\) Law 2018](#). The process

for selecting a jury for a specific trial is set out in Articles 64 to 66 of the 2018 Law, supplemented by the [Criminal Procedure \(Juries – Tirage\) \(Jersey\) Regulations 2021](#). In summary, the process involves the random selection by the Viscount, using a bespoke piece of software, of a list of eligible, potential jurors (a jury list).

Whether to begin collecting this data would be a matter for the next Minister to consider, in consultation with Court Officers.

- (c) Juries are selected on a principle of random selection, which is fundamental to our justice system. It is inherent in a system of random selection that juries may not be representative of the community.

In relation to the gender of jurors, a matter the Deputy raised during the recent debate on the Draft Criminal Justice (Procedures) (Jersey) Amendment Law 202-, Court Officers do not think there is evidence that fewer women than men serve on juries.

18.19 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding measures in schools to encourage and facilitate voting by eligible students. (WQ.105/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise what provision, if any, is being made in schools where students will be of voting age on election day to encourage and facilitate voting, including what access and opportunities students will be given to ask questions of all candidates; and if no such provision is being made, will he explain why not?

Answer

Island wide education and support for voting age students specific to the Jersey election cycle is led by the States Greffe, in cooperation with curriculum leads from the Education department and schools/colleges. This is offered in addition to the ongoing Personal Social Health Education (PSHE) curriculum which supports the education of children and young people in citizenship and political awareness, at an Island, British and international level.

For the 2026 Jersey election specific provision has been made to support students who are, or will be, of voting age on election day to understand and take part in the democratic process.

These opportunities are being actively promoted to support informed participation in the democratic process among young voters. Scheduled events for students close to the election may be impacted by coinciding with public examination period, with most voting age young people in years 11 and 13 having public exams between April and the end of June.

Detail of provision

Ahead of the Sunday 7 June 2026 elections, the States Greffe is offering a range of free educational opportunities designed to bring democracy to life and help students understand how Jersey's democratic system works and why participation matters. These opportunities are aimed specifically at students who are, or will soon be, eligible to vote.

Sessions are delivered by a team of qualified and experienced teachers and are designed to be engaging, age-appropriate, and aligned with curriculum goals. They can be adapted to suit different school contexts, including delivery to whole year groups or individual classes.

The current offer includes sessions on:

- **Vote.je Assembly** designed to improve students' understanding the States Assembly and the election process, including how parliament works, how decisions are made, and the role of elected representatives and how to have your say in electing the Island's decision makers for the next four years. ~1,490 students have attended or are booked in to attend an Assembly ahead of the election.
- **Vote.je Lesson** provides the who, what, where, and why of voting in Jersey, helping students to understand manifestos and how to make informed voting decisions. ~1,300 students in Years 11-13 have already had the session, with more scheduled for April/May, which will cover 9 schools in total; and
- **Election CPD for teachers** has been designed, to support and empower staff in discussing politics and elections with students in an appropriate and balanced way. To date, four schools/colleges have signed up for this training.

In addition, a Candidate Fayre, taking place on Wednesday 29 April. This has been designed to give students the opportunity to meet election candidates, explore their priorities, and ask questions. This initiative is being held for the first time and to date 907 students are booked in to attend during the day, plus a dedicated session where Jersey Youth Service will bring a group of young people. The event will be open to the wider public in the evening. Students will be given worksheets to help guide them and encourage them to record their views. The Fayre is being studied by researchers from King's College, London, to measure the impact/effectiveness of this new offering in encouraging voter turnout amongst 16–18-year-olds.

Outside of school/college time, students are also encouraged to attend the public hustings events taking place between 5 May – 3 June. There will be 38 events over the course of the month, which will also be live streamed over YouTube.

All sessions and events are completely free. Schools have been encouraged to engage early with the States Greffe to ensure access for their students.

18.20 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding correspondence with DFDS following the Tarifa Jet collision and any contractual implications. (WQ.106/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise what correspondence has taken place with DFDS following the Tarifa Jet's collision with Elizabeth Harbour's east berth on 29th March 2026, and whether the incident activates any agreement clauses, and if so, which clauses and what actions are being taken?

Answer

There has been close, daily coordination between Government, the harbour authority, and DFDS since the collision on 29th March 2026 through a Tactical Coordination Group. Ministers have been kept closely informed. Owing to particular aspects of the incident, under the Concession Agreement, the Government issued a formal Emergency Operator Event letter on 30th March 2026. These aspects include:

1. Release of an amount of oil / lubricant into the harbour
2. Temporary harbour blockage

3. Requirement for contingency arrangements to be mobilised

Under the clauses in the Concession Agreement, the Government was able to instruct DFDS to: immediately replace the Tarifa Jet with a suitable substitute vessel; to take all necessary mitigation measures around the effects of the incident; and to keep the Government fully apprised of its actions and developments.

18.21 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for the Environment regarding prosecutions under the Public Health and Safety (Rented Dwellings) (Jersey) Law 2018. (WQ.107/2026)

Question

Further to his response to [Oral Question 36/2026](#), in relation to inspections to agricultural staff accommodation, will the Minister confirm how many prosecutions, if any, have taken place during the last five years under the [Public Health and Safety \(Rented Dwellings\) \(Jersey\) Law 2018](#); and will he advise whether any such prosecutions were in relation to farm worker accommodation, and if so, how many?

Answer

There have been no prosecutions in the last 5 years under the Public Health and Safety (Rented Dwellings) (Jersey) Law 2018 over the last 5 years. That is not to say there has been no compliance work, however the Regulation Directorate will operate according to the [Regulators Code](#) and the [Enforcement Policy](#) opting to utilise collaborative working and the 4 E's of enforcement (engage, explain, encourage and enforce) to achieve compliance.

18.22 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding the projected increase in the Government deficit in 2026. (WQ.109/2026)

Question

Further to the statement in [Jersey's Fiscal Policy Panel - Annual Report 2025](#), regarding the increase in overall deficit to £247 million in 2026, will the Chief Minister explain this increase given the Government's stated intention to curb public sector growth?

Answer

The Budget 2026, approved by the States Assembly indicated Net Operating Surplus of £61 million in 2026, or an operating deficit of £12 million after taking into account depreciation. Surpluses are then forecast to increase throughout the plan.

Performance in 2025 was slightly better than forecast, with the Annual Report and Accounts for 2025, published last Friday 17th April, demonstrating the ongoing strength of the Island's finances. The actions already taken to curb the growth of the public service are beginning to deliver and must remain a priority for the next government.

The FPP use a completely different measure for economic purposes that takes into account all expenditure, both capital and revenue. This includes capital expenditure funded through borrowing rather than revenues – most notably the New Healthcare Facilities (hospital) which is the largest capital project ever undertaken by the Government. This accounts for the increased figure.

18.23 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Children and Families regarding progress towards introducing internet filtering requirements to protect children from harmful online content. (WQ.111/2026)

Question

Further to the Scrutiny review publication [What protection do children in Jersey have from online harms?](#), will the Minister advise what progress, if any, has been made to put in place legal requirements, similar to the UK's [Digital Economy Act 2017](#), on Internet Service Providers to implement a filtering service that blocks access to certain online extremist and dangerous content?

Answer

Government's response to Recommendation 10 of the CEHA Scrutiny Panel Report - Online Harms, noted the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development's support for undertaking a consultation on the impact of mandating network level filtering of content by December 2026.

The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development has started the consultation. There is a focus on engaging with stakeholders on-and-off Island including Jersey's Internet Service Providers to understand the form and operation of the UK's legislative framework for network filtering (including the Digital Economy Act 2017), and how legislation in Jersey might help protect children.

In addition, the scope of work for the legislative gap analysis that is being developed includes network filtering. The review will identify the gaps, inconsistencies in Jersey's legislation and provide expert analysis that will help inform future Ministers priorities for policy development and legislative changes in this policy area.

18.24 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding progress in reprioritising funding for Le Rocquier School and community sports facilities. (WQ.112/2026)

Question

Further to the approval of the [Proposed Government Plan 2024-2027 \(P.72/2023\): twenty-first amendment](#), brought by the Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel, will the Minister detail what progress, if any, has been made to reprioritise funding for Le Rocquier School and community sports facilities, in order to improve access to sports facilities in the east of the Island?

Answer

The amendment stated – *The funding of at least of £4.705 million (approved in the Government Plan 2020-2023 and Government Plan 2021-2024) for the Le Rocquier School and Community*

Sports Facilities will be reviewed with the intent that the project is reprioritised, in order to improve access to sports facilities in the East of the Island.”

The commitment remains to improve community sports facilities in the east of the Island and support school sport in the delivery of such projects. It is important to note that the bulk of the Island's sporting infrastructure is in fact in the east of the Island. We are also exploring further opportunities for netball facilities in the east of the Island as well.

The Investing in Jersey plan makes specific reference to improving the sports facilities at Le Rocquier. As the project relates primarily to educational infrastructure and school-led facilities, decisions regarding its scope, prioritisation and progression will be considered within the CYPES capital programme, informed by the outcome of the current feasibility work and in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.

It is also hoped to advance plans for a 3G pitch at Le Rocquier and to rent the parish a parcel of land for the provision of a play facility and pump track.

18.25 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the performance of DFDS services and actions being taken to secure improvements. (WQ.113/2026)

Question

Further to his response to a letter from the Jersey Hospitality Association in August 2025, in relation to the Government escalating service concerns to DFDS at the highest level and demanded improvements, will the Chief Minister advise –

- a. whether the current DFDS service meets the standards expected;
- b. how the performance of DFDS is being measured;
- c. what areas Government are requesting to be improved; and
- d. what steps, if any, are being taken to achieve improvements in the DFDS service?
- e.

Answer

- (a) Feedback from local organisations and from members of the travelling public indicates that there are ongoing areas of dissatisfaction with aspects of the service provided by DFDS. While services are operating, it is clear that performance in some areas has not consistently met the standards expected by ferry users.
- (b) The performance of DFDS is measured by a set of indicators defined in the Ferry Concession Agreement, which was published by the Government in October 2025. These include service reliability, cancellations and delays, disruption management, governance arrangements and financial reporting obligations. These are monitored through regular reporting and the contract management process.
- (c) The Government has made clear to DFDS that improvements are required in a number of areas, including concern over pricing, freight handling processes, sailing times and timetables. Conversations between the Government and DFDS, which underpin continuous improvements, are ongoing.
- (d) There have been significant challenges such as the recent incidents with both the Caesarea Trader and Tarifa Jet vessels. In these instances, Government's role is to ensure that the

operator implements its contingency arrangements fully, thereby minimising disruption for passengers and freight. The Concession Agreement provides a mechanism for the Government, Ports of Jersey and DFDS to work together on continuous improvement, or to address substantive non-compliance, should it occur. In addition, officers are in close and regular contact with DFDS to support the shared goal of delivering reliable sea connectivity for Jersey, with a clear expectation that service standards must improve.

18.26 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding restricted tenure properties data. (WQ.114/2026)

Question

Further to the response to [Written Question 15/2026](#), in relation to restricted tenure properties data, will the Minister –

- (a) detail the work that has been carried out to date to collect this information;
- (b) advise when the most recent work was undertaken and the data collected;
- (c) explain the methodology used to compile the data collected;
- (d) share what information is currently available, including the number and location of sites; and
- (e) advise when detailed information will be available and publicly accessible?

Answer

- (a) The work carried out to date has focused on scoping the number and location of restricted tenure (first-time buyer) properties, together with a high-level review of the conditions that apply to them. Its purpose has been to identify what data is available, develop a baseline understanding of the current position, and begin to determine the nature and types of arrangements in place.
- (b) The work started in October and is being undertaken on an ongoing basis, with activity progressed incrementally alongside other established housing policy commitments.

As previously set out in my [comments to P.55/2026](#), this work has been prioritised alongside other significant areas of housing policy, including consultation on the property transaction process (P.61/2025 Amd.), the development of policy mechanisms for empty homes (P.70/2025 Amd.(31) Amd.(2)), the embedding of the new Residential Tenancy Law provisions, consideration of the outcomes of the review of social housing rents (R.8/2026), and strengthening the approach to tackling homelessness.

- (c) The methodology used has primarily involved a review of Planning consents, Planning Obligation Agreements, conveyancing documentation and key policy documents, including the current Bridging Island Plan, previous Island Plans (2001 and 2011), and States Assembly decisions relating to the rezoning of sites for housing.
- (d) Information currently available includes substantive, though not yet complete, data on the number and location of first-time buyer properties, together with an initial understanding of the conditions that apply to them. However, this information is not yet sufficiently complete or standardised to enable publication. Further work is, therefore, required to

validate its accuracy, including engagement with the Minister for the Environment, given the basis in planning consents and associated agreements.

- (e) Work to identify first-time buyer properties is important, and as a minimum there is an intention to publish a comprehensive list of sites, their locations and the number of properties, together with clear signposting to the documents that define ownership, occupancy, onward sale and related obligations. However, decisions on how and when this work should be taken forward will rest with the next Minister for Housing. This will need to be considered in the context of existing commitments and the priorities of the incoming government.

18.27 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Westward development at South Hill. (WQ.115/2026)

Question

Further to the Minister's response during Questions Without Notice on [9th March 2026](#) that pre-sales for the Westward development at South Hill totalled 'a little over £10 million, or about 15 apartments', will the Minister provide an update on the site, including –

- (a) the financial value of pre-sales;
- (b) the number of units pre-sold; and
- (c) whether this level of pre-sales meets the requirement for construction to commence?

Answer

(a) and (b) The States of Jersey Development Company (SoJDC) has secured reservations on 31 apartments for a total value of £21.49m.

(c) These reservations are in legal hands for the formalising of the pre-sale contracts. Assuming all reservations convert to formal pre-sale contracts, this total value of pre-sales meets the requirement for construction to commence. SoJDC is targeting entering into the construction contract by the end of May.

18.28 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding Jersey's ferry service. (WQ.116/2026)

Question

In relation to Jersey's ferry service, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what consideration, if any, he has given to reviewing the Concession Agreement between the States of Jersey and DFDS; and
- (b) whether he has any plans for a Jersey-based service to Guernsey and, if so, how he intends to establish this service?

Answer

- (a) The Concession Agreement is maintained under regular review by the signatories: Government of Jersey, Ports of Jersey Limited and DFDS. Having recently assumed the role of Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, I will be meeting Ports of Jersey, Visit Jersey and local businesses, as well as DFDS, to identify how their operations can meet the needs of all users of the ferry service.
- (b) Members will be aware that DFDS put forward proposals earlier in 2026 for a Friday and Monday inter-island service using the RoPax vessel, STENA VINGA. This proposal has unfortunately been rejected by the States of Guernsey Committee for Economic Development, but I will be seeking to engage with my colleagues in Guernsey to explore how we can improve inter-island connectivity.

18.29 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the condition of Jersey's road surfaces. (WQ.118/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise whether, in his assessment, the quality of Jersey's road surfaces is acceptable and, if not, what steps he is considering to address any concerns he has identified?

Answer

The quality of Jersey's road surfaces varies across the network. While the Department continues to maintain the Government-owned main road network in a safe and serviceable condition, over the long-term it has to be recognised that currently we do not spend enough money to maintain the network in good condition over the long term. This is why I said in my nomination speech that we effectively have a policy of "managed decline".

To put more detail on that, Infrastructure and Environment carries out a carriageway condition survey every three years. Roads are categorised by condition, from those with structural or severe surface impairment to those that are serviceable or damage-free, and this evidence is used to prioritise the annual maintenance programme. The programme is also shaped by available budget, utility and developer works, road-space constraints, traffic impact, safety improvements, seasonal considerations and the need to minimise disruption.

The Department allocated £6.1 million capital in 2025 for carriageway preservation and replacement, and approximately £900,000 revenue for reactive patching and panel repairs to maintain immediate safety and serviceability. To give an idea of what this buys, the current three-year rolling average return period for significant carriageway maintenance is approximately 29.3 years, even including micro asphalt. Put more simply, any given stretch of road will only get significant maintenance work about every 30 years. Officers advise me that we would need a return period closer to 20 years to recover the maintenance backlog.

As a result, the Department is having to prioritise works carefully, manage safety and serviceability, and preserve the value of existing road assets for as long as possible. Where carriageways are life-expired or structurally impaired, reconstruction or resurfacing is required. Where roads remain structurally sound but are beginning to deteriorate, surface treatments such as micro asphalt are used to extend their life and delay more costly intervention.

I recognise that micro asphalt is not universally popular with the public, particularly when newly laid, because it does not provide the same finish as a fully resurfaced or reconstructed road.

However, it is an important asset-management tool. It helps seal the road against water ingress, restores surface texture, reduces disruption, uses significantly less material, produces less waste, and allows more of the network to be treated within the funding available.

Over the last three years, an average of 4.28km of carriageway has been treated with micro asphalt for c.£700k of the budget, while an average of 4.78km has been resurfaced/reconstructed with the remaining c£5.4M budget. This demonstrates how cost effective the micro asphalt is, where it can be used in preserving and extending the remaining value of our carriageway assets, saving money, and increasing their serviceable lives by approximately 8 to 12 years.

As Minister, I intend to explore other options that might be available in addition to micro asphalt, as well as exploring whether there are ways we can find more resource to allocate to the road network, for example by extending active travel routes.

In the meantime, the Department will continue to use its condition data to prioritise its work, coordinate works with utilities and developers, undertake reactive repairs where safety defects arise, and apply the right treatment at the right time.

18.30 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding SEND and inclusion funding. (WQ.119/2026)

Question

In relation to how Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and inclusion funding are structured and spent within the Children, Young People and Education and Skills (CYPES) Department, will the Minister –

- (a) provide a breakdown of how the additional SEND and inclusion funding has been allocated each year since its introduction in 2023, including by –
 - (i) early years, primary, secondary, and post-16 educational provision; and
 - (ii) mainstream inclusion schools, special schools, and out-of-Island placements;
- (b) advise the split, in both full-time-equivalent posts and cost, between frontline SEND delivery and administration, monitoring and supervision within CYPES inclusion services;
- (c) explain what progress has been made to address the weaknesses in relation to records of need identified in the [Island Special Educational Needs and Disabilities \(SEND\) review](#); and
- (d) detail any available data on how prevention and early identification of SEND or inclusion needs impact educational outcomes, in contrast to later intervention?

Answer

- (a) Whilst badged exclusively as inclusion funding, the approved investment provided for a wider remit. The summary below sets out how this new money was invested across the system. Allocations are not tracked at this level beyond this initial phase, and values will have changed over time e.g. with the addition of annual pay awards.

Allocation to:	2023 Funding (£m)
Inclusion Funding Formula (schools)	3.2

Central Inclusion	0.7
New Inclusion Projects	0.2
Early Years Inclusion	1.0
Recruitment	1.0
6.1	

Notes - The Central Inclusion Team has around 34 staff, including specialist teachers, education welfare officers, education psychologists and inclusion staff working across education settings.

We can however provide you with the current funding structure for inclusion across the various areas requested. As of 30th June 2026, Inclusion funding allocation is shown in the table below:

Allocation to	2026 Funding (£)
Post 16 Educational Provision	1,580,000
Central Inclusion Service	4,622,400
Primary Education (Includes Nursery Inclusion Funding)	12,103,000
Secondary Education	7,249,000
Special Schools	8,887,000
Further Early Years Inclusion Support (JCCT)	750,000
Off Island Placements	399,600
35,591,000	

Notes

Post 16: Highlands College courses are generally designed to meet inclusion needs as an integral part of course delivery. As a result, these inclusion-related costs are embedded within each course budget and cannot be separately identified or extracted.

- (b) Staff are not categorised in either the finance or HR systems as administration; frontline or supervision. Standard data definitions do not exist for these terms. Estimates have therefore been made to the best of our knowledge based on the information available at a specific point in time. Assumptions are described separately for Central Inclusion service and the Other Teams in the following paragraphs.

Central inclusion teams

In practice, central inclusion teams all undertake a combination of monitoring, supervision, and frontline service delivery. For the purposes of this analysis, indicative FTEs have been allocated to each category as set out below, based on the following methodology:

Allocation to:	FTE	Cost
Administration	4.78	286,500
Frontline	45.86	4,023,100
Total	50.6	4,309,600

Administration comprises back-office support functions for frontline teams, as well as certain frontline administrative activities.

Frontline services are delivered directly to schools to support improved outcomes for pupils and families and include teams such as Educational Psychology and Wellbeing facilitators, SEND

statutory team, Outreach, Speech and Language Therapy, Education Welfare Officers, and the Virtual School, Social, Emotional and Mental Health Inclusion Team (SEMHIT) and the Autism and Social Communication Inclusion Team (ASCIT).

Other teams:

Across the wider education sector, including primary schools, secondary schools, special schools and post-16 education settings, the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) split and costs for the requested categories are estimated as follows:

Allocated to:	Budgeted FTE	Cost
Administration	14.1	779,000
Frontline	350.0	20,079,000
Supervision and Monitoring	61.6	4,869,000
Grand Total	425.6	25,727,000

Administrative Staff:

This category includes inclusion administration support staff, attendance managers, secretaries, and other administrative roles.

Frontline:

This category includes all inclusion service frontline delivery teams, such as teachers, learning support assistants, emotional wellbeing officers, counsellors, and other frontline staff. It also includes operational support roles that directly enable service delivery, such as caretakers, drivers, and kitchen staff at Mont à l'Abbé School.

Supervision and Monitoring:

This category includes team leaders and managers, Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs), Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSLs), and other staff with oversight, supervisory, or monitoring responsibilities. These posts will also have a significant amount of Frontline delivery.

Important Note

Funding for staff is tracked and reported by post rather than by the categories requested above. Consequently, the categorisation presented is an estimate that has been prepared to the best of our knowledge based on the information available at a specific point in time. It is also important to note that inclusion features as a component of many, many roles and, as with Post 16 comments above, cannot be separately identified or extracted

- (c) Action B3 from the immediate priorities plan, the departmental response to the SEND review, describes the action and updates for Record of Need as:

Action - Improve Records of Need (RoN) for pupils with SEND

Update (March 2026) - A new Principal Educational Psychologist has been appointed and starts next term. Schools are working more closely with CYPES officers, including Educational Psychologists and SEND advisory staff. This means that panel decision making, and information sharing are becoming more consistent. RoN redesign work is in development and aligning with the Government's strategic financial planning and our development of new Inclusive Practice Guidance for teachers and school staff.

Since this last update the Principal Educational Psychologist has started, and the EP service is now at full capacity. Work to redesign the statutory assessment process along with a related school

funding review continues. The next progress report, as will be tested by the (independent) Inclusion Executive Board, is due in the autumn term 26/27.

- (d) The department does not collect this data. The department subscribes to the well documented benefits of early intervention, evidenced most recently by increased funding for early years.

18.31 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding the Childcare Funding Scheme. (WQ.120/2026)

Question

In relation to the Childcare Funding Scheme for 2 to 3-year-olds, will the Minister provide an update on the scheme, to include –

- (a) take-up of the scheme to date, including the number of approvals;
- (b) whether parents have raised any concerns with CYPES regarding the model of up-front payment for childcare and reimbursement by the Department and how any such concerns have been addressed;
- (c) the number of providers participating within the scheme; and
- (d) budgeted costs for each of the next 5 years?

Answer

- (a) Data to 08.07.26.

537 applications have been approved for 409 families and a total of £1.4m has been paid out. The average number of days from application submission to initiation of payment is 8.5 days against an ambition of 20 days. The main reason for an application being rejected is ‘*invalid receipt*’. This first cohort can continue to apply until the end of August 2026.

Data to 30.06.26

An additional 35 families have benefitted from supported payments which have been made and administered by the Jersey Childcare Trust. The total value of these payments is £63k.

- (b) No formal complaints have been received and logged on the department’s complaints management system. The scheme remains in its 2-year pilot phase and feedback is constantly being reviewed to enable continuous improvement.
- (c) Claims have been made for children attending 50 registered providers.
- (d) The available and approved budget for 2026 – 2030 is:

2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
£3.74m	£4.78m	£4.76m	£4.86m	£4.86m

Budget for 2030 has yet to be established however the 2029 budget is assumed to be allocated on a recurring basis.

18.32 Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding LibertyBus fleet renewal. (WQ.121/2026)

Question

Further to the commencement in 2024 of a 10-year contract with LibertyBus, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what obligation, if any, LibertyBus has to renew its fleet to lower emission vehicles in alignment with the [Carbon Neutral Roadmap](#);
- (b) if any such obligation is contractual, what the terms of that agreement are;
- (c) how many new vehicles LibertyBus has purchased during the current contract period; and
- (d) what rationale he has received for the fuel choices made by LibertyBus?

Answer

- (a) There is a clear path to the operation of low-emission and zero-emission vehicles within the 2025 Bus Operator Contract, as set out in the response to (b).
- (b) The 2025 Bus Operator Contract envisages the complete renewal of the bus fleet over the lifespan of the contract. The contract provides for the introduction of battery-electric double deck vehicles from 2028, subject to the successful implementation of the associated infrastructure upgrades at the La Collette Bus Garage premises. Fleet renewal from 2030 depends on the availability of a suitable single deck bus design with the required dimensions, passenger capacity, and operating range appropriate to the requirements of the Jersey bus route network.
- (c) Liberty Bus has acquired 22 brand new high-capacity single deck diesel buses which are fully compliant with the latest Euro 6 emissions standards. They have entered service during 2026.
- (d) The new single deck bus type was chosen because Liberty Bus determined that there are currently no single deck electric vehicles on the market with the required combination of narrow width, shorter length, adequate seating capacity, and operating range that could operate satisfactorily on Jersey's constrained road network. The vehicles currently used on Jersey bus services are the most appropriate types currently available for the local operating conditions.

As noted earlier, it is important to emphasise that while the procurement of zero-emission fleet replacement is allowed for within the 2025 Bus Operator Contract, enhancements would also be required to the Government-owned La Collette Bus Garage site to install the necessary power supply to enable electrification of the bus fleet.

18.33 Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding swimming safety measures at Victoria Marine Lake. (WQ.122/2026)

Question

In relation to swimming safety at the Victoria Marine Lake, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what safety measures and warning signage are currently in place to discourage swimming;
- (b) what assessment if any, has been made of whether those warnings are sufficiently visible, accessible and understandable to all users from the main access points;
- (c) whether the no-swim zone is clearly marked; and
- (d) whether any further safety measures are planned?

Answer

For clarity, there are presently no circumstances whereby swimming can be undertaken safely at the Victoria Marine Lake.

- (a) There is signage on the steps at La Fregate, the Castle Slipway, and the steps from car park 1 on Victoria Avenue stating that there is to be no swimming in the Victoria Marine Lake. There is further signage at the Marine Lake itself. Signage has been updated since the department received notification on 1st July of the serious incident that took place at the Marine Lake on 21st June.

Subsequent to that incident, there are now large blocks (the placing of which has been cleared with the Planning Department) in a line across the mouth of the Marine Lake, joined by out of life mooring rope from Ports and marked with buoys with further signage that says that there is no swimming in or walking around the lake structure. This signage includes pictograms that provide a visual representation of the no swimming message, easily understood whether beach users speak English or not.

- (b) The placing of the warnings has been validated by an Infrastructure and Environment Health and Safety assessment of the content and location as being effective.
- (c) The dangers of swimming in or near the structure, or walking around the structure, are clearly and now more explicitly identified. I once again urge the public to comply with these notices in the interest of safety.
- (d) The measures in place are designed to draw attention to the significant danger of swimming in or near the structure. Additional work is being undertaken as a matter of priority to consider how we can further reduce the risk associated with the structure and to develop longer-term solutions for the site.

18.34 Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for the Environment regarding Les Mielles Golf and Country Club site. (WQ.123/2026)

Question

Will the Minister detail any planning designations, protections, constraints or obligations that currently apply to the site of Les Mielles Golf and Country Club in St Ouen's Bay, and advise what planning policies apply in the event of any proposed change of use, redevelopment or intensification of activity on the site?

Answer

Any proposed change of use, redevelopment or intensification of activity at Les Mielles Golf and Country Club would need to satisfy both the policy objectives relating to the retention of sports and recreational facilities and the stringent environmental and landscape protections that apply to this nationally important coastal location.

The Les Mielles Golf and Country Club site is located within the St Ouen's Bay coastal plain, one of the Island's most environmentally and visually sensitive areas. The site lies within the Coastal National Park, where the highest level of landscape and seascape protection applies. Development proposals within the park must protect or improve its special landscape and seascape character, be compatible with the purposes of the Coastal National Park, and must not undermine its special qualities or setting.

Accordingly, any proposal involving a change of use, redevelopment, extension of facilities or intensification of activity at Les Mielles Golf and Country Club would be assessed against the key policy provisions of the bridging Island Plan, including:

- Policy PL5: Countryside, coast and marine environment;
- Policy NE3: Landscape and seascape character;
- Policy CI7 relating to sport, recreation and open space facilities;
- Other relevant strategic plan policies and thematic development management policies concerning economic value, design quality, traffic generation and parking, infrastructure, biodiversity and environmental impact would also apply, depending on the nature of any emergent proposal.

Where a proposal sought to change the use of the site to something other than a golf course or recreational facility, Policy CI7 would be of particular relevance. As an existing sports and recreation facility, there would be a presumption in favour of retaining recreational provision unless it could be demonstrated that the loss of that use was justified.

Given the site's location within the Coastal National Park and the environmentally sensitive landscape of St Ouen's Bay, any proposal for intensive development would also need to demonstrate compliance with the Island Plan's spatial, countryside, landscape and biodiversity policies, which afford a high degree of protection to the site and its setting.

Any proposal that conflicted with the existing policy framework for the site would need to be supported by a convincing case and robust evidence, together with a clear and reasoned justification demonstrating why departure from established Island Plan policy should be permitted. This would require the applicant to show not only that the loss of the recreational use was justified, but also that any wider planning, environmental, social or economic benefits were sufficient to outweigh the significant policy protections that apply to the site.

18.35 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the coordination of roadworks, road closures and traffic management arrangements to minimise congestion. (WQ.124/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise how roadworks, road closures and changes to traffic flow on the main road network are coordinated to minimise congestion, including how the cumulative impact of works, diversions and one-way systems in St. Helier is evaluated; and will he further advise whether it is his assessment that the current coordination arrangements are working effectively for residents and businesses?

Answer

The Department approves up to 5,000 roadworks permits each year. These include highway authority works, utility works and specified works such as scaffolding, crane operations, skips and other activities that occupy or affect the public highway. Around 80% of approved permit applications are planned for off-peak periods, which is an important part of reducing disruption to road users, residents and businesses.

Roadworks, road closures and temporary changes to traffic flow are coordinated through the statutory roadworks permitting and traffic management process. This requires those carrying out works to obtain approval, demonstrate safe working arrangements, provide trained, qualified staff and appropriate traffic management, including diversions where necessary.

Applications are assessed by officers before approval is granted. Consideration is given to the road hierarchy, peak travel periods, bus routes, school movements, pedestrian and cycle safety, access for emergency services, and access for residents and businesses. The timing, notification period, duration and method of traffic management are also reviewed, and applicants may be required to amend their proposals to reduce disruption.

In line with the Restricted Routes Policy, which aims to ensure that strategic thoroughfares are kept available, where possible works are scheduled outside peak periods, take into account seasonal travel patterns and are coordinated to avoid unnecessary overlap on key routes. However, some disruption is unavoidable, particularly where works are urgent, relate to essential infrastructure, or cannot safely be carried out without restricting traffic.

The cumulative impact of works is considered by reviewing other planned or live activity on the network, particularly where closures, temporary signals, diversions or one-way arrangements may interact. In St. Helier, this assessment is especially important because the road network is constrained, traffic demand is high at peak times, and alternative routes are limited.

Changes to traffic flow, including one-way systems, are subject to separate consideration. This includes assessment of road safety, network impact, access requirements, public transport, active travel, servicing needs and the likely displacement of traffic onto surrounding roads. Monitoring and feedback are used where appropriate to inform whether arrangements should be adjusted.

To facilitate this the Department hosts monthly Utility Coordination Meetings which brings together all statutory undertakers, contractors, and optional Parish representatives. These meetings incentivise dual working and allow participants to share plans, reduce overlaps, and coordinate works to minimise disruption.

Long-term planning is also a key feature of the Department's approach. Each year, major work promoters are asked to submit 1–5-year forecasts of their planned activities. This enables alignment of works programmes, including major utility works and infrastructure improvements such as resurfacing schemes, and helps avoid re-excavation of newly resurfaced roads by making the Planned Highway Maintenance Programme the lead reference point.

Major road events such as the Battle of Flowers also compete for road space, requiring a careful balance between supporting the social and economic benefits these events provide and delivering the infrastructure improvements and maintenance necessary to keep the network safe and efficient.

The current coordination arrangements are generally effective, but I recognise that residents and businesses, particularly in St. Helier, can still experience significant disruption when multiple pressures occur at the same time. The Department therefore continues to challenge the timing and

duration of works, improve coordination between promoters, and strengthen communication with road users, residents and businesses.

In summary, roadworks and traffic-flow changes are coordinated through permit approval, traffic management review, network assessment and ongoing liaison with relevant parties. While the arrangements provide a sound framework, there remains a continuing need to improve sequencing, communication and town-wide planning to minimise congestion wherever possible.

18.36 Deputy A. Maltman of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding public transport access to the new hospital. WQ.125/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise what consideration, if any, has been given to public transport access to the new hospital, detailing –

- (a) the intended bus routes to the new hospital, including how he intends to ensure that all medical sites are serviced;
- (b) the intended types of buses to be utilised and any actions to be undertaken to ensure that these vehicles are fit for purpose in terms of accessibility for those with mobility issues; and
- (c) the potential impact on traffic in the area, specifically in respect of the frequency and size of the vehicles required;

and if no such consideration has yet been undertaken, will he explain when he intends to undertake this work and what third parties, if any, he will invite to take part in the discussions?

Answer

Consideration has been given to public transport access to the new Acute Hospital throughout the development of the project. Public transport planning is being progressed in partnership between Health and Care Jersey, Infrastructure and Environment Operations & Transport (I&E O&T) and LibertyBus.

- (a) The new Acute Hospital – and other sites included within the New Healthcare Facilities Programme – are already served by existing public bus routes. The specific bus services and route arrangements that will support the Acute Hospital's operation will be determined ahead of the Acute Hospital opening. The New Healthcare Facilities Programme team has maintained ongoing engagement with relevant teams throughout the Programme and continues to collaborate with LibertyBus, I&E O&T and other relevant stakeholders. This is to ensure that an appropriate public transport provision is in place and that connectivity between the Acute Hospital and other healthcare facilities is considered as part of future network planning. Furthermore, the Planning Permission for the Acute Hospital included a planning condition requiring that public transport arrangements are established ahead of the facility opening.
- (b) Vehicles will be required to meet the relevant accessibility requirements and standards for passengers, including those with mobility issues. Included within the new Acute Hospitals' design is a bus stop adjacent the northern entrance. This will enable staff, patients and visitors to directly access the building under a canopy. Moreover, the Active Travel Route

from St Aubin's Road (the Inner Road) will also allow more mobile users a route from this well-used existing bus route.

- (c) The potential impact of traffic generated by a scheme is fundamental to any Planning Application and was covered in that for the new Acute Hospital, including in the Transport Assessment (TA). Moreover, the Westmount Road Mitigation Strategy has also subsequently been developed. The Mitigation Strategy was recently considered and approved by the Parish of St Helier Roads Committee and I&E O&T, and provides the framework for the traffic associated with the Acute Hospital to be safely managed on this road.

Generally, the TA identified that the principal transport challenge is not an increase in general car traffic, which is expected to remain broadly comparable to existing levels, as the majority of patient volume will be accommodated at the future Ambulatory Facility at Kensington Place/Gloucester Street. Rather, the key consideration relates to the movement of larger vehicles including buses, ambulances and servicing vehicles on constrained sections of Westmount Road.

To adequately address traffic impacts from the new Acute Hospital, a range of mitigation measures have been developed, including localised junction and highway improvements, a Vehicle Activated Warning System (VAWS), bus headway management to avoid bus-to-bus conflicts, and controls for operational vehicles. The assessment concludes that, with these mitigation measures in place, Westmount Road can safely and reliably accommodate the forecast traffic associated with the new Acute Hospital while maintaining reliable access for public transport, emergency vehicles and other road users.

All contractors who have worked on the Acute Hospital site and BYUK, will develop a traffic management plan to ensure all construction transport movements are carried out safely without unduly impacting the network. These are required to be reviewed and approved by Regulators. As the Programme progresses towards the opening of the new Acute Hospital, transport and operational plans will continue to be developed in partnership between Health and Care Jersey, I&E O&T, LibertyBus and other relevant stakeholders, with final arrangements for bus services, routes and operational requirements being confirmed ahead of the hospital opening.

18.37 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding coordination of roadworks, road closures and traffic management arrangements between the Parishes and Government. (WQ.126/2026)

Question

Will the Chair advise how the Parishes coordinate works, closures and traffic-management arrangements on Parish roads with Government and neighbouring Parishes, particularly where it is anticipated changes to one-way systems or diversions may increase congestion on nearby roads?

Answer

The Road Works and Events (Jersey) Law 2016 (Part 2 – Duties on Highway Authorities and on Persons carrying out works) details the general duties of a highway authority in relation to road management and the general duty on persons carrying out roadworks.

Article 9 sets out the general duty of highway authority in relation to road management which includes:

- Using its best endeavours to manage the network of roads for which it is responsible to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its road network; and
- to facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic on roads for which another highway authority is responsible.
- To have particular regard to: the need to minimise the inconvenience to persons using the road (having regard, in particular, to the needs of people with a disability), including inconvenience caused by the frequency of different works or events taking place in the same road or vicinity; and
- the impact of any works on events or other works, and events on any works or other events.
- The duty extends to co-ordination and consultation with another highway authority where any works in, or events in or in the vicinity of, a road for which the highway authority is responsible affect a road for which the other highway authority is responsible.

This is achieved using the Government of Jersey Trafficworx portal to co-ordinate and consult on road works and events being planned.

The Parishes also participate in the Jersey Utility & Road Authority Forum (JURAF) meetings arranged by the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment (IHE) Department, Government of Jersey, and which also include utility companies (such as Jersey Gas, Jersey Electricity, Jersey Water and Jersey Telecom), IHE Drainage, IHE Highways and Coastal and the Operations & Transport Department representatives.

The link to the Government of Jersey managed Trafficworx website is provided here: Road information map and the site provides planned island road information to the public as follows:

- Road ownership: whether roads are owned by the Government of Jersey, the Parishes or by private owners.
- Road resurfacing & embargoes: featuring planned resurface works, embargoes and last resurfaced dates.
- Road works: road closures, diversions, one way traffic and single line traffic. #

18.38 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Social Security regarding a comprehensive review of the Long-Term Care Scheme. (WQ.127.2026)

Question

Will the Minister commit to undertaking and publishing a comprehensive review of the Long-Term Care Scheme before bringing forward any proposal to increase Long-Term Care contribution rates; and if not, why not?

Answer

The Budget 2026 to 2029, published in September 2025, identified the urgent need for a review of the Long-Term Care Fund and its funding:

“Costs are increasing rapidly at present driven by a combination of demographic changes and the increasing complexity of care packages. There has been a sharp increase in costs since the preparation of the 2025 Budget and future costs are forecast to continue to rise steeply over the next few years.

Urgent action is now needed to maintain the Fund. This can be achieved by increasing the contributions into the Fund or by reducing the range or value of benefits provided from the Fund.

The estimates for 2027 to 2029 in the table below include an increase of 1 percentage point in the LTC contribution rate from 1 January 2027. Any rate change will require legislation and a States Assembly debate. Ministers have instigated a detailed internal review of the LTC scheme to consider the way in which benefit levels are set and income and assets of claimants are taken into account as well as the way in which services are delivered. The outcome of this detailed review will be available to the incoming Council of Ministers in summer 2026 to allow for a decision to be made during 2026 as to the actions needed to increase contributions into the Fund and/or reduce the generosity of benefits paid out of the Fund for future new benefit applicants, to ensure the sustainability of the Fund in coming decades.”

The need for urgent action is evident.

This review has been undertaken by the Department, and an initial report has been drafted. I will be considering its contents in the coming weeks before finalising the report and making recommendations to the Council of Ministers. Any proposal to increase Long-Term Care contribution rates will be accompanied by a detailed report based on the outcome of the review.

18.39 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding consultation and planning for the proposed new town school on the former Jersey Gas site. (WQ.128/2026)

Question

In relation to the proposed new town school, on the former Jersey Gas site, will the Minister advise –

- (a) what consultation, if any, has been undertaken with teachers in St. Helier;
- (b) what consultation, if any, has been undertaken with the residents of the area and with the wider public and;
- (c) whether a traffic management plan has been developed; and
- (d) if any of these actions have not been undertaken, why not?

Answer

- a) Headteachers have been consulted throughout the development of plans for the new school. Their input was instrumental in establishing the requirements for the facility and shaping the draft accommodation schedule. The consultation panel comprised Headteachers from several primary schools in St Helier, including La Passerelle, St Luke’s, Springfield, Rouge Bouillon, Plat Douet and First Tower Primary Schools.
- b) The process of consultation with the residents of the area and the wider public is incorporated into the planning process for the approval of a planning application for a future school in St Helier. This detailed planning phase of the programme has not yet commenced.
- c) The development of traffic management plans forms part of the detailed planning design work which is set to commence once the site has been acquired into the ownership of the

Government. Sustainable transport would be a feature of any planning application process and alongside the Safer Routes to School Initiative and active travel plans, any traffic impacts can be minimised. Previous surveys do confirm that the majority of pupils already walk to their town primary schools.

- d) The reasons these actions have not been undertaken yet is specified in the answers above. At this stage the Assembly has given approval for the construction of a new school on Gas Place and funding has been allocated in the Capital Programme. In addition, outline designs have been developed. The detailed planning work to advance the project towards planning permission and construction has yet to commence. This phase can only follow the acquisition of the Gas Place site by the Government from Andium.

18.40 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.

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

18.41 Deputy S.J. Gleave of St. Helier South of the Minister for Social Security regarding analysis of the operation, costs, effectiveness and public understanding of the Long-Term Care Scheme. (WQ.130/2026)

Question

In relation to the Long-Term Care (LTC) Scheme, will the Minister detail what analysis has been undertaken by her department into the following –

- (a) identifying the principal factors behind increased expenditure, distinguishing between demographic pressures and any other factors such as residential care fees, provider charging and the operation of the scheme;
- (b) whether alternative models, including supported living and retirement communities, could improve outcomes while reducing long-term demand for residential care;
- (c) whether the Property Bond arrangements, including safeguards for spouses or partners remaining in the family home, remain appropriate;
- (d) whether the £419,000 asset disregard and other key elements of the scheme remain fit for purpose;
- (e) whether Islanders have a sufficient understanding of how the scheme operates, and when support becomes available and whether improvements are needed to ensure it is transparent, well understood and represents value for money;

and if no such analysis has been undertaken, will she explain why not?

Answer

The Budget 2026 to 2029, published in September 2025, identifies the urgent need for a review of the Long-Term Care Fund as follows:

“Costs are increasing rapidly at present driven by a combination of demographic changes and the increasing complexity of care packages. There has been a sharp increase in costs since the preparation of the 2025 Budget and future costs are forecast to continue to rise steeply over the next few years.

Urgent action is now needed to maintain the Fund. This can be achieved by increasing the contributions into the Fund or by reducing the range or value of benefits provided from the Fund.

The estimates for 2027 to 2029 in the table below include an increase of 1 percentage point in the LTC contribution rate from 1 January 2027. Any rate change will require legislation and a States Assembly debate. Ministers have instigated a detailed internal review of the LTC scheme to consider the way in which benefit levels are set and income and assets of claimants are taken into account as well as the way in which services are delivered. The outcome of this detailed review will be available to the incoming Council of Ministers in summer 2026 to allow for a decision to be made during 2026 as to the actions needed to increase contributions into the Fund and/or reduce the generosity of benefits paid out of the Fund for future new benefit applicants, to ensure the sustainability of the Fund in coming decades.”

This review has been undertaken by the Department, and an initial report has been drafted. I will be considering its contents in the coming weeks. I can confirm that this review will analyse all of the areas identified in parts (a) to (d) of this question.

In terms of (e), a significant piece of work was undertaken in 2022/2023 to review and improve the communications package. I am aware that this is a complex area, and I will ensure it is kept under continuous review. In particular, I am very happy to receive feedback and to continue appropriate stakeholder consultation.

18.42 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the financial and distributional impact of reducing excise duty on road fuel. (WQ.131/2026)

Question

Further to the proposal in [P.60/2026 \(Reduction of Excise Duty on road fuel\)](#) to reduce excise duty on road fuel, will the Minister provide an update of the estimated cost to public finances of the three-month period that has been proposed; and will he advise what assessment, if any, has been made of how the change would affect lower, middle and higher-income households?

Answer

The fiscal cost of a 10p reduction in fuel duty for three months was correctly stated in P.60/2026 as £900,000. As forecast fuel consumption has not changed and fuel duty is applied as a fixed rate per litre regardless of fuel price, this remains the expected cost.

Using Statistics Jersey's [Jersey Household Spending 2021/2022](#) report adjusted to 2026 fuel price levels, household spending on petrol, diesel and other motor oils ranges from £15.50 per week for households in the lowest income quintile, £22.50 per week for the average household, and £28.50 per week for those in the highest income quintile.² As a result, the financial benefit of a 10p reduction in fuel duty would be greater for higher-income households, with estimated savings of £1.10 per week for the lowest-income households, £1.60 for the average household, and £2.00 for the highest-income households. The table below summarises estimated weekly fuel spending and savings by income group.

Household income quintile	Ave. spend on petrol diesel per week (2021)	Ave. spend on petrol diesel per week, adjusted to 2026	Effect of 10p/litre reduction in fuel duty per week
Lowest quintile	£12.00	£15.50	£1.10
Average household	£17.40	£22.50	£1.60
Highest quintile	£22.00	£28.50	£2.00

18.43 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding free admission to the Jersey Museum. (WQ.132/2026)

Question

Will the Minister –

² Household fuel spending estimates have been calculated using the increase in the RPI fuel index over the period Q1 2022 to Q1 2026.

- (a) advise whether it his assessment that the free entry trial to the Jersey Museum was successful;
- (b) if he considers this trial was successful, commit to undertaking the necessary conversations with Jersey Heritage to continue the trial and, if not, provide his reasons for not doing so; and
- (c) detail his policy position on free entry into the Jersey Museum?

Answer

- (a) I've not yet had an opportunity to meet with Jersey Heritage to discuss their evaluation of the trial and whether it met its intended objectives but look forward to doing so in the near future.
- (b) This decision will need to take into consideration both the evaluation of the trial and the costs of continuing this policy.

The trial was supported through Government funding to compensate for the loss of admissions income to the value of £497,000. Any decision to provide free admission on a permanent basis must be balanced against affordability, value for money and other funding priorities within the arts, culture and heritage 1% envelope.

- (c) See answer above.

18.44 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

- (a) 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;
- (b) 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) Given the “budget neutral principle” as outlined above, this is not a consideration.
- (c) See above. None, as none is needed.

18.45 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Chief Minister regarding the development of individual Ministerial Plans and engagement with Scrutiny on Government priorities. (WQ.134/2026)

Question

Will the Chief Minister confirm whether it his intention for Ministers to produce individual Ministerial Plans setting out their individual priorities as part of his Government’s Common Strategic Policy and, if so, will he provide the timetable for issue of these plans; and will he further commit to ensuring that there is timely engagement with Scrutiny Panels on any such individual plans and the Common Strategic Policy as a whole?

Answer

In line with the approach taken by the previous Government, there are no plans to produce individual Ministerial Plans. The Council of Ministers is currently focused on developing its Common Strategic Policy (CSP), which will be lodged by 29th September 2026. The CSP will be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Panels and will subsequently be considered by the States Assembly, in accordance with Article 18(2)(e) and (2A) of the States of Jersey Law 2005.

Alongside this, Ministers will continue to deliver essential public services within their departments, drive improvements, and respond to the needs and concerns of Islanders. Ministerial priorities will be reflected in departmental business plans.

The Council of Ministers looks forward to engaging with Scrutiny Panels in a timely and constructive manner throughout the scrutiny process.

18.46 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs regarding the transfer of prisoners from H.M.P. La Moye to United Kingdom prisons. (WQ.135/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise –

- (a) how many prisoners at H.M.P. La Moye are currently awaiting transfer to prisons in the United Kingdom;
- (b) the average length of time these prisoners have been waiting for transfer and the reason for each transfer;
- (c) the estimated annual cost of holding these prisoners in Jersey pending transfer;
- (d) the cost of transferring and accommodating Jersey prisoners in United Kingdom prisons;

- (e) whether such costs are met by the Government of Jersey, the United Kingdom Government or shared between them; and
- (f) whether any delays in arranging transfers have affected prison capacity, prisoner welfare, rehabilitation opportunities or family contact?

Answer

- (a) 12 prisoners have applied for transfers and are on the transfer list awaiting approval. 10 prisoners applied to transfer to prisons in England and Wales, 2 prisoners have applied to transfer to prisons in Scotland.
- (b) The average time these prisoners have been on the waiting list is approximately 10.3 months. All prisoners on the current list requested transfers for rehabilitation reasons to be closer to home to maintain family contact, and to access support networks.
- (c) The estimated annual cost of accommodating Jersey prisoners according to the latest Government of Jersey figures is £84,000.
- (d) Based on six transfers undertaken in 2026 the estimated average transfer cost is £1,603 per transfer. Actual costs will vary according to staffing, operational requirements and cost of travel.
- (e) Under the Memorandum of Understanding currently in place with His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS), when an unrestricted prisoner is transferred the UK takes responsibility for administering and enforcing the remainder of the sentence. Jersey is not billed for the cost of imprisonment. Travel costs for prisoners and escorting staff are met by the Government of Jersey.
- (f) The current position is not attributable to delays in arranging transfers but to the limited capacity within the England and Wales prison estate to accept transferred prisoners, resulting in a waiting list for approved transfers. La Moye prison is required to seek and obtain approval from HMPPS before transferring a prisoner, and must also accommodate essential movements of prisoners (such as for medical treatment or court appearances) in addition to the voluntary transfers requested by prisoners.

While waiting periods may have implications for prisoner welfare, rehabilitation opportunities and family contact, the extent of any impact cannot be reliably measured. Further, due to population pressures, transfer to England and Wales does not guarantee placement in a prison close to a prisoner's family or support network. In addition, while family ties are commonly cited in transfer applications, other factors may also influence requests for transfer, including the sentencing and release arrangements that apply in England and Wales.

No evidence is held to demonstrate a measurable impact on prison capacity, prisoner welfare, rehabilitation outcomes or family contact arising from current waiting times for transfer. Prisoners held at La Moye still have access to letters, telephone calls and visits options to keep in touch with their family and friends. The main impact cited by prisoners or their families is the costs of travel and accommodation costs in Jersey. Extra back-to-back visits is offered for visitors from the UK and beyond.

18.47 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding progress in responding to United Nations recommendations on tackling child poverty in Jersey (WQ.136/2026)

Question

Will the Minister provide an update on any progress in responding to points 44 and 45 of the [United Nations Economic and Social Council's recommendations](#) for the adoption and enhancement of measures (including necessary fiscal reforms and increased budget allocation) to end child poverty, noting the specific reference to the Island within point 45(b) of the recommendations?

Answer

Policy measures are in place to mitigate the impacts of poverty and the cost of living on families, including regular increases in income support, achieving a minimum wage of 2/3 of median earnings, additional investment in childcare, free GP surgery visits for all children, improved access to affordable housing, and the introduction of school meals in non-fee-paying primary schools. Policy development in various areas has involved consideration of children's rights and best interests, including completion of children's rights impact assessments.

The 2026-2029 Budget (Government Plan) included significantly increased investment in children and young people. Improved financial support for the Children's Service was allocated both for the provision of improved care (£7.6 million) and capital investment to modernise residential facilities ('Loving Homes'; £12 million), supporting the most vulnerable young islanders.³

At this early stage of the administration, the Council of Ministers will continue to reflect the recommendations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the development of the Common Strategic Policy and future Government Plans, considering the range of fiscal, social and wider policy levers available to support children and families over the course of the term of office.

18.48 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Children and Families regarding plans to improve access to children's sport and active play opportunities. (WQ.137/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise what plans, if any, he has to enhance and develop access to children's sport, including options for active play for toddlers, and will he explain how those plans will be funded and supported going forward?

Answer

The Government recognises the important role that both sport and active play have in supporting children's physical health, wellbeing and development. The recently published Jersey Play Plan 2025-2028 provides a framework for improving opportunities for children and young people to play and be active across the Island.

The plan includes a range of actions to improve access to play opportunities, including enhancing play infrastructure, supporting play in schools and early years settings, increasing opportunities for play within communities, supporting initiatives such as play streets and school streets and

³ [Budget 2026 to 2029.pdf](#)

investigating the option of greater use of school grounds. The plan also promotes the development of inclusive and accessible play spaces for children of all ages and abilities.

With regard to toddlers, the play plan aligns with the Best Start Partnership Plan and includes actions to increase play opportunities for children under five, including those with additional needs. These actions include supporting play in the home, providing advice and resources for parents and carers, strengthening play opportunities within early years and childcare settings, and ensuring that future play spaces consider the needs of babies, toddlers and young children.

The Government also continues to support participation in physical activity and sport through existing initiatives, including Jersey Sport's Access to Sport grant scheme and Move More Toddler Play, which helps reduce financial barriers to participation.

The Play Plan is intended to influence and support existing programmes and services rather than establish a standalone funded programme. Delivery will therefore rely on partnership working, existing resources and the alignment of play-related actions across Government and community partners.

18.49 Connétable I Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Social Security regarding eligibility criteria and discretionary support arrangements for the 2026 Back to School Bonus. (WQ.138/2026)

Question

Will the Minister confirm whether eligibility for the 2026 Back to School Bonus is assessed solely on a household's combined income in 2025 where the family is not receiving Income Support at the time the payment is made and, if that is the case, will she advise –

- (a) whether any discretion, review or exceptional-circumstances process is available for families whose current or anticipated income is substantially lower than their income in 2025;
- (b) what assessment was made of the effect of using a historic income threshold on larger families, particularly those with several school-age children and high private rental costs; and
- (c) whether she will consider introducing a discretionary reassessment process based on current or projected household income so that families facing a substantial and evidenced change in circumstances are not excluded from any support intended to help meet the costs of the September 2026 school year?

Answer

The rules for the Back to School Bonus were established by a Ministerial Decision ([MD-SOSEC-2026-436](#)) signed on 16th April 2026 by the previous Minister for Social Security.

This is a pilot, non-statutory scheme, which has been established by the above Ministerial Decision. The application process ends on the 31st July 2026. It would not be appropriate to change the eligibility criteria towards the end of the application process, as it would create confusion.

In line with the rules as set out in that Ministerial Decision, I can confirm that, for families who do not receive Income Support, eligibility is based on 2025 earned income and the scheme does not provide for any review or discretionary reassessment.

I would encourage any family who has experienced a significant drop in income since last year, or is struggling financially, to approach the Employment, Social Security and Housing Department for advice on claiming Income Support and other available benefits. Additionally, if the Connétable has a specific case in mind, I would encourage this to be raised directly with either myself or the Department.

18.50 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chief Minister regarding ministerial responsibilities following the creation of a Minister for Planning and Regulation. (WQ.139/2026)

Question

In relation to the [Notice under Article 29A\(3\) of the States of Jersey Law 2005: Changes to Ministerial Offices \(R.106/2026\)](#) and the transfer of functions from the Minister for the Environment to the new Minister for Planning and Regulation, will the Chief Minister advise –

- (a) whether PFAS mapping, monitoring, and any associated remediation enforcement will remain with the Minister for the Environment, be transferred to the new Minister or split between the two, given that no law specific to PFAS or water pollution appears on the schedule of transferred legislation;
- (b) how the ministerial responsibility for any functions which may fall under more than one of the transferred or retained laws, such as contaminated land or water quality enforcement, will be determined and how any questions around remit will be settled; and
- (c) who retains ultimate ministerial accountability for Jersey's compliance with its obligations under International Agreements and Conventions to which Jersey is a party and for which the Minister of Environment is currently responsible?

Answer

The answers to parts (a) to (c) will be determined by the draft Order and any subsequent Order that is made.

In general, Ministers are responsible for the laws assigned to them, including how those laws operate and any related international obligations.

(a) Responsibility for PFAS mapping, monitoring, and any related enforcement or remediation work will remain with the Minister for the Environment. These responsibilities are not included in the draft Order and are therefore not being transferred.

(b) Responsibility for a particular function will sit with the Minister who is responsible for the relevant law, whether that law is retained or transferred under the Order. Where responsibilities overlap, Ministers and officials will work together to determine the appropriate lead Minister, as is routinely done across the Government.

(c) Ministers are accountable for ensuring compliance with international agreements and conventions within the areas covered by the legislation for which they are responsible.

For legislation that is transferred under the Order, accountability will transfer to the receiving Minister. For legislation that is not transferred, accountability will remain with the existing Minister.

18.51 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding trainee nurses and other public sector trainees. (WQ.140/2026)

Question

Will the Chair advise –

- (a) whether trainee nurses (including those undertaking pre-registration nursing degrees or apprenticeships sponsored by, or placed with, Health and Care Jersey) are paid during their training, and if so, at what rate and under what terms;
- (b) whether other clinical or healthcare trainees (such as trainee midwives, paramedics, or allied health professionals) receive the same or comparable rates and terms;
- (c) how the pay, terms and conditions of trainee nurses compare with those of trainees in other frontline public sector roles, including (but not limited to) the States of Jersey Police and the Fire and Rescue Service, specifically whether they are paid a salary, a training allowance or are unpaid during their training period; and
- (d) where there is any disparity between the treatment of trainee nurses and trainees in other frontline public sector roles, why that is the case and whether any assessment has been made of its impact on nurse recruitment and retention in Jersey?

Answer

- (a) Trainee nurses in Health and Care Jersey are not paid, as they are full-time undergraduate students. They are eligible to apply for the Government's student maintenance grant and the additional clinical grant, both of which are means-tested.

This approach is consistent with Nursing and Midwifery Council-accredited, non-apprenticeship nursing courses throughout the UK. There are also apprenticeship pathways in Jersey for Healthcare Assistants at Levels 2 and 3.

- (b) All trainee nurses, midwives and operating department practitioners are full-time undergraduate students, as outlined above.

Radiography students (currently two in training) and paramedic students (due to start in September) are apprenticeship students and are therefore paid during their training. We are also exploring both apprenticeship and non-apprenticeship routes for other Allied Health Professional roles.

This approach is consistent with Health and Care Professional Council- approved courses in the UK, which offer both routes to accommodate school leavers, career changers and existing staff seeking career development opportunities.

- (c) Pay scales for all pay groups are published on gov.je [Public Sector payscales](#). Terms and conditions for trainee roles in other frontline professions vary according to the nature of the role. A training allowance is not paid to these groups because they are directly employed by the States Employment Board and receive a salary while undertaking their training. Unlike trainee nurses, they are not full-time undergraduate students and are therefore paid as employees during their training period.
- (d) Pay, terms and conditions of employment vary across pay groups due to differences in job requirements. Variations may include overtime arrangements, shift allowances, on-call payments, annual leave entitlements and career progression structures.

In addition, separate collective bargaining arrangements exist with the recognised Trade Unions, meaning that negotiation and agreement are required before any changes can be made to terms and conditions.

All roles within the Government of Jersey are evaluated to determine the relative value of different jobs across the organisation. The primary purpose of this process is to provide a fair, consistent and evidence-based framework for establishing pay levels and grading structures.

18.52 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding assessments of infrastructure upgrades required across the States property estate to prepare for future heatwaves. (WQ.141/2026)

Question

Will the Minister advise what assessments, if any, have been undertaken across the States of Jersey property estate of the need for infrastructure upgrades in response to potential future heatwaves, including details of –

- (a) any buildings which require upgrades;
- (b) the type of infrastructure upgrade that is required; and
- (c) the estimated cost of any upgrades;

and if no assessments have been undertaken, will the Minister explain why these assessments have not taken place, when such work will be undertaken, and how Members will be informed of the findings?

Answer

The public estate covers a wide variety of buildings and assets that fulfil a wide variety of functions. These functions have different recommendations for comfortable operating temperatures, with office work for example the subject of UK HSE guidance of a maximum of 30 degrees. Building users have a process of risk assessments and business continuity contingency plans that will enable them to continue to perform their functions in a variety of different scenarios, including high temperatures. Current temperature spikes are managed by building users and operators, with options from a selection of measures such as hours of working, working from home and relaxed clothing guidelines to ensure safe and comfortable working.

Where operational mitigations are not possible or are difficult to achieve, alterations to the fabric of buildings and the introduction of mechanical solutions is considered, and there are a number of interventions that are currently in progress. These vary from temporary solutions such as keeping roofs wet to increase evaporation, increasing solar reflection by changing roof colours from dark to light colours, solar reflective film for windows and extend to the introduction of mechanical cooling solutions.

There is currently no plan to undertake estate wide thermal modelling. There are plans to include upgrades where needs have been identified which cover a wide variety of measures as outlined above. Funding for these measures requires reprioritisation of reactive maintenance funds. If operational requirements necessitate more material alterations, these funds will be bid for in the budget process.

18.53 Deputy L.D. Carpenter of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the cost and household impact of removing GST from food and essential grocery items. (WQ.142/2026)

Question

Will the Minister provide an estimate of the annual cost to public finances of removing GST from food and essential grocery items and will he advise what assessment, if any, has been undertaken of how such a change would affect lower, middle and higher-income households?

Answer

The estimated annual cost of removing GST from food is £14 million, which is based on Statistics Jersey's [Household Spending 2021/2022](#) report, uprated by inflation.⁴ The term 'essential grocery items' included in the question is undefined and therefore items cannot be identified for inclusion in the modelling.

The most appropriate assessment of the impact on different households is arrived at by examining the estimated saving for each 20% of households (quintiles). The question asks specifically about lower, middle and higher income households, which are highlighted in bold in the table below. The analysis shows that removing GST from food provides the most benefit to the highest income households because they spend most on food:

Household income quintile	Saving from removing GST from food	Percentage of saving received
Lowest quintile	£1.8 million	12%
Second quintile	£2.3 million	16%
Middle quintile	£2.9 million	20%
Fourth quintile	£3.4 million	24%
Highest quintile	£4.0 million	28%
Total	£14.4 million	100%

Analysis from other countries suggests retailers often do not reduce their prices accordingly, especially when the GST reduction increases administration costs for businesses.

When GST was introduced, the States also agreed enduring compensation for Islanders for the impact on food prices via three mechanisms:

1. Improved personal tax allowances – 6.5% increase from 2007 to 2008;
2. Uplifted Income Support payments; and
3. Targeted support (e.g. through the Food Cost Bonus, and later the Community Costs Bonus)

Ministers maintain that a broad-based GST, accompanied with these support measures, is the most effective way to support people with the cost of

⁴ Household food spending estimates have been calculated using the increase in the RPI food index over the period Q1 2022 to Q1 2026.

19. Oral Questions

The Bailiff:

We now move on to Oral questions with notice, and I invite the Connétable of St. Helier to put the first question to the Minister for Infrastructure.

19.1 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the Victoria Marine Lake. (OQ.58/2026)

Following the recent incident of Victoria Marine Lake and the installation of additional safety measures, will the Minister outline the next steps for the Marine Lake and advise when it is expected to be restored to safe public use?

Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for Infrastructure):

It feels strangely appropriate to be answering the first question given my reputation for asking questions in the previous Assembly. **[Laughter]** So we had a lucky escape last month. We were exceptionally fortunate that the incident on 21st June resulted in just minor injuries and not something much more serious and we are of course thankful for that, but we cannot rely on luck again. As the Constable knows, we have therefore installed additional measures to try and improve public safety, but the key point is that it is still not safe to swim in the pool. We are now considering short-term measures that would make the site safer, while bearing in mind the structure's grade 4 listing. Once we have taken whatever short-term measures are most appropriate, we then need to consider the long-term future of the Marine pool alongside other investment and maintenance priorities. As things stand today, I do not know when, how or if the Marine Lake will be restored to safe public use. I am open to all options, but I would note that this is a 129 year-old structure that exists in a harsh environment that, for whatever reason, has not been properly maintained over the years and is therefore in a very poor state of repair.

19.1.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

It is all right for the Minister to say: "I do not know when it will be restored" and it is a harsh environment, but we are in the 21st century and I would like to check, if we do not know when it will be restored, would the Minister advise when does he expect to at least receive all assessments and to have plans to put in place and not restore? If it is several months or what the timeline is this Minister is working in.

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, that is a very reasonable question. The answer is that, in terms of the short-term measures that we might take, I would be expecting to decide those within a matter of weeks. They require consultation with Regulation, it is a listed structure, but those measures we should be able to take decisions on very quickly. In terms of the longer-term future, I think that is a question that I would want to discuss with the Constable, with other Deputies of the area and so on and with my ministerial colleagues. As I say, I think that decision needs to be taken in the context of our overall investment programme for infrastructure in the Island.

19.1.2 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I was just wondering if the Minister would ensure that demolition is one of the options that is on the list of options. It does not mean demolition should take place but sometimes, with a 129-year-old structure, it just needs to be accepted that it is time for it to go. So would the Minister ensure that demolition is one of the potential options that should be looked at?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, I think I said in my first answer that I would consider all options and clearly all options would include a removal of the structure. The Deputy will be aware that the structure is listed. Listing is a statement of significance. A listing gives guidance to society at large about what is considered significant. It is grade 4 listed which recognises the fact that it has been, in colloquial terms, “knocked about quite a bit” over the years. It is not the original structure, so that would indeed be an option. As I said earlier though, it would be considered in the light of all the other priorities that we have for infrastructure spending.

19.1.3 Connétable A. Howell of Trinity:

I just wondered if the Minister would consider removing the grade 4 listing.

Deputy J. Renouf:

I think that would be implicit if the decision is that we did not wish to fund a full restoration, the cost of which I think was previously - certainly by the Constable in a proposition that she brought or an amendment she brought to the budget - at £600,000 with an ongoing expenditure of £60,000 a year, which I think are reasonable estimates. Were we to decide that we did not wish to do that, then delisting would have to be a part of that process.

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

The former Minister for Infrastructure, when discussing the amendment to the Budget around funding for maintenance of Victoria Marine Lake pool, said that in 2025 he had spent £65,000 on the structure because his first priority was safety. Obviously, that seems to have not worked. What was the analysis from the department of that £65,000 and what has deemed it unsafe now?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, I think it is very telling in fact that indeed my predecessor did authorise expenditure of £65,000 over the winter to repair the pool. I think it was finished around January-time and, within 3 months, the wall had failed again, which is indicative of the challenges that we face with that structure. It failed by the undertow, so the water, under hydraulic pressure of being held in, found a way underneath the wall in several places. That created whirlpooling which had the risk of sucking people down and pinning them against the wall. Therefore, the decision was taken to open the sluice gates which would provide a faster means for the water to get out. However, it was recognised that that did not remove the risk and, indeed, what happened was somebody was indeed sucked down through the sluice gates. They did at least make it through alive but, as I say, we had a very lucky escape and, therefore, the short-term options we are considering have to include an option that would remove that danger.

[15:00]

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

The listing of the pool has been mentioned a number of times, and I am just wondering if the Minister thinks that this is the biggest hurdle to making the pool safe and/or investing in it?

Deputy J. Renouf:

No, I do not think the listing is a barrier to making it safe. A listing imposes responsibilities on us when we do things to the structure. We have to consult about them and have due regard to its listed status, and then that would mean that we would be dealing with regulation to make sure that they were happy with whatever steps we were taking. I do not regard that as a barrier. I think that is an appropriate thing to do when we identify an important historic structure and that we have a series of checks and balances before we undertake work. I think it represents a slightly bigger barrier to

removal because it is a listed structure, but as I have already outlined, I do not think that that is a complete barrier to removal and I am prepared to consider that as an option.

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

Given that, in the answer to my Written Question, the Minister confirmed that the incident took place on 21st June but was not notified to the department until 1st July, and then it took almost a further week for the incident to be reported publicly, can the Minister give us more confidence as an Assembly that action will be taken sooner both in terms of notifying departments of such serious incidents that need their attention, but also notifying members of the public where they should avoid areas of what is significant risk?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Well, the answer is of course we will act in as rapid a fashion as we can. I have a slight issue with the timeline the Deputy has outlined. I have not got my calendar in front of me, but I remember I was appointed on the Tuesday 2 weeks ago and, on the Wednesday, I was informed later in the day of this incident and, on the Friday, we made public announcements about it. In the intervening period, I had requested officers to find out more information about the nature of the incident and to explore what options were available and that time was used to, for example, do a full assessment of what warning signs were in place and what immediate steps could be taken to remediate the situation. So that took about 48 hours and we then made the announcements that we did. So I think that was a fairly timely action, and it did not stop there. Over the weekend we explored the options around putting the line of buoys in, and that was done on the Monday morning.

19.1.7 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Because I do have the dates and the Written Question in front of me, so would the Minister undertake to assess the reason why there was a delay in the department being notified about the incident because that of course will have caused a delay in him being able to take the processes that he then did undertake very quickly?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, I think it is worth just recapping a little bit what did happen. The incident happened on the 21st. However, there was no formal notification to any authority in Jersey at that time. There was a visiting school party, I understand, and we were notified sometime after the event by, I understand, informal means. I was told it was to the Parish Hall - although the Constable tells me she had no knowledge of that and it was me who told her about that event - but that is how the information came to us. I think it came because parents had probably complained about what had happened and wanted to know what Jersey was doing about it. That is my supposition, but it is supposition. So it took a while for the information to get back to Jersey and, as soon as I was made aware, I acted.

19.1.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The Minister may be aware that chapter 6 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 talks about land condition orders; Article 84 talks about the requirement to repair or remove ruinous and dilapidated buildings. I am not sure if that applies in this case but certainly Article 86 talking about requiring proper maintenance does give the Minister for Planning and Regulation now the authority to issue a notice in that case. Does the Minister for D.f.I. (Department for Infrastructure) believe that it would be helpful for the newly elected Minister for Planning and Regulation to issue such a notice to facilitate the work that he needs to do and give a steer on what the Minister for Planning and Regulation thinks should be done with that site?

Deputy J. Renouf:

I think the Deputy raises a good question and I will be very happy to consult with my newly elected colleague, but I would note that throughout the time that we have been dealing with this structure - certainly the timeline I have goes back as far as about 2014 or 2012, I think - it has been dealt with by the Department for Infrastructure as a question of maintenance of an asset rather than as a dilapidated structure. So I think the precedent is that it has been dealt with as you would with a building that needs maintenance rather than as a dilapidated or ruinous structure.

19.1.9 Deputy M. Tadier:

With that mind, given the fact that it does have a listing, albeit a grade 4 listing, does the Minister think that it is important that Government leads by example? In the absence of any desire, if it transpires that that Government does not want to remove the listing, it leads by example and maintains its listed structures so that they can be enjoyed and certainly not pose any health risk to the public who would want to use them.

Deputy J. Renouf:

I think I have already spoken at some length about my attitude to the listing. Listing is an index of importance and it tells us that that structure has considerable historical and cultural significance. It does not say that it must be maintained at whatever cost for all time, and we are entitled to take a rational view about where we wish to put our resources. I note that the previous Assembly voted against an amendment to the Budget that would have allocated what I think is a reasonable estimate of what the funds would be. So I absolutely believe that listing is important and that the Government should take its listing responsibilities very seriously, but it also has overall responsibilities to consider the best allocation of resources.

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

The Minister said that review of the work needed must be taken in the context of the wider investment programme. Will he explain where the work on the Marine Lake falls priority-wise within the wider investment demands that are placed on his portfolio?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Well it is an important asset for the Island but it is a very old structure and a very dilapidated structure. I would point out that the department is carrying a backlog of maintenance on the property estate of a considerable size. Therefore, decisions about where the greatest priority lie have to be taken in the context of that overall estate and where operationally we most need that money spent. What I am not going to do is say that this rockets to the top of the priority list; it does not.

19.1.11 The Connétable of St. Helier:

The £600,000 was raised several times but I never managed to get a clear answer from the Government how much it will cost. My question to the new Minister for Infrastructure, what repair options is the Minister considering for Victoria Marine Lake and would he commit to publish or to share evidence-based estimated cost for each option so we would know the number and what is possible?

Deputy J. Renouf:

The second bit is easy; yes, I will commit to consult and discuss and publish whatever information I am able to achieve. I should say in terms of the short-term options that I am considering, which I think are very important to bear in mind because we do have a significant safety risk here, the 2 options that are most immediately likely to be considered are pouring a lot of concrete to plug the existing holes that we have. The advantage of that is at least in the short term it brings the pool back into use. The disadvantage is that it could fail again at any moment, and we may not know that it has

failed because of the method in which the water goes underneath; therefore, there would be ongoing continuous maintenance costs. The other option is to make a breach in the wall, which would mean that the water flowed out unimpeded as soon as the tide started to go out. The disadvantage would be that it would no longer be a pool. The advantage would be that we would have removed the safety hazard and we would have safeguarded the remaining bits of the wall because they would not be subject to the same hydraulic pressure that is currently undermining the structure. Those 2 options need to be costed up and they need to be discussed with Regulation to see how they view them in the light of the listing status. Those are the 2 immediate options that are under consideration in the department. The longer-term options, as I said, would come forward more in due course.

The Bailiff:

I am now going to pause to give the results of the 2 outstanding elections in relation to the associate member of the British-Irish Parliamentary Assembly. The result is: the Connétable of St. Martin, 22 votes; Deputy Coles, 12 votes; Deputy Raimondo, 11 votes. Accordingly, the Connétable of St. Martin is elected an associate member of the **[Approbation]** British-Irish Parliamentary Association.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I just check the voting? Does it not go to a second round of the first result? I might be wrong.

The Bailiff:

Not in relation to that, no. There is one abstention as well. Now in relation to the Bailiff's Consultative Panel: the Connétable of St. Helier received 35 votes; Deputy Tadier received 31 votes; Deputy Alex Curtis and Deputy Stephenson both received 30 votes; Deputy Morel received 27 votes; Deputy Doublet received 20 votes; and Deputy Porée who was not standing received one vote so **[Laughter]** congratulations to her. The Connétable of St. Helier, Deputies Tadier, Alex Curtis, Stephenson and Morel are appointed members of the Bailiff's Consultative Panel. **[Approbation]**

19.2 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Chief Minister regarding the Automatic Voter Registration Project. (OQ.53/2026)

Will the Chief Minister commit to the Government's continuing support of the A.V.R. (Automatic Voter Registration) Project until the system delivers the functionality necessary to meet the requirements of the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002 to the satisfaction of the parishes and to ensuring that sufficient funding is provided to achieve that functionality?

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

As part of the Automatic Voter Registration Project a formal lessons-learned exercise is currently underway. That includes feedback from those involved in delivering the system together with an independent review workshop facilitated by the chair of the Jersey Electoral Authority. That work will help identify any areas where the current system can be improved to better meet both the requirements of the Elections (Jersey) Law and the operational needs of the Parishes. Can I just take this opportunity to thank the Parishes for the excellent work they did under pressure **[Approbation]** on the run-up to the election. The objective of the Automatic Voter Registration was to remove unnecessary barriers to democratic participation by replacing the previous manual registration process with a modern automatic system. In respect, the project has already helped deliver a significant benefit. The number of registered electors increased from 60,701 in 2022 to 85,470 for the 2026 General Election; a sizeable increase. However, ongoing refinement, support and continuous improvements are necessary to ensure the system continues to meet the needs of users and maintains that close consistency between government data and the Parish electoral register. In short, the answer to the question is, yes, any funding requirements will of course need to be considered through the normal Budget process and Assembly approval. The Government is

committed to working with the Parishes and all stakeholders to ensure the Automatic Voter Registration system continues to evolve and delivers functionality required to strengthen and encourage participation in our democratic process.

19.2.1 The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am delighted that the Chief Minister has made that commitment, so it is almost redundant but it was just to get it out. Lots of people think that the A.V.R. is only used every 4 years but A.V.R. is not only needed every 4 years, it is needed on a weekly basis in the Parishes and it is especially needed for Centenier elections and Procureur elections. That is why it is so imperative that we do not close the project down.

The Bailiff:

Sorry, was there a question there?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Would he agree that this will be needed for those?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I agree.

[15:15]

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

Can the Chief Minister commit to considering future candidates in the general elections as one of the user groups in this and ensure that the data provided is clear and easier for candidates to follow and understand?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am not sure how appropriate it would be to have candidates involved in the process but certainly no objection to all relevant stakeholders being involved. That will probably be a decision for the Jersey Electoral Authority at the appropriate time.

19.2.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Maybe it is more to set on record rather than to ask the Chief Minister himself, but some of the data that was provided through the A.V.R. and then via the Parishes had addresses that did not line up because of flat numbers, house numbers and things like that. Stakeholder engagement would include candidates from an election, so would the Chief Minister do what he can to ensure that they are considered?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

As I said previously, the Government will do everything it can do to ensure the data that is shared between the Government and the Parishes is as accurate as possible. I think we have made a good start but there is still quite a way to go.

19.2.4 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

As the Connétable of St. Martin explained, the data is required for Parishes ongoing during this 4 years because this data is used at the Parish Assembly, for example, or committees or others. Would the Chief Minister advise if the ongoing A.V.R. project will ensure that once a change of name and address is provided to one of the government departments it will be rolled across immediately to the Parishes system as well because we are using the A.V.R. system as our to-go system now?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, that certainly is the intention.

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

I also welcome the Chief Minister's mention of the great work that was done in the Parishes, particularly by the electoral administrators and all the adjoints who worked on the day. The Chief Minister mentioned feedback. Can the Chief Minister confirm who has been asked to provide that feedback?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I cannot list that because I do not know. The work on the feedback is being facilitated by the chair of the Jersey Electoral Authority, and I am sure they will share all of their findings with the Government when they have finished that piece of work.

19.2.6 The Connétable of St. John:

I can tell the Chief Minister that the feedback has been requested from a very small group of people. I would ask him to consider extending the breadth of the feedback and also the time allowed for the feedback.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I thank the Connétable for alerting me to that fact. I will certainly follow that up.

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

My question follows on nicely from the question posed by the Constable of St. Helier because it relates to the Tell Us Once process, because the Automatic Voter Registration will only work properly if there is a Tell Us Once process in place whereby when somebody reports their change of circumstances, change of address, it goes across all systems, all departments and the Parishes. Will the Chief Minister commit to providing that project with the resources that it requires so it can be finally done properly?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, I understood it did have the resources required but I will make sure it does. I think it is important to reiterate the importance of involving the public as much as possible in the democratic process, so that will be a high priority.

19.2.8 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I will take this opportunity, because I know that we have quite rightly thanked all of the Parishes, but could the Chief Minister also extend his thanks to the civil servants that worked very hard on this project as well? [Approval]

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, and I thank the Deputy for reminding the Assembly of the work, the huge amount of dedication required to make sure we had a successful election should be recognised. I join her in that recognition.

Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement:

My question has been answered through the Constable of St. John.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I would just like to thank the Chief Minister for his assurances that A.V.R. will continue.

19.3 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding charging a separate stamp duty on residential mortgages from the stamp duty charged on property purchases. (OQ.56/2026)

Will the Minister explain the rationale for charging a separate stamp duty on residential mortgages from the stamp duty charged on property purchases and will he commit to a review of stamp duty on residential mortgage transactions in order to determine whether it could be reduced or removed?

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

Stamp duty is a tax on a wide range of documents that are registered in the Royal Court. Under the current system, I should make it clear that no stamp duty is payable on residential mortgages for properties valued below £600,000. Historically, documents registered in the Royal Court have attracted stamp duty, including mortgage deeds, seemingly for revenue-raising purposes. That has been the position in Jersey for many years. Whether that historical justification in relation to residential mortgages is appropriate today is, in my view, a legitimate question. Accordingly, I have asked officers to review the continued case for this charge as part of the work towards Budget 2027, which will be lodged at the end of September. I should add that the duty currently raises around £2.5 million to £3 million a year and if it were reduced or indeed removed, that loss of revenue would need to be offset elsewhere to support the need for balanced budgets.

19.3.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for his answer and especially to look at a review. Maybe to follow on from his answer, has the Minister for Treasury and Resources or the Treasury ever assessed whether this duty discourages right-sizing, older Islanders down-sizing or growing families moving to larger homes, given that the refinancing concession does not apply to new purchasing, as the Minister for Treasury and Resources said, but also given the *Future Housing Needs* report finds that Jersey's core housing mismatch is now about the wrong size of homes sitting with the wrong households?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

The Deputy asks a very valid question. I can say, as far as I am aware, that Treasury has never looked at that particular issue, although the discussion has now been had. I can give an undertaking to the Deputy to have that as part of the consideration. It is not a straightforward issue but we believe it is something that certainly needs looking at to make certain that appropriate properties are released, if indeed there is a desire to do so. It is not that straightforward, unfortunately.

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

I know that the Senator was not in the last Assembly but in the last Budget it was approved by this Assembly and the current Chief Minister to look at a right-sizing policy, which included a stamp duty holiday. Is this going to be looked at for this Budget?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

As far as I am aware, a full suite of issues are going to be looked at as far as the Budget is concerned. Again, it will come down to affordability of course, which is a major aspect that we need to consider and the need to balance budgets. I will take that point away that the Deputy raises and give it due consideration.

19.3.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Will the Minister concede though that at least, when you have a property transaction, if one person does not pay stamp duty the purchaser still will be paying the stamp duty and therefore revenue will still be raised?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Indeed, revenue will be raised and it is a question of balancing that revenue to make sure that it is fiscally neutral.

19.3.4 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Is the Minister for Treasury and Resources aware of any other jurisdiction which charges stamp duty when people borrow money?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Less and less it seems; there are, though, cases. I am not sure I should mention the United States but there are various states over there that charge. I believe that India and Nigeria do as well. There are a few, but a diminishing number, and that is why I have given an undertaking to look at this matter. I am not sure in a modern tax system it is necessarily appropriate. Again, I repeat the point that whatever changes we put in place need to be handled carefully and with a focus on being fiscally neutral.

19.3.5 Deputy M. Tadier:

I know that the Minister might be more of a pragmatist than a philosopher, but if I could ask a philosophical question about the basis for stamp duty *per se*. Would he consider going back to the very root of why stamp duty is charged at all, whether it is on borrowing or on properties, given the fact that it is charged on the buyer not on the seller and that it is making properties less affordable for people right across the board, especially when they need to borrow money, to see if a fairer tax could be introduced that does not discourage home ownership but that targets people who have the capital or the wealth to pay such taxes?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

There are quite a number of jurisdictions who have looked at stamp duty and many economists who have an opinion that it is not a good tax; I think that is fair to say. In Jersey terms, it raises in the region of £60 million to £65 million a year; most of these other jurisdictions also raise significant amounts of money, so that revenue needs to be replaced. Finding an alternative that works is not, again, that straightforward. I think that is at the heart of the issue.

19.3.6 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I may not formulate this in the best way but the answers that we are hearing from the Minister for Treasury and Resources are mainly around fiscal neutrality and the issue of needing to raise revenue. At the same time we have heard from the Minister when he was in the elections to be Senator, and other Senators who are now in the Council of Ministers, recognising that housing is of real concern in Jersey and that we need to ensure that we can have that flow of the housing market and be able to ensure that Islanders have the right-size housing when they need it. How will he work with other Ministers and also his Treasury colleagues to ensure looking beyond that fiscal neutrality or that revenue raising only and looking at the wider more long-term picture where then it really is the need for housing overriding potentially the need for revenue for one particular year?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I think the point is about neutrality; it does not mean that we cannot direct funds to the priority areas where they are absolutely needed. Working with colleagues, I am very keen and focused, as the Deputy, and I am sure Members in this Assembly are, of ensuring we have the right available property at appropriate prices. I think the appointment of the good Senator in front of me and his desire as the Minister for Planning and Regulation to open up the system and ensure that we get properties built, and built quickly, will help supplies; an important issue without question. I think a joined-up approach to make sure that all Ministers are focused on the need to get property on to the market and

at the right price. I do not think any of the points that I have made, and particularly around stamp duty, are going to be a barrier to property purchasers. As I have said, we have on the stamp duty mortgage issue an exemption level up to £600,000. In fact, what I did not mention there is also a taper which goes up to £700,000, so that is before it kicks in at all, but we are reviewing that. Stamp duty itself has exemptions, maybe we need to look at being slightly more generous with those, if we possibly can, for first-time buyers. That is another area that could get a little bit of attention perhaps. A package of measures, I think, to support the local market is important.

19.4 Deputy V. Li of St. Helier North of the Minister for Children and Families regarding the number of referrals received by the Children and Families Hub. (OQ55/2026)

In relation to the number of referrals received by the Children and Families Hub each year, will the Minister advise what assessment has been carried out on the impact of the school holidays on the identification of children at risk and if no assessment has been carried out, will he agree to undertake such an assessment?

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

I thank the Deputy for this question. I spoke with the Deputy at the end of this morning's session and in fact there were things that I was not going to mention which I probably will now, as she has encouraged me to do so. In fact, assessment of numbers that come through the Hub did not take place prior to me becoming Minister, so the first data that we have of actual numbers only start in July 2023. I have to say I am pleased this is an area that I was keen to concentrate on. Over the last 2 years really this service has come on an enormous amount and there are new structures in place. I will not go through the individual monthly numbers, but I have agreed to meet with Deputy Li and share that information directly with her.

[15:30]

The Children and Families Hub demand is monitored through regular performance reporting. The volume and themes of contacts, together with their outcomes, are reviewed monthly at an operational performance meeting to support the service delivery and identify emerging issues. Of course, that is critical, as I spoke about on another question recently. Emerging issues, obviously the situation can change dramatically. A more detailed strategic review is undertaken quarterly. These reviews consider volume but are also focused on qualitative insights. Additional analyses are undertaken on performance information across the service, including that relating to missing children and child exploitation, as well as the potential locations of concern. This information informs a strategic multi-agency risk management panel, which ensures a strategic overview of areas of concern to ensure an effective multi-agency response. Around 30 per cent of our referrals to the Children and Families Hub are submitted by schools. Typically referral numbers ...

The Bailiff:

Minister, your answer has reached 2 minutes now. It has been a long answer; there is an informal target of 90 seconds.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I am happy to share more with the Deputy. It is a wide area so it is difficult.

19.4.1 Deputy V. Li:

I thank the Minister for answering, I am looking forward to receiving such data and findings to our panel. Given the school holidays is around the corner right now, will the assessment cover this summer, not just the future ones?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes, the summer is something that we have recognised is a crucial period. In June and July we undertake work with headteachers and teachers and we encourage them to bring forward those children who might not necessarily have reached the bar normally for referral, so that we are aware of those children during the holiday period. We have outreach workers during the holiday period. We also cover events such as music festivals and we also cover those areas that I referred to before where we know children congregate. Through that I am satisfied that we fill that gap during the holidays, and I look forward to talking to the Deputy further about that.

19.5 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Chief Minister regarding Palestine. (OQ.60/2026)

The U.N. (United Nations) Commission of Inquiry in June 2026 stated that Israeli forces “deliberately carried out acts inflicting death, severe bodily and mental harm on hundreds of thousands of Palestinian children” and concluded the acts “form part of a deliberate strategy to destroy the future of the Palestinians in Gaza by targeting their children”; is the Chief Minister prepared to use his voice to condemn the genocide happening in Palestine?

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

I share the Deputy’s profound concern for civilians and particularly children in Gaza. The findings of the June 2026 report of the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry are exceptionally grave. The commission concluded that Israeli authorities and security forces deliberately targeted Palestinian children and that this conduct resulted in genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes in Gaza. I condemn without reservation the killing, suffering, forced displacement and profound psychological harm suffered by Palestinian children. I equally condemn all conduct that targets civilians on any side. I would, however, remind Members that the commission is an independent U.N. investigative body and the final judicial determination of genocide remains a matter for the competent international courts. That distinction does not lessen the seriousness of the commission’s evidence or conclusions which cannot be ignored. Israel has the right to defend its population against terrorism; however, that must be exercised in accordance with international law. Nothing can justify the death and suffering to civilians on such a devastating scale. While Jersey does not determine foreign policy, we are not prevented from speaking out in support of international law and fundamental humanitarian principles. We must continue to advocate for the immediate and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance, a permanent ceasefire and a diplomatic settlement that delivers a lasting peace, security, dignity and justice for both the Palestinian and the Israeli peoples. [Approbation]

19.5.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I am glad to hear that the Chief Minister does condemn this act and uses the term “genocide” in his response. The U.K. is set to have a new Prime Minister on Monday. As one of the acts for the Chief Minister, would he write to the U.K. Prime Minister to voice that same concern?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I have consistently spoken out where I believe international humanitarian law has been breached, and I will continue to do so. In discussions with U.K. Ministers on this topic, I have reaffirmed Jersey’s support for the U.K. applying all means at its disposal to ensure this happens, working with international partners and local organisations to get help where it is most needed. I will follow up this discussion with the Minister for External Relations, and it is certainly something we would be prepared to mention to the new administration when we meet with them.

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

I welcome and agree with the sentiment expressed by the Chief Minister in his initial response. I would just like to press him a little on the fact that the question did specifically refer to genocide. Could the Chief Minister please confirm whether he agrees with experts such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the Israeli human rights organisation B'Tselem, Doctors Without Borders, Oxfam, Christian Aid, the International Association of Genocide Scholars, Amos Goldberg, the Jewish-Israeli Holocaust Professor of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Omer Bartov, The Israeli Dean's Professor of Holocaust Studies at Brown University and Raz Segal, the Israeli historian and Professor of Genocide and Holocaust Studies at Stockton University. I could go on, the list is extensive. Could the Chief Minister please confirm whether he agrees with these experts that we are witnessing a genocide taking place in Gaza?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

As I said in my remarks, I condemn without reservation the suffering that is currently going on. I reminded Members that the commission is an independent investigative body and the other organisations, respected, incredible organisations that the Deputy mentioned, make a point - a very valid and distinct point - which does not lessen the seriousness of the evidence they provide. I remind Members again that they are not courts and the determination of genocide remains a matter for the competent international courts in due course. It is difficult to say, because I have not studied every single article and piece of evidence in detail, and I will defer to the international courts, but I am absolutely appalled at the actions taken by the Israeli authorities which has caused death and suffering to a large amount of civilians for which I think there can be no justifiable reason.

19.5.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The Chief Minister has already referred to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, which I think he respects. Could he clarify that when it comes to the arrest warrant that was issued for the current Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, that there is still currently a warrant out for his arrest for alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity? Does the Chief Minister recognise the validity of that arrest warrant?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Well, again, I have not studied the detail of the arrest warrant and I am not sure what the position of the U.K. Government is on that. We align our foreign policy with that of the U.K. Government. While I might agree in principle that the perpetrators of such humanitarian actions should be held to account, I am not in a position - I do not have the full detail to hand - to comment on that right now.

19.5.4 Deputy M. Tadier:

It is a strange position to take given the fact that previous answers said that the Chief Minister recognised the International Criminal Court and that they should decide on matters of ...

The Bailiff:

Yes, but the question about the warrant is beyond the question that the Chief Minister was asked. It is beyond the original question. I allowed it but it was beyond the original question.

Deputy M. Tadier:

To bring it back, whether it is to do with genocide or the immediately-related issues to what is going on in the Middle East in this regard, can the Chief Minister give an assurance that he supports the upholding of international law and the recognising of international institutions such as the I.C.C. (International Criminal Court)?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I think I did allude to that in my opening remarks, and I do absolutely. I hope I speak on behalf of all Islanders when I say we continue to support international law at all times. I cannot really add much more I think in strength and personal feeling to what I have already said. We will see what happens in the fullness of time. As I said, it is certainly a matter I am prepared to discuss further with the Minister for External Relations and the new U.K. administration when we meet with them.

19.6 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour of the Chief Minister regarding the reference to child poverty in Jersey within the United Nations Economic and Social Council's concluding observations on the seventh periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. (OQ.52/2026)

Will the Chief Minister advise whether he is aware of the reference to child poverty in Jersey within the United Nations Economic and Social Council's Concluding observations on the seventh periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and, if so, what plans he has to address the concerns raised therein?

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

I am aware of the United Nations observations on the United Kingdom's seventh periodic report. These observations relate to the U.K. as a state party and include matters relevant to the Crown Dependencies and the Overseas Territories. Jersey has also provided a formal response. The committee raised concerns about child poverty and the impact this can have on children's rights and life chances. These are concerns that the Government shares. The Government recognises that growing up in a household experiencing financial hardship affects children's health, education, well-being and future opportunities. Tackling affordability and improving living standards are therefore central priorities for this Council of Ministers and will form an important part of the forthcoming Common Strategic Policy. We have already begun discussions on further measures to support families, building on existing initiatives such as expanded childcare support, reduced G.P. (General Practitioner) charges, school meals, housing supply and measures of targeted increased income support. Ultimately sustainable reductions in child poverty require both support for those most in need and a strong, growing economy that creates good jobs, rising incomes and opportunities for all families to thrive. To that end, we continue to work across Government and with Scrutiny and Members to improve outcomes for all children and young people with the aim of eradicating child poverty in the fullness of time.

19.6.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Chief Minister for his answer. I think it is clear that this issue is important to him, and I hope important to all of the Ministers. It is really positive to hear that it is going to be one of the key priorities within the C.S.P. (Common Strategic Policy). With that in mind, would the Chief Minister agree to meet with myself and with the group behind the letter that was sent around today, I believe, which all Members will have had, which outlines some of the issues in this area and asks for a meeting to make an action plan to tackle it?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, and I thank the Deputy for sharing with me that letter earlier. I had received it but basically, for Members' benefit, the letter reported that many families are struggling with the cost of living, including housing, childcare costs, incomes not keeping up with inflation. The letter stated - I am not sure if this is true - that one in 4 children are in relative low-income households and more than a third of households are experiencing financial difficulty. The group also argued that current support systems are fragmented and difficult to navigate. These are things that we need to address as a matter of urgency. I and the relevant Government Ministers will be pleased to meet with all stakeholders who can help us deliver the solutions we need.

[15:45]

19.6.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

It is very well known that a high proportion of child poverty are St. Helier residents. Would the Chief Minister engage with myself and the Parish to ensure that he will tackle this as a targeted support for St. Helier residents as well?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, of course we will meet with the Constable. I am not sure we can give a separate or targeted report on a Parish-by-Parish basis because I think we have to look at the problem Island-wide. The Constable can rest assured that the Government will work closely with her and relevant parties.

19.6.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

Since I was elected I have received several communications from the families that they have not been receiving income support for various reasons, including not eligible as they are less than the 5 years in Jersey but the families are still experiencing the same difficulties with the cost of living and living in poverty. Is there anything that the Council of Ministers have considered to look at for the residents that have children and they are less than 5 years in Jersey?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am looking to the former Minister for Social Security; that is something that has certainly been discussed but I need to pick that up with the new Minister. I think when it comes to supporting or getting behind our commitment to children, we need to consider all known cases of child poverty or hardship regardless of particular status that can prevent its own challenges. I think this Assembly has undertaken to put children first at all times.

19.6.4 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

One of the points outlined within this letter was understanding where the current systems are falling short. Indeed, the Chief Minister mentioned some data, around a quarter of children living in poverty, and he was not sure if that was the case. I can assure him it is indeed the case. Would he commit to including in this work some data collection because I am aware that Jersey does not collect and have the same measures that other jurisdictions do. Therefore, this problem is largely hidden, so would he make sure that understanding the problem in terms of data collection, that is part of the work in this area?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Yes, we do not have I think a legal definition of child poverty. Statistics Jersey collect stats that we use but they could be better designed to target the problem. I think in any challenge in any problem, the way to solve it is by understanding it fully. We do not fully understand the child poverty issue in Jersey as yet, although we are making good progress. To solve the problem we have to fully understand it; I agree with the Deputy.

19.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding an education-specific Human Capital Strategy. (OQ.62/2026)

Will the Minister advise whether consideration has been given to producing an education specific Human Capital Strategy for the Island and if not, why not?

Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning):

As I am sure States Members know, a Human Capital Strategy, in kinder words, is a strategy to recruit and retain, to manage and develop the people who make up the workforce, in this case for education. A strategy, while useful, is sometimes not sufficiently flexible. We are facing a new and

different challenge over the next few years as we need to reshape our workforce and education system more generally to reflect a falling number of children and young people consequent of a sustained drop in birth rate. In this environment some elements of a people plan remain critical, like investment in learning and development to support improvements in the capability of our workforce. Other elements of a people plan change in their focus, for example, less emphasis on external recruitment and more emphasis on flexibility of our existing workforce. What I expect to see are the core components of a plan. In my early days in the role, I have seen evidence of much of this content, reassuring me that we have an appropriately clear focus on our workforce. I will continue to expect this focus and to see evidence of these approaches throughout my time as Minister. Consequently, at this time, I do not see the requirement for a new and specific strategy, as the Deputy suggests; instead, confident that the core activities required are in place. I will continue to require evidence of this focus, clarity on where we can improve, and clear actions to deliver these improvements.

19.7.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Would the Minister agree that more probably should be done, especially for Year 9, Year 10 and Year 11 to prepare them for when the time is right for when they are to enter the labour force?

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

We are looking at all of these points at the moment. Some of the children of course come under the special educational needs and disabilities section. At the moment there is work going on to bring in more continuous professional development for staff which is being monitored, so this will make a difference to those particular children in those year groups. It is early days in the role, and I can assure the Deputy that that is also being looked at as a whole.

19.8 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chief Minister regarding what renewable energy, incentives and Government actions shall be prioritised. (OQ.57/2026)

Following his nomination speech where he spoke about the importance of sustainable energy and committed to focus on this, will the Chief Minister advise which types of renewable energy, incentives and government actions will be prioritised during this term?

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

The Minister for the Environment has overall responsibility for energy policy and is continuing to develop an evidence-based energy strategy for Jersey in accordance with the decision of the Assembly, P.11/2025 as amended. That work is intended to provide a long-term framework that balances affordability, energy security, market competitiveness and Jersey's carbon reduction commitments. As part of that work, Government will consider the role that proven renewable energy technologies can play in Jersey's future energy mix, including offshore wind, solar, tidal, alongside wider issues such as energy resilience, electricity demand and storage and grid capacity. The strategy will also consider what incentives may be appropriate to encourage the uptake of renewable and low carbon technologies, recognising that any such measures must represent value for money and be supported by robust evidence. Alongside the energy strategy, the Government will continue to support practical measures that improve energy efficiency, reduced reliance on fossil fuels, encourage the electrification of transport and heating where appropriate, and strengthen Jersey's long-term energy security. While it would be premature to pre-empt the conclusions of the energy strategy, I can assure the Deputy and Members that the Government remains committed to delivering a secure, affordable and sustainable energy system that supports Islanders, businesses and our environmental ambitions long into the future.

19.8.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Chief Minister for his comprehensive answer. Would the Chief Minister say what specific financial incentives would he encourage the Minister for the Environment to introduce such as grants, loans or others for households or businesses for renewable installations? When will the Islanders be able to access these or be able to see these come into fruition and will it become part of the next Budget 2027?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Those are all matters for consideration as part of the strategy. I do not have a list. Some of the things we have tried have worked very well; I think some have been poorly targeted. We need to make sure that our environmental journey leads us to where we want to be, but it has to be supported by Islanders so we have to have the right incentives. The incentives are not just paying Islanders to reduce their carbon footprint but it is also making sure that the implications and, dare I use the word, regulation in front of our new Minister for Planning and Regulation, is practical, affordable and realistic for Islanders moving forward. I know the Minister for the Environment is already thinking in advance about the best way to do that. What I will undertake to do is ensure the Government works closely with Scrutiny. I think this needs to be as joint a piece of work as we possibly can. There should be no tension here, there should be no juxtaposition, we should all be working towards what we want to achieve, not least given I know what we do here will have very, very little impact on the globe. We are now suffering our third heatwave in as many months, so I think that is a wake-up call to all the citizens of this planet. If everybody plays their part we should make some progress.

19.9 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding project priorities during the term. (OQ.61/2026)

Further to the Minister's recent statement in the media that the Infrastructure and Environment Department's budget will not be sufficient to meet its objectives, will he outline which projects he will prioritise during this term?

Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (The Minister for Infrastructure):

I think it is important to start by clarifying that the interview I gave to the BBC when I was opening a children's playground, which I presume is what the Deputy is referring to when he talks about my recent statement in the media, was no different in substance to the nomination statement I made in the Assembly 2 weeks ago. I said to the BBC: "I think infrastructure needs more money than it currently has" and I added an important qualification: "Whether we do that by reprioritisation, by raising more money, staggering and perhaps not being as ambitious, I do not yet know." So the media are entitled to take part of what I say and make a headline, but I was clear to the BBC, and to this Assembly, that there is a balance to be struck, that infrastructure budgets have to be considered in the light of other priorities, and I stick to that. In answer to the Deputy's question directly regarding which projects will be prioritised, I am still assessing the infrastructure priorities which will need to be viewed through the lens of public safety, economic significance, value for money, alignment with strategic goals and many other factors. As soon as I am able to bring forward a programme of infrastructure investment I will do so. I would say this, and slightly echoing the Chief Minister's comments, as much as possible the infrastructure investment plans that I bring forward will need to be co-produced, both with colleagues in Government, in Scrutiny and across the Assembly. We will need as much buy-in as possible because this needs to be a programme which caters for the long-term needs of the Island.

19.9.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

I am glad that the Minister used such terms as he did in his answer because a lot of those I think personally, as representative of St. Helier South, point to the Shoreline Management Plan because of

strategic goals about public safety, value for money and also good for our economy. Does the Minister strongly agree that that project should be one of the ones on his priority list?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Tempting but I am not going to **[Laughter]** leap in, having just said I would consider all the priorities. What I would say is that I would also see all the infrastructure investments we have to make through the lens of what I think will be one of the overriding objectives of this Government, which is to improve economic competitiveness. Basic infrastructure is of course a key part of that but the exact balance or its sequencing, the scale of each investment project and so on, is something that I am not prepared to opine on right now. I think we do have to consider more, but I am very pleased to note that the Deputy has been chosen to sit on the Scrutiny Panel and I look forward to sharing plans with him and discussing them with him as soon as I can.

19.10 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Extension of Time Dangerous Building Notice issued in respect of 106 and 108 Rouge Bouillon. (OQ.59/2026)

Further to the Extension of Time Dangerous Building Notice, issued in respect of 106 and 108 Rouge Bouillon, will the Minister advise when the road and footpath are expected to reopen fully and what action will be taken if the required works are not completed within the extended period?

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

Can I query this because we did ask that should this come to me, bearing in mind we now have a Minister for Planning and Regulation? I am happy to take it but I just thought it was more appropriate for that person to answer it.

The Bailiff:

Well it is a question to you unless the questioner agrees to another Minister responding to it. Are you content for the Minister for Planning and Regulation to respond to this question?

The Connétable of St. Helier:

Absolutely.

[16:00]

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat (The Minister for Planning and Regulation):

I thank the Connétable for the question. Despite the 6-week timeframe provided to enable the property owners to appoint contractors and undertake the necessary work, progress was not made to address the matter. Therefore, the Regulation directorate exercised powers under Article 69 of the Planning and Building Law to enter the land and carry out the works required to make the structure safe. Works commenced on Saturday and are anticipated to take up to 2 weeks to complete. The directorate has worked with the landowners throughout this process and remain committed to ensuring that the necessary measures are implemented as quickly as possible in the interests of public safety.

19.10.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I am grateful to the Minister and grateful to the Government to take in and start to do the work and that it will be completed within 2 weeks. Would the Minister confirm that the charge for this work will be borne by the owners or the insurance and not by the public?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

It would be the intention to recover the cost of the work from the property owners as permitted in the law.

19.10.2 Connétable A. Howell of Trinity:

I wonder if the Minister will be kind enough to look into the length of time it has taken to get this sorted. It has been very difficult because there are a lot of diversions come down Trinity Road and then there has been a further very long wait for these traffic lights. I think it has been a very long process and I just wondered if in future we might be able to make it shorter.

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I find myself greatly frustrated with the time to do things in this Assembly in various respects, and this is one of them. The fact is we have had to comply with the law. The Dangerous Structure Notice was initially issued for 4 weeks, which was a reasonable timeframe to obtain the necessary surveys, appoint contractors and for the work to be carried out. At the end of the 4-week period there seemed to be agreement between the separate owners to appoint contractors and therefore a further 2-week extension was granted, which was not unreasonable under the circumstances. However, progress stalled and no actions had been taken on the expiry of the extended period, so I also regret the timeframe but we have to do things in accordance with procedures. I do hope the work will be completed as quickly as possible; I understand the problems it is causing.

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

Given the Minister's answer to the previous question, and noting what he said previously in his speech, what improvements has he seen that could be made to make the timescale more improved in future time and what action will he take?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

That is a really good question. It is not easy, there are multiple owners of the property. If it was a single owner then that might be different. They also have to consider what the insurance aspects are, and these things also take time. Personally, I welcome the shortening of all timescales for almost everything, and I undertake that we will have a look at this but one has to give reasonable notice to the people concerned. If we fail to do that we could be equally criticised, but I do undertake we will look at them. What we could have done is say at the end of 4 weeks: "Sorry, you have had your 4 weeks, that is it" then I think there would have been some criticism. Look, we are nearly there. It is something we all have in life. We give a deadline and someone says: "Just give me a week" and then it does not happen. If we had known it was not going to happen we clearly would not have given the extension, but it seemed a reasonable prospect at the time.

19.10.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Given the public interest in this particular case and the disruption that it has caused, does the Minister agree with me that this is a very good example of why we require robust, well-resourced and timely regulation?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

I am an enthusiastic supporter of robust and timely regulation and enforcement action where it is appropriate, and this is one such case.

19.10.5 The Connétable of St. Helier:

I recognise that the Minister was not in the post over the last 6 weeks that this was ongoing. One of the difficulties was there was no communication from the Government on an ongoing basis of what was happening. Would the Minister ensure that the residents, school, businesses, road users, the

public would receive updates online that it will be clear, is it going on plan, would it be delivered within 2 weeks and what is next?

Senator Sir M.J. Boleat:

It is absolutely appropriate that information is provided to residents who are affected. I cannot give the answer I would like to on that. I will take it back but say, in general, that it is important that people are kept informed.

19.11 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding election costs. (OQ.54/2026)

Will the Minister advise from which States department the Parishes should seek reimbursement in relation to the June 2026 elections of costs they have incurred but which are to be met by the States pursuant to Article 15 of the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002?

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

Article 15 of the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002 provides that certain costs incurred by the Parishes in connection with a public election are to be met by the States. However, it does not prescribe which department or office is responsible for administering or reimbursing those payments. Historically, claims for reimbursement have been submitted through the Judicial Greffe together with appropriate supporting evidence for that expenditure. Accordingly, I consider that the appropriate office to which the Parishes should submit their claims is the Judicial Greffe who are allocated a sufficient budget for the purpose.

19.11.1 The Connétable of St. Martin:

I have notification that apparently there has been no agreement that the Parishes should seek all of their Article 15 costs from the Judicial Greffe, and this is why we keep going around in circles. So, could the Minister for Treasury and Resources investigate this and tell us where we should be recovering our costs from?

Senator A.J.H. M. Maclean:

As I have mentioned, I am of the clear opinion that it should be the Judicial Greffe. I have in front of me a document, which is the business plan submitted by the Judicial Greffe in relation to public elections, which makes it clear that there is sufficient funding for the purpose of the 2026 election, including for the Parishes, which are an item. There are a number of items listed for payment here and the Parishes are listed. I also note that that particular budget is roughly double what it was in 2022, which takes into consideration the additional costs of a Sunday election and so forth.

19.11.2 Connétable I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

The Minister just mentioned there are Parishes expenses that should be covered by the Government. Would the Minister item what type of expenses are expected to be covered by the Government for the Parish?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

As far as I am aware, it is covered under Article 15. If I could direct the Constable to that particular Article, that should give enough sufficient information. I will just repeat the point that I made earlier, that is, from 2022 to 2026 the budget has more or less doubled. So, there should be sufficient budget there. There is also, I would add, an underspend in the States Greffe in relation to the elections, albeit a small underspend, which could also assist if necessary.

19.11.3 The Connétable of St. Helier:

We have Article 15, but I do not believe that the public knows what Article 15 is as we have in front of us, and there is this miscommunication going between what Parishes under Article 15 think they will receive from the Judicial Greffe, and the Judicial Greffe are not sure. So, if the Minister will help the public and Assembly to understand, as currently stated, what is expected to be recovered from the Judicial Greffe?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I am afraid I do not have the information to go through items line by line. All I can say is that I am happy to circulate the information, once I have had an opportunity to review the particular Article, to Members of the Assembly.

19.11.4 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

The Minister rather tantalisingly said he had a business case with a line in it saying “Parishes”, and I assumed there was an amount next to that line, so I was wondering what was the amount that the Judicial Greffe felt that should be budgeted for the Parishes expenses?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

The total budget for the elections was up to £268,800, I think £270,000 in total. The budgets for the Parishes was £57,000, which is more or less double what it was in 2022.

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

Will the Minister for Treasury and Resources agree with me that the Parishes invested themselves significantly in the elections, not only in hosting on a Sunday but in the build up to those elections? Will he take it upon himself for his Department to liaise with the Judicial Greffe so that the Parishes can send their invoices to a single point?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I am delighted to agree with the Constable; I think the Parishes did an excellent job in the election and their staff, in particular. The first time we have had a Sunday election. A lot of people gave their time and commitment, and they did a marvellous job in that respect; so, I completely agree. With regard to assistance, I would encourage the Constables to submit their costs to the Judicial Greffe. For my part, I will make certain that officials from Treasury speak to the Judicial Greffe to ensure that the matter is dealt with swiftly and efficiently, and there are no further issues.

19.11.6 The Connétable of St. John:

I thank the Minister for Treasury and Resources for those words. Would the Minister for Treasury and Resources agree with me that potential savings could be made in not employing moderators for hustings in the future, but going back to the traditional volunteers chairing those meetings?

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

I think the moderators did an excellent job, but whether indeed we could get volunteers to do as good a job is a matter for further consideration. I am all for good outcomes at lower cost, if that can be delivered.

19.11.7 The Connétable of St. Martin:

I thank the Minister for his answers, and I am pleased that we seem to be getting somewhere. I do not have a question. I was sad that I had to bring this before the Assembly because we were going around in circles, so thank you.

Senator A.J.H.M. Maclean:

Can I thank the Connétable for her non-question and for raising this matter. It is clearly a concern, and I do take the matter seriously. We need to get it sorted.

20. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for the Environment

The Bailiff:

We now move on to Questions without notice. The first period of questions are for the Minister for the Environment, and the first question is from Deputy Andrews and then Deputy Jeune.

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

Can the Minister confirm whether she believes Jersey can achieve its net-zero target, and if so, how?

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

I think it is important for us as an Island to acknowledge the fact that when we agreed to net-zero in 2019 things were probably very different. Where we are today is we are moving forward. I still have money coming in and I will continue to work in order to continue with the plan of net-zero. We obviously have some of it that has been extended from 2030 to 2050, but I will move forward with net-zero in the best way that we can with the funds that we have.

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

Following the Assembly's vote in principle on P.26/2026 supporting enhanced water standards for Jersey, can the Minister confirm whether she intends to bring substantive proposals back to the Assembly on P.F.A.S. and water standards as a priority, and, if so, in what timeframe?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I thank the Deputy for the question. In relation to P.F.A.S., I think it is exceptionally important that we continue the work that has already been started. There was a significant amount of work done by my predecessor along with the Minister for Health and Social Services at the time and also Deputy Morel. I think it is important that we continue that work. In relation to what our next steps are, I think I need to sit down with all of the information that we have, and we need to make a significant plan. We need to work on how we are going to fund that in order to move forward. I think it is essential that this ... it is not only me, this is an Assembly matter. We have to sort out P.F.A.S. moving forward and our water quality.

20.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for her answer. Given the concerns raised at the time around the costs and the type of treatments required to meet enhanced water standards if they are agreed, what steps will the Minister take to ensure decisions on implementation are evidence based rather than what we saw before, which from several Ministers came several different suggestions?

[16:15]

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

Over the next few weeks, I will obviously be ... we have obviously had lots of briefings, and I will not say my brain is about to explode, but it probably is. What I think is important is that I need to meet with the water company, I need to have discussions with my fellow Ministers in relation to this matter, but I think it is important that we do continue and we have a budget. Whatever we decide, moving forward I will ensure that I keep the Scrutiny Panels updated so that everybody is exactly clear as to our way forward.

20.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Would the Minister outline her vision for micro-renewables in tackling carbon emissions and also helping households keep their bills down?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I thank the Deputy for the question. I think what is important is that we need to look at what we have done, what we need to be doing moving forward. We have been helping residents with purchasing vehicles of different style. We have also helped with assisting people in relation to getting away from fossil fuels and using electricity and other means. I think that work needs to continue, but we need to look at what is the best thing and ensure that whatever we do is targeted to the people that need it the most. What we cannot afford to do with the money that we have and the envelope we have, we will not be able to necessarily encourage everybody, but what I do think we need to do is make sure that whatever we do is targeted.

20.3.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

When it comes specifically to things like solar panels or mini wind turbines on people's properties, is there any policy that the Minister would like to encourage or continue in this area?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I think it is important to look at everything in the round. The Government has just been formed, we have got different people around the table, and we have got new States Members as well. I am, as an individual, not necessarily keen, as you may well know, about solar panels on fields, but I do think that it is exceptionally important that where we can ... and I will be obviously working with the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Planning and Regulation and others in relation to being able to utilise solar panels where possible, States-owned buildings for example, maybe homes and other areas. I note in some of the things I have seen, that in some parts of Europe they are putting garden fences up which are solar panels. I think that is important. In relation to the wind power, windfarm matter, I think it is something that, as was previously discussed with a previous Minister, we needed to obviously see what we were going to be able to do if we went down that road, and those discussions are still ongoing. So, it is something that is still on the table, but we need to move things forward and we need to look at everything in the round.

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

Carrying on the theme of renewables, as the Minister mentioned about solar panels on fields, there is a lot of evidence and lots of research out there that shows that farming can still carry on under panels ... maybe not the panels the J.E.C. (Jersey Electricity Company) have currently installed. Would the Minister, as part of this working in the round, investigate different types of agriculture that can happen under solar panels?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I think from my perspective I would not disagree with what the Deputy says, because I am aware that there may be other alternatives. I think the journey that we were on was very focused on certain things and saying certain things would happen, so the land was going to be used in a certain way. So, from my perspective, in the past I had asked those questions, what other alternatives can we do, what other things can we grow potentially, if we were going to have solar panels on fields? I do also believe that when you are putting that level of concrete or whatever on the land, then my concern in relation to some of these types of things is about when those items are no longer usable, what is going to happen to the removal of them and also the clearing up of whatever material is put into the ground. For me, that is also a concern moving forward.

20.4.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Given the extreme heat that we have had over the last couple of months, there is evidence to suggest that solar panels covering fields prevents soil erosion and further evaporation of moisture out of the fields. So, is this not a potential way to keep Jersey farming with this new method?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

In honesty, I have no idea. **[Laughter]** It is not something that has been brought to my attention, but obviously, as the new Minister in this role ... and I do not need to be an expert because I do have a lot of people who are far more knowledgeable than I am, so this will be something that we will look at. It is going to be important for us, as an Island, to look at all the possibilities that we have in relation to renewable energy, to ensure that we continue to move forward in relation to using less fossil fuels than we already do.

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

Will the Minister clarify whether the Agricultural Returns (Jersey) Law 1947 has transferred to her following the States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order 2026 the Chief Minister signed, as it is not listed in schedule 3 of the order that the Minister signed changing it from Sustainable Economic Development?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I do believe it has been, because I think you might find that the person sat behind him was the one that said we needed it.

20.5.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Will she clarify whether that change was made by the order signed forming the Minister for Planning and Regulation?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I believe it had been. If I have missed it off the list, then I apologise, but I believed that the law that you mentioned had been transferred to me.

20.6 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:

During the course of the last Assembly, various references were made to the adequacy or otherwise of the Statutory Nuisances (Jersey) Law 1999 with the Minister of the day suggesting that it was appropriate to review it. Would the Minister advise whether it is on her agenda to so review?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I do not believe that the Statutory Nuisances (Jersey) Law 1999 does still sit with me, if I am perfectly honest. If it sits with me, then I will certainly take a look at it, but I do not believe that it does.

20.6.1 The Connétable of St. Mary:

I thank the Minister for that. Will she therefore confirm that in her view, it sits with the new Minister for Planning and Regulation?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

That is an affirmative.

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

Given the growing popularity of dark sky tourism, for example as we see in Isle of Sark, as a successful implementation of this strategy, will the Minister consider stronger measures to reduce light pollution, especially in the rural areas, which would protect the biodiversity but also create new opportunities for Jersey's visitor economy?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I will certainly look at anything that is going to change the environment if that is a possibility, but I am not totally sure that that is feasible in relation to what we have at the present. Certainly, within the countryside, and certainly where I live, there are no streetlights. So, I think it is a matter for how we would achieve that.

20.7.1 Deputy A. Maltman:

Would the Minister consider options then to look at various zones, for example out at Grosnez, where this kind of tourism would lend itself?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I am not averse to that, but I do think we need to be aware that there is the possibility, depending on where agriculture is and what sort of facilities of agriculture are working, to create zones may create us an issue with being able to use the land and the buildings in relation to agriculture and the environment. I am happy to look at it, but I do think that there are other things in relation to this. As an example, certainly when people have applied to have greenhouses and light, *et cetera*, in relation to growing of produce, that then creates light within those areas, and that is where people have raised concern. So I do think we need to be careful about how we do this and where we would be doing it.

20.8 Connétable M.O'D. Troy of St. Clement:

Would you be happy with the recommendation of the Parish of Grouville for this venture?
[Laughter]

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

Maybe the Constable of St. Clement may need to speak to the Constable of Grouville before he proposes to him that he may not have any lights in his house anymore, because I think maybe there might be an issue. Of course, ironically, I think if my recollection is correct, it was in Grouville where this matter was brought up.

20.9 Deputy M. Tadier:

Would the Minister outline her position on dilapidated glasshouses in the countryside?

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I do believe that we need to find some form of solution in relation to the unused greenhouses within the countryside. Whether that is repurposing them for use, as some have been done, whether that is in relation to potentially being able to utilise them for other purposes, solar panels, housing or whatever, but let us be clear here that in relation to certain sites, there is not the necessary infrastructure to be able to do some of the things that people would like to do with those sites. So, I would certainly look at what we can do with them, but I think it is a piece of work that needs to be done. We need to be careful about the fact that not all of those sites are easily accessible, they are in quite small areas, there is potentially not going to be mains drains or water. So, I do think that it needs careful consideration, but I am happy to have a look at it.

20.9.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Does the Minister agree that as a general rule that change of use needs to be supported by evidence that all current uses have been exhausted and that when it comes to glasshouse sites, it is important to engage with community groups, potential community land trusts that might be able to repurpose those and repurpose them for their original intention, if that is not contradictory, so that they can be used for community growing as glasshouses to provide food security for communities in the area?

The Bailiff:

You have 15 seconds, Minister.

Senator M.R. Le Hegarat:

I am happy to look at this in the round.

21. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Health and Social Services.

The Bailiff:

The second period of questions are questions for the Minister for Health and Social Services. The first questions are from Deputy Coles, then Deputy Jeune, and then the Connétable of St. John.

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

Will the Minister outline his intention to return P.116/2025, which was the proposition in relation to cannabis, back to the Assembly with the revisions that he proposed?

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

I think that will happen in due course, but there is still a bit of work to be done before that happens.

21.1.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Is the Minister able to give any outline as to what caused the delay and what work is going on to resolve it?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I think the principal cause of delay is the workload that we have with the people that are doing the work, because they are undertaking a lot of work in a lot of different areas, and they are not able to get through it as quickly as we would like, notwithstanding the fact that they are putting in an enormous amount of effort.

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

The Minister has said that signing the main construction contract for the new hospital was only completed by the narrowest of margins and has called for a review of the process. Given he has also stated publicly the C. and A.G. (Comptroller and Auditor General) intervened very heavy handedly, and he came under pressure to carry out due diligence he considered unnecessary, will the Minister set out precisely what those issues were, what specifically was demanded of him at the last minute, by whom, and why he believes that due diligence was not necessary?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Firstly, if it has come across that I said the due diligence was not necessary, that was not quite the way it was. I was very disappointed that the due diligence work had not kept pace, particularly that the contract signing was delayed by quite a while. In my view, the due diligence should have been running parallel and the only due diligence work that should have had to have been done from the time when I had the last discussion and shook hands on the deal with the French contractors, was the work that was discussed at that last meeting. I come under intense pressure at the last moment to go back to them and tell them that we could not sign the contract and that the whole process would be delayed until after the election, which we promised them we would not do. I felt that that was inappropriate given all of the circumstances. I shall be making that plainer later. I want some work to be carried out to do some lessons learnt because I do not think that the way that was handled was appropriate.

[16:30]

21.2.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I thank the Minister for this answer, though we did not hear what the due diligence that was demanded of him at the last minute. Seeing as the C. and A.G. now confirms that it will do a full audit of programme that is underway, does he support that full audit, and will he support the C. and A.G. in doing that audit? The review of the due diligence could be part of that audit.

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

Of course I will support that. That was the intention, that the C. and A.G. was going to carry out that process in any event, and it stands to reason that I would support that. The reason I cannot quote off hand the information that was required of me is that in the event it took about 2 weeks to compile, and I had a day and a ½ before we reached the close of play before the election. I think the C. and A.G. was expecting me to stop my work on that and respond in detail, which would have taken me well in towards the end of the next week to do, and I did not think that was an appropriate thing to do, given the public interest in getting the contract signed and the safety issues that we all have in working in an aged hospital. As we have seen, theatres have been put out of use because the hospital is not fit for purpose, and I considered there was a public safety issue to be addressed by signing that contract.

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

Further to his answer to Written Question 31/2026 in February, on legal controls on the prescribing of medicinal cannabis, can the Minister advise the results of the consultation that he said would be carried out in the spring with prescribers and patients, and confirm if he plans to publish the results of that consultation?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I could not quote that all offhand. I am very happy to meet with the Constable at a later stage or pass that information on. I will need to take advice as to what time that can be published. As I say, we have been busy on a number of fronts and offhand I cannot bring that to mind, but I am very happy to address that at a later stage.

21.3.1 The Connétable of St. John:

I look forward to discussing with the Minister. When will the Minister be publishing the proposed legal controls on C.B.P.M. (Cannabis Based Medicinal Products) prescribing practice and/or an independent inspection regime that he said his officers were actively developing back in February?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

That work is ongoing. There is an awful lot of work to be done in the medicines law area, but we have had some work done to identify the gaps. There are a number of gaps that need to be addressed, and I make the same point as I made to an earlier question, the people we have got engaged in this, while they are very capable and hardworking, they are having a great deal of trouble to cope because there is a very broad spread of work for them to be undertaking.

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

Now that the assisted dying legislation has received Royal Assent, could the Minister outline what are the next steps in terms of setting up the service?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I think we made it clear when this was passed through the Assembly that there was an 18-month development period so that everybody could be recruited and trained appropriately. I think we are probably running just a very short while behind schedule, but we are hoping that all of the things will have been put in place ready for the service to be available in approximately September. We had said towards the end of the summer, and it is now looking like September of next year.

21.4.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Minister for his answer. Could he elaborate on what has caused the delay and are any further resources necessary? Will he need to bid for any further resources?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I think the resources we have should be sufficient, at least that is what I am led to believe at this point in time. When we are talking about a delay, I think we are only talking about a delay of a couple of weeks, so I would not really know offhand what the reason for that would be, but it is only a very slight delay.

Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

My question has been asked.

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

Given that employment and recruitment is usually not something that Ministers would get involved with and it tends to be administrative or dealt with by the States Employment Board, could the Minister confirm whether he has sought to be involved in any recruitment of staff personally?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

This sounds like it is heading towards something specific, and it may be easier if the Deputy alludes more directly if there is something more specific.

21.5.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Can the Minister confirm whether he has given any staff any direction with regard to what his preferences may be in consideration of recruitment processes within his Department?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

This is a difficult one. I know that it is not up to me to do recruitment, that is up to other people. In the course of discussion I think we all discuss what our preferences might be, and if I have made the mistake of discussing what my preferences might be, that may well be the case that I have done that. I really do not know. There is clearly something specific and I cannot really address that until I know ... I know full well that I am not in a position to effect who does and does not get employed.

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

Can the Minister advise what consideration, if any, has been given to using A.I. (Artificial Intelligence) in radiology?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I cannot make any comments specific to radiology off the top of my head, but I know that A.I. is becoming a real issue. It was discussed at our digital implementation board meeting recently, and there is work ongoing in all departments to see how A.I. might be applied. It is coming on to our agenda as an official item.

21.6.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

The Minister referred to A.I. in this context as an issue, but there is a lot of evidence to suggest that A.I.'s ability to read images is far superior than that of the human eye. Will the Minister then bring this up in their discussions to look to the advantages and help improve our Radiology Department by using A.I.?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

All of these things are currently being looked at. I am not entirely certain that A.I. is not already employed. I believe that a lot of our images are sent abroad to be analysed at a central point that specialises in that work, and I believe that A.I. is employed, but everything has to be subject to human ratification, obviously.

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

Could the Minister update the Assembly on the position with regard to the Chief Pharmacist role in the Department of Health, please?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

That role, I think, is currently being advertised. I think the structure of the Pharmacy Department has been rearranged and the arrangements going forward will not be exactly the same as they have been in the past. There is work being undertaken at the moment to make sure that all the right people are in all the places.

21.7.1 Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Could the Minister give an assurance that given what he has just said about the Medicines (Jersey) Law 1995, that he will get the appropriate pharmacy professional advice to make sure that he is complying with the law in relation to pharmacy services across the piece please?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

We will most certainly be doing that.

21.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

What are the procedures that the Minister would like to prioritise reducing the waiting times for?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

That is a very difficult one, because reducing waiting times is not a simple business. It requires whole system improvement. It would require more recruitment and better facilities than we have. We are working as hard as we can on that. It is a real priority for this year, and it is going forward. However, until we have a new hospital with the extra facilities, it is going to be difficult to make any meaningful progress, though we will make as much progress as we can.

21.8.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Is the Minister likely to carry out any work on assessing the impact that private work has on waiting lists and whether there are any unintended consequences to public waiting lists from the use of private work?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

We are always at pains to make sure that we maintain a real focus on the public work, though we do have to try and accommodate as much private work as we can without compromising that, because the private work does bring in revenue which gives us money to spend in the health service, which in turn helps us to reduce the public waiting lists. It is a delicate balance, and that is always under review.

21.9 Deputy M. Tadier:

If there are no others, I will use my second question as a supplementary. When it comes to the private work, could the Minister outline whether he thinks that a true market rate is being charged for the use of the facilities by the consultants for the work that they do at the General Hospital? Is this something he would like to look into?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

I am certainly happy to look into that. Perhaps it is an assumption on my part, but I would imagine that that is the case. We also have to be certain that we give the clinicians sufficient private work because that forms part of their income and, quite simply, if we do not allow them to make enough money on private work, either they will not come to Jersey because they will go elsewhere. So, once again, these things are all very delicate balances, and we do try and keep an eye on them as best we can.

21.9.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

I suppose this is supplementary, is the Minister willing to look at alternative models? It strikes me that we do not make that provision in other areas of the public sector. We do not rely on teachers to come to Jersey to be able to do private work within the schools that they are teaching in during the daytime, to run private classes on the side, but we do do that at the hospital. Would the Minister give consideration as to whether the underlying philosophy behind that is a sound one, especially if it is putting pressure, because it is the same consultants doing the same work on those public waiting lists. Is that something the Minister could look at in the round?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

The underlying philosophy is, broadly speaking, correct. I do not know much about education, but it does not run the same way as a health service does. The incentives are different and, in my view, they are just not directly comparable.

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

Today in the *J.E.P.* there was information about the support service for miscarriage for women. I was just wondering if the Minister knew if that support was specific counselling, specifically around miscarriage, or was it referral to general counselling?

Senator T.J.A. Binet:

On this one, unfortunately I have not seen the article, so I do not know what it contains, so it is very difficult for me to answer in those circumstances.

The Bailiff:

There are only 30 seconds left, which brings that period to an end.

22. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister

The Bailiff:

The third period of questions are for the Chief Minister, and the first question is from Deputy Alex Curtis.

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

Following the C. & A.G. report on Revenue Jersey on 3rd July which concluded: "There is evidence that Revenue Jersey is inefficient due to digital immaturity which increases cost and increases risk", will he advise how he is working with Digital Services to ensure sufficient support is given to Revenue Jersey to increase its digital maturity?

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

On the whole, that report was fairly positive, although there were one or two not so positive and appropriate observations. I know the Minister for Treasury and Resources is looking particularly at that point. I can confirm it is the Government's intention to achieve digital maturity as soon as

possible. We fall short of that in many areas across Government, and that is something we are going to tackle.

22.1.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

The Chief Minister says it is an ambition and, to take Revenue Jersey, that Department has seen significant capital expenditure on multiple phases of the Revenue Transformation Programme. However, the report and perhaps Islander's experiences, are that capital delivery has not exactly followed through to digital maturity in the organisation. How does the Chief Minister plan to ensure digital investment across Government improves digital maturity?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am not sure I agree totally with the C. and A.G.'s recommendations and observations. In fact, I question quite a lot of them. Members will probably know that in the last 10 years, we have received over 1,000 recommendations, of which we have implemented about 999 of them, but it just does not stop. One day, I am not sure when we will be good enough, but of course we take all of these recommendations seriously. I know that the Minister for Treasury and Resources is focused on this. We have made considerable improvements with Revenue Jersey, but there is still a long way to go. The Minister for Treasury and Resources is aware of that and is looking at it closely. We need to expedite that because it is essential, especially in Revenue Jersey, that we get this right, because if it does not, it could have an impact on our cashflow. Also, we want to make sure that Islanders are getting their tax statements and businesses are being dealt with properly and accurately.

The Bailiff:

Any other questions for the Chief Minister? If there are no questions for the Chief Minister, then that concludes business for this meeting.

[16:45]

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

I invite the chair of P.P.C. to propose the arrangement of public business for future meetings.

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

There is not particularly much to be shown under the Arrangement of Public Business, compared to what is already shown on the Order Paper. There is an amendment to P.60 that was lodged today. So, as things stand at the moment, the meeting on 8th September probably will not go beyond Tuesday, but we are yet to hit some of the lodging deadlines, so please bear that in mind for the September sitting. It may be worth also just reminding Members that Wednesday to Friday are always identified as continuation days, and they might be used if business is required, but at the moment, that is where we stand on the current Order Paper. I propose the Arrangement of Public Business.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content now to adjourn? The States stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 8th September.

ADJOURNMENT

[16:46]