

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

THURSDAY, 10th JULY 2025

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER.....	3
1.1 Welcome to representatives of the National Association of Headteachers.....	3
PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	3
2. Meanwhile use of the former Gas Place site (P.48/2025) - resumption	3
2.1 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:	3
2.1.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	5
2.1.2 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:	5
2.1.3 Deputy M.E. Millar of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	6
2.1.4 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	8
2.1.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:	8
2.1.6 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:.....	10
2.1.7 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	10
2.1.8 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	11
2.1.9 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:	13
2.1.10 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:	13
2.1.11 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	14
2.1.12 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	15
2.1.13 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	15
2.1.14 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:	16
2.1.15 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:.....	18
2.1.16 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:	18
2.1.17 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	19
2.1.18 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	20
2.1.19 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:.....	24
2.1.20 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	26
APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS.....	29
3. Appointment of member of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel.....	29
3.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour (Chair, Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):	30
PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	30
4. Continuation of Annual Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey (P.49/2025).....	30
4.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	30
4.1.1 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:	32
4.1.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	33

4.1.3 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	33
4.1.4 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	33
4.1.5 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	33
4.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	34
4.1.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	34
5. Joined-up public infrastructure framework for an ageing population (P.50/2025)	36
5.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:	36
5.1.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:.....	38
5.1.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:.....	38
5.1.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	39
5.1.4 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	39
5.1.5 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:.....	40
5.1.6 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	40
5.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner:	40
6. Channel Islands Lottery Distribution of Proceeds 2025 (P.51/2025)	47
6.1 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	48
6.1.1 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	48
6.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	48
6.1.3 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	49
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	51
7. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	51
7.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	52
7.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:.....	52
ADJOURNMENT.....	52

[9:30]

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

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

1.1 Welcome to representatives of the National Association of Headteachers

The Bailiff:

Before we move on with the business of the day, I am delighted to welcome representatives of the National Association of Headteachers who have come to watch these States at its best [Laughter] namely before we start anything, and welcome them in the usual way. [Approbation]

Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:

Excuse me, Sir, although I am present this morning, I am going to the A.P.F. (L'Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie) conference in Paris this afternoon, and I do have faith in the local travel arrangements.

The Bailiff:

Well, I would hate to say that attendance or non-attendance of the Assembly is a matter of faith, Deputy, but we can proceed on that one. Thank you for telling us. Deputy Doublet, you wanted to raise an issue?

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

Hopefully, this is the right time now. I wish to seek the leave of the Assembly to extend the number of members on my Scrutiny Panel and to nominate a member today.

The Bailiff:

Right. I suggest that what we do is we conclude the debate on the current matter, and then that can be the next item of business, unless any Member objects to that. Very well, that is the way we proceed.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Thank you, Sir.

Connétable R.A.K. Honeycombe of St. Ouen:

Can I just advise the Assembly that I have to attend a funeral later this morning and I will not be here from 12.15.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much.

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

2. Meanwhile use of the former Gas Place site (P.48/2025) - resumption

The Bailiff:

We proceed now with the business of the day. The debate is on P.48, Meanwhile use of the former Gas Place site. Does any Member wish to speak?

2.1 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

Let me start by saying clearly, I support the intention behind this proposition. I believe, like many of us, that we must make better use of vacant spaces across the Island, and meanwhile use can benefit young people, wider community, and other matters. In fact, why I decided to speak early, because yesterday I was able to support the amendment as I recognised the value of the principles after

listening carefully to Deputy Renouf's and Deputy Curtis's speeches. This is why I felt that I was able to support the amendment. But what we are having now, I understand the intention and, however good, it must align with reality. In this case, with regret, I cannot support the proposition as it stands because I believe it risks undermining the very thing we are all working hard to deliver; a new purpose-built school for St. Helier Central. **[Approbation]** To be honest, we are not in any imagination to choose between use it or lose it. We know that the school is going to be there. We are in the middle of creating some transformation for St. Helier children and families - long overdue - modern schools that meet the needs of the children and families in our capital. I hope the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning - I saw that he put his light on - will give more details on programmes and funding and reassure the Assembly it is going forward. Actually preparing this speech today, the memory of Word documents where showing you the date of the first speech. I have gone back to 2021. It was 4 years ago when I first supported Deputy Warr and we have changed the positions a lot, but I supported Deputy Warr 4 years ago when we all decided here in the Assembly to dedicate space and to purpose build to St. Helier residents. Everyone talks about the birth rate falling. It is not in St. Helier. The schools are full. We are building so many housing developments around that area. Somebody told me you can bus children to other schools where they have children. I do not believe the children need to be bused to St. Mary, St. Peter, St. Ouen, that was suggested. I believe children need to go to school in their community and they can walk. Let me make it clear to Deputy Warr and Members, it is not about opposing use provision. It is far from it. It is about ensuring that our young people get real lasting investment and not a temporary fix. The Youth Centre, hopefully, and the Youth Centre going forward just around the corner from that place. So it will be full use provision, brand new use provision in the Youth Centre around that area. My comments on this occasion align with those of the Council of Ministers who made it very clear they support the intention of the proposition as it currently stands and raises too many practical, operational and strategic concerns. There are 3 areas I would like to highlight very swiftly. First, operational risks. Significant questions, and I raised this with the Deputy, remain unanswered. Who will be responsible for health and safety, for safeguarding, for insurance, for maintenance, fire protocols? We cannot endorse community use of the site without a clear risk management plan in place. There are not small technicalities. There are really important legal and moral responsibility, especially when it comes to the children. Second, planning and strategic alignment. The site is already a major strategic priority in new town schools. It is already in meanwhile use and any adaptation made, you need to do planning application. What I feel, would we, after a year, create a brand new space in another year or 10 months or 18 months, we will move it to another place, saying to young children: "No worry, we are building something else, we are moving you to another place." This is coming to ... actually, I would like to ask Deputy Warr and challenge, would a better option exist? We, yesterday, mentioned so many vacant sites. If we are serious about supporting meanwhile use for use in community service, let us do it. Let us do it in the right location. There are other vacant and unused properties on the Island, which are not part of the active construction site, and where risk can be much lower. Let me be clear, I completely agree in St. Helier, actually across the Island, we absolutely need spaces for teenagers. That is why I was very strong support to exploring options for St. Andrew's Park, and something that I raised a number of years, and I hope we will see something coming in the next Rates Assembly in St. Helier. There are other areas in town that could benefit from the great ideas and Deputy Warr's passion and funding that he worked hard to secure. Let us make sure we channel that energy into a location where it can thrive for a long time without compromising other critical projects. In closing, I thank Deputy Warr for bringing this important discussion forward. I share his values and concerns, but I believe the priority now, we must deliver the new school safely, swiftly, without unnecessary complication.

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

Can I raise the default on Deputy Southern?

The Bailiff:

Yes, the défaut is raised on Deputy Southern.

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

Parliamentary, I think it is fair to say you are doomed if you do, and you are doomed if you do not. We are now in a fairly amusing and comical position. Sir, you were fortunate not to have to sit through it yesterday.

[9:45]

With the legal profession, strong arguments normally win cases. Unfortunately, they did not last time. We had a chance to vote on something that would have made this workable and instead, this was voted down because some Members of this Assembly did not want to support a workable version of something they agreed with. On the counter, if we had not debated it separately, I just know that the amendment would have been swallowed over, skirted over, and the arguments put forward would have been those targeting the unamended version. I am quite surprised to hear Deputy Gardiner's comments. She - and I thank her - recognised that we could have had a workable proposition as amended, but then went on to criticise the Deputy's main proposition, following the Council of Ministers line, despite knowing the position taken by the Council of Ministers was one of winning a position rather than representing values. We are now truly debating a proposition without reason, which is disappointing, and I already know the arguments that will be given. This is frankly comical albeit I find slightly sad genuinely for Members who, like me, think they know exactly how this will go. I will invite them to play along with me a light game of avoidable reasons bingo. This is filled with reasons Members might bring up in their speeches today, which we all know would have been dealt with if the amendment had passed. Members may choose to add to this or choose 5, and I will start with the first box. There will be confusion about what we will be doing because of what the Deputy has put in the media. We had a chance to be very clear, the Assembly could not agree with an unamended version, and we chose not to take that. Second box, the proposition is too tightly worded and does not allow for the case where it is truly not possible to fit a meanwhile use on the site. Third box, Andium might not own the site for much longer. Fourth, we have a plan to invest in new children, and youth facilities and a community use here will distract or remove budget. Fifth box, a community use would need planning, building, health and safety challenge. Sixth box, there will be a risk to the delay to the school which we cannot have. I think that one can be copied 2 or 3 times for those trying to fill their lines. On a serious note, it is really disappointing we are now debating something where we could have got behind a principle and I, like most Members now, will no doubt be unable to vote pour on this. I cannot. I will not support based on people, I will support based on good worded propositions and the policy or intent they drive. So I cannot in good conscience support this out of disappointment, but I can air that here, and I can ask Members instead perhaps to either consider abstaining because they know in their hearts there was a workable solution and they know that that would have been the right option to take.

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

It is a pleasure to follow the colleague to my left in his bingo game because I am going to see if I can go for a full house. Let me start by saying that I share Deputy Warr's passion for improving the lives of young people in St. Helier and beyond. The challenges as laid out in his report, the erosion of public amenities, mental health pressures, the loss of recreational venues, are all very real. But this proposition, while emotionally compelling, risks undermining strategic development by introducing short-term fixes that could compromise critical long-term outcomes. Tick. Particularly when the well-laid plans for Ann Street Brewery site are well underway. The meanwhile use of the Gas Place sites until construction of the primary school begins on the surface may appear to be a practical solution but good intentions do not necessarily make for good policy. We cannot afford to treat one of the most strategically vital sites in St. Helier as a temporary experiment. First and foremost this site has been formally safeguarded for educational development under the Bridging Island Plan. This

policy does not exist in isolation. It is a product of long-term vision, cross-departmental planning and public engagement. We cannot allow emotional urgency to detour what is, in essence, a critical pillar of our future infrastructure. To allow temporary use on a site earmarked for major public investment sets a dangerous precedent. It opens the door to piecemeal decision-making that may hinder construction timelines, inflate costs and confuse development opportunities and priorities. We must scrutinise the feasibility and deliverability of what is in the report. Deputy Warr assures us that no government funding is required, that charitable donations, sponsorships and goodwill will surface to transform Gas Place into a youth leisure hub. Yet experience tells us that even temporary builds come with costs. Costs for site management, safety, insurance, accessibility, safeguarding compliance and co-ordination with stakeholders. If these costs are underestimated or underfunded, responsibility would ultimately fall back to the taxpayer. Let us not forget that meanwhile use often becomes long while use. There is no faster way to derail a major capital project than to hand over a site for use without a clear and binding timetable for hand back. What assurance is being offered that such facilities could be dismantled quickly when construction of the school must finally begin? Would community groups be forced to disband and relocate once again, creating further disappointment and disillusionment? Would the optics of tearing down a skate park or community venue delay the school's delivery? We must also consider the cost of dispersing scarce energy and resources into a temporary venue when so much work remains to be done to deliver permanent high-quality youth services. The work to develop the St. Helier youth facility at Ann Street is already underway and developing at pace. The facility is not a vague concept. It is a committed project with a defined purpose, confirmed location and, as of last week, approved planning application. Rather than dilute focus and funding, let us commit to that scheme and others like it, which are being developed with permanence in mind. On the issue of indoor activity space, it is indeed understandable that Fort Regent will ultimately have to close and other facilities are disappearing. But this should galvanise us to accelerate substantive solutions, not invest in transitory ones. We need a broader conversation about sustainable access to sport, well-being, and recreation, rather than retrofitting temporary infrastructure that might serve for a few years, only to vanish before embedding itself in the lives of those it intends to serve. As for the argument around children's rights and well-being, I would argue that the best way to honour our duties under the Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law is to prioritise long-term education infrastructure. A new primary school in the town centre is not just a policy commitment, it is a societal need. This is how we create equity, this is how we tackle systemic disadvantage and how we build a town for the next generation. I acknowledge a concern about teenagers without safe, constructive places to go after school, but these social issues are not best solved by rebranding underused parcels of land as youth playgrounds. They require holistic approaches, investment in mental health services, as we have done with our C.A.M.H.S. (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) service, and embedding changes and structured after-school programming, collaboration with schools and sports bodies and community-led projects. But they must be aligned with the Island's strategic framework, not pursued in reaction to frustration. Let us not mistake urgency for emergency. Let us not prioritise today at the expense of tomorrow. Above all, let us not reduce one of Jersey's most valuable central urban sites to a pop-up project when we should be building for our children's future. I urge Members to reject the proposition.

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

I believe I am the main respondent to the Deputy's proposition, as the shareholder representative for Andium homes, which has been very much put in the frame for delivery of this project. Contrary to some comments yesterday, I believe this is absolutely a project that would take considerable time and effort to deliver. I draw Members' attention again to the Council of Minister's comments paper. My fellow Ministers have and will no doubt continue to talk later in the debate about the youth facilities that are currently planned - Deputy Curtis, we have mentioned those - and in development. I do, however, want to highlight in particular the timeline for which this meanwhile use is likely to

be available. ROK, who are the Andium construction partner, are currently using the site as they complete the Maison Les Arches development across the road from the Gas Place site. They will have occupation of this until at least June 2026. It is used for storage, welfare facilities and office facilities; so that is a key part of the Maisons Les Arches development. I hope that no Member would think that it would be a good idea to force ROK to find and use alternative facilities in the centre of town for these purposes, which would not only delay the completion of Maisons Les Arches but also, no doubt, have a series of financial implications. It is estimated that enabling works for the new primary school will begin in October 2026, so this meanwhile use may only be for a matter of a few months, at probably considerable cost and effort. Members should therefore consider whether this proposition brings true value for money and benefit to Islanders for such a short timeframe. Like fellow Ministers, I do of course agree that our young people need spaces dedicated to them, but I cannot agree that this is such a space, not only from the nature of the space but also from its location, which is right in the middle of 2 very significant construction sites. The Deputy has circulated some photos yesterday, which does show a vast amount of space that is seemingly available, but it remains the case that it is simply not suitable for this purpose. The proposition calls for Andium to work with stakeholders to develop and implement a meanwhile use of the Gas Place site that will be beneficial to the community. I absolutely acknowledge that Andium is not just a social housing provider. Many of its developments, such as Edinburgh Court and the Plaisant Court, have charitable facilities included in them, and Andium works extremely well with the third sector. Those, however, are clearly ancillary to its main purpose, which is to manage and develop social housing. Deputy Warr will acknowledge, I am sure, particularly having served as Minister for Housing, the excellent work and progress that Andium has made and continues to make. If I could just emphasise - because I thought, I may have misinterpreted, but I thought that Deputy Tadier was making a comment yesterday about the quality of our social housing - 100 per cent of Andium's homes currently meet the Better Homes Standard. They also meet other modern facility standards, so they are absolutely of very good quality, and I do feel that I have to defend that point. I am sorry to the Deputy if I misunderstood his comment, but it is always worth recognising the huge progress that Andium has made. Indeed, it is because of that progress that the current Minister for Housing has been progressively able to widen the eligibility criteria for the Housing Gateway. Anything therefore that diverts Andium and its resources from the primary purpose of social housing provision and supporting a large section of our community, I would suggest, is questionable. If any Members believe that Andium could undertake the work envisaged by the proposition, it is worth considering what is involved in the meanwhile proposals. This is not just consulting with stakeholders. The proposition implicitly suggests that Andium will have to be involved in raising funds, whether in part or whole, since government funds are not to be used. To address Deputy Curtis's other point, I am not going to suggest loss of budget because there is no Government budget proposed, that Andium has to go out into the third sector, the private sector, philanthropists, and raise funds for a short-term project. Presumably, Andium will also be expected to co-ordinate the planning process. Assuming that planning approval is received in the timely fashion that Deputy Warr believes is possible, Andium will be required to project manage the development and change of use of a site with a developer or, more likely, developers. It is not simply a case of brushing out the premises and sticking in a couple of football nets. Once the site has been redeveloped, it is not clear who will co-ordinate the management of the leisure facilities as well as the ongoing costs associated with the site. The proposition makes it clear that none of this falls on Government, so presumably again Andium will be required to either run the facilities or find an organisation to manage them. Since Andium is the current owner of the site all risk will sit with them. Andium was not formed for this purpose and I urge Members not to divert their resources to a project they are just not suited for.

[10:00]

If I could touch briefly, Deputy Ozouf I think raised some questions yesterday about funding for Gas Place for the school. I believe we do have funds in the Budget for the build of the school up to 2028

but not beyond that, because the project will continue beyond 2028. The amount in the Budget I believe reflects the spending plans and the spending profile for the school and C.O.M. (Council of Ministers) will be discussing the capital provision for the purchase of land tomorrow because there are various options for funding and timing of that purchase, but that will not stop ownership of the site, it will not stop Education starting the school project; for example, things like design work and planning. That will, I believe, carry on apace very soon. I am sure Deputy Ward will discuss that with you. For all those reasons, therefore - and I agree that the Deputy's proposition is well-intentioned and we all support meanwhile use where it is appropriate - I would urge Members to reject the proposition.

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

Although I congratulate the Deputy on the spirit behind this and his commitment to urban regeneration, I do not feel the assurances he wants to provide are sufficient. I would prefer to avoid establishing a precedent with this. In theory, this meanwhile use is to be applauded, but in reality, as I have said, I cannot support this. There is no firm budget for this and having a message from a trust does not equate to funding. I know this from many years of fundraising. I have been successful with raising money for medical scanners for infertility, the proceeds towards a new facility unit, and more recently the playgrounds and play equipment in St. Martin, et cetera. I have had amazingly generous sponsors, amazing promises and unfortunately at times have been very badly let down, even from bona fide trusts, et cetera. This funding is fraught with problems. My other problem is that if the money is spent and it is successful, who will want to knock it down and take it away? This will end up with this much needed school, which is an absolute priority, being pushed even further down the line. I cannot support this but I do genuinely thank the Deputy for thinking outside the box, and with firmer funding may support something like this in the future.

2.1.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:

One thing I would just like to address first is that people keep saying that the site has a current meanwhile use, but the site is warehouse, offices and associated showroom. As far as I am aware, it is being used as a warehouse and offices still for the current property, so actually it is not in a meanwhile use, it is in its current form as what it is designed to be used for. But any change to anything proposed by the Deputy in any of his Articles and things would be a meanwhile use and would, therefore, require planning permission, but I will get on to that further on in my speech. But if I may, I will start with a quote. This quote comes from a TEDx talk given in Jersey a few weeks ago and is available to watch via YouTube. The quote: "It's about making sure that we make the best use of the space that we have in our Island of 9 by 5, so we must make sure we do that. A couple of big examples are the Eiffel Tower. Now, that's okay, you can say it's a meanwhile use. It's a use which was a temporary use. It was a use which was set up for a great event and then after a while everybody got used to it and it actually became the permanent use. And I think this is the thing. We have to be brave. We have to go and start thinking about meanwhile use. We have to be brave that sometimes the meanwhile use becomes the permanent use." This quote is from a talk called "Jam Today" by Deputy David Warr that he gave in the Arts Centre but a few weeks ago. **[Interruption]**

The Bailiff:

Sorry, could we please not?

Deputy T.A. Coles:

So, first things first. That big event was the 1889 World's Fair in Paris. Other examples are Crystal Palace in London, built in 1851, the Space Needle in Seattle, built in 1962, and a project that I saw earlier this year was Habitat 67, built in Montreal in 1967. All fascinating buildings, all built with a purpose of showing off the engineering prowess of those cities for the hosting of the World's Fair. I am not sure about the timeframe or any obligation to remove these after the events that they are built

for, because I am pretty sure back in the 1800s planning permission was not a thing. But of course this does lead me on to planning permission and to our Bridging Island Plan. The preamble for policy ER5 states: “Proposals for the retail and town centre-related meanwhile uses in St. Helier Town Centre and the defined centre at Les Quennevais will be supported to help maintain their vitality. Such uses have the potential to aid the recovery from the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic, offering a chance to find new and flexible uses for underutilised spaces. It is, however, important to ensure that any meanwhile use does not result in the unacceptable impact on the local amenity and that the use does not prevent development sites from being brought forward in the longer term.” Continuing on the Bridging Island Plan, policy CI1, Educational Facilities, clearly states: “Jersey Gas site is for educational facilities unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer needed.” I find it alarming that just a few weeks ago Deputy Warr was speaking about meanwhile use becoming permanent use, for the Deputy to then lodge a proposition about meanwhile use for this specific site. The Deputy pledged to extend the park, no ifs, no buts, but of course there was a brief if and but when it came to consideration for different sites in this area, but the Deputy voted against the 21st amendment to the 2023-2026 Government Plan. I can quote the Deputy again, this time from Hansard: “We scour town. However, considering all the options I can say with confidence that I was swayed by the arguments for the school on the Gas Place site.” The previous Minister for Education, the current Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning both believe that the school is very much needed in this area. The Council of Ministers in their comments confirmed that funding is coming in the next Government Plan. I think it is clear that it has not been demonstrated that the new school facility is not needed. If you managed to catch a copy of the 1st July *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* you will have seen the graphics that Deputy Warr shared. These graphics show an ambitious plan for the whole site, not just the warehouse. I do not know about you, but I had never heard of a pump track before the S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company) mentioned one in their consultation for Fort Regent and now all of a sudden we have 2 on offer. I know some people have been calling out for new climbing walls and bouldering courses and all of a sudden we have 3 ambitious plans in front of us. That is the Youth Centre, Fort Regent and now the site that Deputy Warr is referring to. The Deputy has not been quiet on his dissatisfaction on the plans at Fort Regent, his desire to see the Millennium Park extended ... well, at least since he left Government. This feels like a plan to achieve, as I will quote the Deputy again, meanwhile use becomes the permanent use. The Deputy says in his report that we need action now. The problem is that this site is currently being used now. At this point, these ambitious plans do not have planning permission now. Construction does not have building control now. There is no operational plan now and there is no evidence of funding now. The Deputy distributed a leaflet around St. Helier South in which he claimed to have advanced major housing projects like South Hill, which right now does not have building control. Later on in his talk the Deputy says: “We need to, as I said before, fight for people before policy, people before policy. We’ve got to think about people. Forget all the planning rules, you can’t do this, you can’t have that, and all the rest of it.” This feels like an off-the-cuff comment that was mentioned at the Planning Committee last week when somebody said: “Nobody wants to apply for planning permission themselves but everybody wants their neighbours to have planning permission.” With the Deputy saying people before policy, if I am correct - and I strongly believe that I am - our role in this Assembly is to create policies for the people, or the public as the Deputy likes to say. If we do not like these policies, we should use our powers to have policies changed into something more fitting. While I support the concept of meanwhile use, there are many Government-owned sites or sites owned by States-owned entities and A.L.O.s (arm’s length organisations) that would be ideal for some kind of meanwhile use. Deputy Curtis’s amendment made this point and is a reason I could have supported it. However, the mention of Gas Place still remained. The issue of Gas Place is that it is still currently in use. The future use is in train and Deputy Warr’s plans are not ready to go. The Deputy has shared a timeline with Members by email and I am confused by this timeline, not only because it involves time travel, going back to the start of the year, but also that it misses out the fact that the Government’s side of this had been in plan since when he was in Government, and yet those

concept plans are not mentioned on his timeline. The plans might not be that complex that the Deputy is proposing or has mentioned outside of this Assembly, but these would all still be subject to the same level of scrutiny from planning permission, building control, third party appeals ... because he does not mention that on his timeline either. Those who have worked in planning know that third party appeals can come from anyone who lives within 50 metres of the redline boundary, which is quite a large number of people within that area. But by the time they are ready to go and this facility is built, it would not be very long before it has to close to make way for the school. I feel that this is almost cruel, to promise to build a great facility, to get young people excited and let them get a glimpse of something amazing, just to take it away moments later. My final comments will be on the subject in the Deputy's report. The Deputy grossly confuses neuro development with mental health challenges and mental illness. These 3 conditions are not the same thing. They all cannot be prevented by a climbing wall. To challenge the funding of C.A.M.H.S. in such a way shows great lack of understanding of the challenges of mental health, mental illness and neuro-divergence. I am just going to leave my comments there.

2.1.6 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

Meanwhile use in general is a great concept when there is agreement from all stakeholders. Having spoken to some business leaders, it is clear that there must be full agreement from all the stakeholders for meanwhile use to work. When meanwhile use is feasible it is on land with known future plans and long lead times. The Gas Place site is already being used, which is expected to continue into next year. Around that time hopefully work should be starting on the permanent plans for the site. These plans are for a primary school to replace the existing St. Luke's and Springfield Schools. I visited both schools and it is clear that while they are excellent schools, the buildings and the play space are not sufficient. I would suggest that States Members, especially town Deputies and the Constable of St. Helier, should visit these schools and speak to the headteachers about facilities if they have not already done so. In fact, I have been to St. Luke's School just in the last few weeks. It is imperative that there are new facilities for St. Luke's and Springfield, and I do not want to see any possible disruption to the plans for these new facilities as provided for by the new school. I have to say that I am not confident that meanwhile use plans on the Gas Place site would not cause delays or more problems to the progress of the new school. We are aware that there are campaigners against the school being sited here, and I would be concerned if meanwhile use plans go ahead as illustrated by Deputy Warr on the site that there would be calls to make the meanwhile use permanent. So for me to support a proposition for meanwhile use on the Gas Place site, it would have to be detailed. It would have to be with agreement of all stakeholders and would have to include a detailed exit strategy. For this reason, I could not support the amendment either. Alternatively, I would be happy to support some sort of proposition about meanwhile use more generally, not connected to any specific site but to ensure it is considered in all developments. This particular proposition falls somewhere between these 2 possibilities so, therefore, I cannot support it.

[10:15]

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

I am pleased to follow Deputy Catherine Curtis there, who gave a perfectly good and nice speech but obviously against Deputy Warr's speech, but perfectly civil and perfectly nice. Unfortunately, I am less keen to follow Deputy Tom Coles's speech, which I just felt was unnecessarily personal in the way it developed. Because what Deputy David Warr has done is provided us with a perfectly reasonable proposition. I think, and I will not be supporting it, it is a perfectly reasonable proposition in itself. I think the right thing is to put perfectly nice arguments against in a very civil way rather than taking the attacks further than that. I think there are good reasons, unfortunately, that this cannot be supported and the main one is the Gas Place school. I do not personally want to see anything that can possibly knock out the Gas Place school from going ahead. So for that reason I will not be supporting this. But the idea of meanwhile use is, I think, something that Deputy Warr has hit upon

and is a perfectly good thing in general that this Island really would like to see the Government delivering more often. I thought Deputy Warr's list of properties that were unused that he read yesterday ... it is startling and it is embarrassing that we have so many unused properties, and meanwhile use is a perfectly good way to deal with that. I see it happening across Europe and across the U.K. I see buildings put into meanwhile use and it can be simply 6 months as a brief retail outlet for a charity. We see it happening in King Street. We see private landlords giving up their shops for charities to use them for 6 months. Why can Government not do something similar? I do not understand. It brings life back to those buildings and allows them to be used in an appropriate way. I have heard too many excuses, listening to the reasons given against Deputy Warr's proposition, which when you take them beyond Gas Place and think of them in general, I then think do we have no vision in this Assembly? Are we really incapable? Do we really think that we are so bound by health and safety and we are so bound by insurance, we are so bound by planning, we are so bound by all these things that we are unable to make the town thrive and live, that we cannot bring buildings to use for 6, 7, 8 months? Is that what we are telling ourselves, that it is not possible to bring buildings back to use for a temporary period of time? I find that unbelievably disappointing, because we must. We have to bring life into buildings, and while the long-term planning may well take a while to get through for a new development on a new site, to be able to put something on that site temporarily is a good thing to do. When it comes to that idea that temporary becomes permanent, not if it is made very clear both publicly and privately through contracts that this is temporary, that however much it is enjoyed this use will be temporary. We do have perfectly good meanwhile uses going on in the private sector and, in my view, it is about time that we brought them into the public sector in a meaningful way. But that all said, because of the specific nature of this proposition on this one site, which I do believe needs to have a school built on it as quickly as possible, I cannot support the Deputy's proposition.

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

There are quite a few things already been said. Constable Jehan is not here but I have been working with the Minister for Infrastructure. There are some comments that I would make sort of on his behalf but the words do not sound right as mine because of the way they are written. I just want to point out a couple of things that were made to me. Deputy Warr mentioned La Folie Inn several times in his opening speech. I just remind him and Members that it is under Ports of Jersey, a limited company, rather than a public body. In terms of empty sites, the Deputy also mentioned sites that belong to the Parish of St. Helier and the States of Jersey Development Corporation, so there is a complexity there in where those sites are. During Ministerial meetings with J.P.H. (Jersey Property Holdings), the Minister for Infrastructure I know introduces a review of empty sites every 2 weeks. This is seen as actual make progress building in order to identify buildings, as Deputy Morel has suggested, and I would agree with him. So I believe that process is ongoing. It is just not my remit, but I would be happy to support that. I will not mention any more on that because I am doing badly with other people's words. I am pleased to speak on this proposition because on the surface it does appear optimistic, even appealing, but I believe beneath the veneer of good intentions lies a proposal that is premature, is opaque and fundamentally flawed. Meanwhile use as a concept is hugely beneficial. Indeed, there is a library of TED Talks which extol the creative and interim uses of spaces for community gardens, art installations, temporary sports grounds. These things can be wonderful and I would support that when they are meaningful. Indeed, it is interesting that Deputy Curtis's amendment seemed to be covered by the part in the law that talks about temporary use as quoted by Deputy Coles, whose speech I believe was actually very factual. I do not think it was personal at all. I think it was factual. Unfortunately, the facts do not hold up and one has to, when one brings a proposition, have the facts behind you. But not every site and not every moment is appropriate for meanwhile use and we must be careful in imagining that because something works in theory it therefore works in practice. I have to challenge the lack of clarity and financial detail. My greatest concern on this ... well, I am not so sure on that after people have talked about threats to the school,

and I will come back to that. But one of my huge concerns is a complete absence of serious financial due diligence. Who will fund the project? I ask the Deputy these questions so perhaps he can sum up. Who will fund this project and how much will it cost? Is it going to be free to users? Then who absorbs the operational costs long term? Who staffs it and who employs those staff? Who takes care of the risk assessments, of the health and safety issues that go with it? Because this might seem tedious to those with high ideas but the reality of dealing with young people is you have to take care of these. Anything that involves young people must involve taking care in the long term of their well-being. Because if you do not, there are an awful lot of problems that will arise from it. I will also ask the Deputy: does he agree with the Millennium Town Park group, who are opposed to any school and new facility and want to use this project to prevent these happening? I quote from their letter that we were sent: "Provisional plans suggest that a new school would be developed across Gas Place, running from the boundary with the existing Town Park to St. Saviour's Road. This is a substantial size development and should be justified. It appears to be an expensive luxury development." Does the Deputy believe a new school is a luxury development? What happens ... and this is where we have to put some parts of a jigsaw together. I am trying not to have a paranoia that develops after 7 and a half years in the Assembly when things happen. I am trying to move away from that, but when I put the pieces of this together I have serious concerns. What happens when demolition is required and a facility begins, if this was to happen? Will we have the friends of the skate park, the friends of the climbing wall group lobbying us? Because that is what happens in our politics on this Island. I think Constable Shenton-Stone mentioned those concerns, and I think she has had some experience of those issues. Let us not forget that the site has waited years to be a school. The children of the Parish deserve better than uncertainty dressed up as innovation. We are told that this is not a stalling tactic, but there is a troubling pattern. One, the proposition was lodged by the Constable of St. Helier to rethink and to relook at the Gas Place site that would delay the Gas Place site. That proposition was then delayed until September and lo and behold this meanwhile use proposition pops up at the same time. I would ask the Deputy to make clear in his summing up speech whether he will support the Constable of St. Helier in bringing a further delay to the site by sending off for a rethink, because the 2 go hand in hand. I think that is one of the concerns that we have, I certainly have, that this proposition goes way beyond that point. I stood on a platform in my district of a new school on that site. I knocked on every single door. I dealt with every single issue that arose with that. I was elected in that constituency with it. Since taking over as Minister ... and I know the previous Minister is absolutely in support of this and I know ... I have seen the plans that were produced at that time. There are plans. There is funding in the Government Plan. I have to say I am going to be critical of the structure of the Government Plan because ... I have lost my bits of paper. I was going to show there are 3 different tables. I have to say this does happen a lot where the funding is spread all over the place. I take on board what Deputy Ozouf said to me in the tearoom yesterday. I think we need to do that better in terms of its presentation. If there is a project, there is no reason we cannot put all of the parts together for a project in there. But there is money in 2025 for the development. There is money beyond that for the development. I remind Members that there is an election next year and so we have no idea what will happen after that. It is so important that we first get the land, which we are very close to detailing, and I think we are going to be discussing this week to finalise having that land for the build, and then the planning permission and then work can start early next year in terms of the precursor work, et cetera. It has to be in place and ready to go before the next election, otherwise this is going to become a new hospital project. It will be delayed and delayed and delayed, so we have to take action now. I have to ask the Deputy where his financial plan is. We were sent an email that seemed to suggest: "Oh, I have contacted somebody and they said just be in contact with us and we will be fine." That is not a way to fund the project. If I was to bring a proposition to this Assembly and say: "Do not worry about the funding, there will be some money down the line from somebody somewhere" I would be laughed out of the Assembly. So we have to be really careful on these promises. I want to ask the Deputy to be clear as to whether he will be bringing a projet to the St. Helier Rates Assembly to ask for money from St. Helier to do this,

towards this project. Because we were at a Deputies meeting where we were giving a briefing on the rates and the situation within the Parish, and I thank the Constable and his staff for providing such a detailed presentation to us so we know where we are and we know why the rates will be what they are. But no mention was made of it then and I do not think we should be playing those games in the Assembly in that way. The staffing model I must return to because it is so important. If we are going to offer a facility what will the hours be? When will it be accessible? Who is going to staff that and who bears liability in the end? Where is this positioned in terms of running and the liability for any injuries, the liability for any situations that arise? A climbing wall, a pump track, all ... I am risk averse with my children, I must confess that. I was very risk averse with my children, but I would probably let them go on the climbing wall if their mother took them along because I could not cope with that. But there has to be a liability for anything that goes wrong and that needs to be detailed. I will finish because so much has been said. The proposition I believe is a distraction and I would say it is to some extent - and I really hope I am wrong but I cannot get away from it - masquerading as community engagement. It risks diverting attention, time and potentially millions of speculative cost just as we inch closer to the delivery of what our parishioners truly need. I urge Members to vote against the proposal and keep the focus on the future that our children deserve. But I will finish by saying I do support the use of spaces. We have been working with the Minister for Infrastructure to open up ... Deputy Stephenson, I have not spoken to the Deputy yet and I must do that - I just forgot; it was a busy day yesterday - about the way in which we are trying to open up all of the facilities that we have in schools for community use as well in the appropriate way. Again, I have to be the really boring party pooper here and say in an appropriate way with appropriate safeguarding so that schools are not affected and so that we can continue to use those facilities properly and they are not damaged, et cetera.

[10:30]

But we have to do things correctly and this is not the correct way to approach this. It does put a project at risk and I urge Members to reject this. Then we can move forward, build on the community projects that we have, add to them where we possibly can, but most importantly have the best facilities for our young children in St. Helier so they can walk through the park to go to school. Springfield becomes a park for the people in that area and St. Luke's and Springfield children have the best possible facilities they can have as soon as they possibly can. So I urge Members to reject this proposition.

2.1.9 Connétable M.A. Labey of Grouville:

Just to reiterate the voice of the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel, I was honoured to visit those schools. Janvrin School we have been to fairly recently, Rouge Bouillon, Springfield School and, indeed, St. Luke's School. That last school inspired me in many ways because I cannot believe the amount of make do and mend they have to put up with in that school in adequate premises - not great, but adequate - I would say. But truly inspiring to see the attitude of the principal there, the headteacher and their staff and how they cope with those facilities. Truly, I was inspired enough to think nothing can get in the way of this new school at Gas Place and I simply cannot support this proposition.

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

I am going to also include something else in this topic. I supported a little while ago a proposition brought by Deputy Gardiner in relation to the site of the fire station, which sits close by Rouge Bouillon School. At the time they were looking for sites in relation to a fire station and an ambulance station and that has bounced around. They were together, they were not together, et cetera. Gas Place site fits into the puzzle, as I have mentioned on numerous occasions when asked by the Scrutiny Panel. If we do not build the school at Gas Place site, I would like to ask those people that want to do something with Gas Place site where they think we are going to build a fire station. Because until

we resolve the issue with Rouge Bouillon School ... because surprisingly enough their facilities may be good in relation to some of the facilities in the school; however, they have no facilities for children around the school. Those schools are not up to the standard that they should be. I think we need to be quite clear that we need to ensure that we build schools where the majority of our population is living and hence that is St. Helier. We need to have good, modern schools and infrastructure. I am not going to go on about and follow what Deputy Ward has said because people have already said it. But when people consider when they think that this is a good idea or not to have a meanwhile use of the site in Gas Place ... and like others, from my perspective I have no issue with meanwhile use and I did not support the amendment because I will not - let us make this clear - support anything that has anything, any word, that includes Gas Place in it because I will only support the building of a school in Gas Place, as was promised in the previous Island Plan. I am not going to vote for anything that talks about Gas Place otherwise. We will be building a school there as far as I am concerned and then, once that school is built, all of the other bits of the puzzle will fall into place. We will be able to do something with Rouge Bouillon. We will be able to do something with St. Luke's. We will be able to do something with Springfield School. Those schools, all of those puzzles and all of those opportunities for the meanwhile use of some of those sites may fall into our laps. Once that is done and I can have a new fire station, I will agree to other things. At this stage I will not.

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

I am really struggling with this one, and I am listening closely to the speeches and I will listen to the summing up. I thought I knew which way I was going to vote on this proposition but what I am hearing is that there is clearly a strength of feeling about the school that is due to be built on this site. In terms of my own values, Members will certainly be aware that I have always advocated for children and the reason why I am struggling with this is because there are children on both sides of this. What I am hearing is that children may benefit or may feel a benefit one way or the other, whichever way this goes. I am trying to ascertain where the greatest benefit for children will lie. In terms of the school project on this site, I have not always agreed with a school being built on this site in the past because one of my other values is preserving green space, particularly in areas where lots of children live. Indeed, for my parishioners in St. Saviour, St. Saviour is quite built up in places and for those living on the St. Saviour/St. Helier border, in that area, Millennium Park is the largest green space that my parishioners in that area can access. So I have in the past felt quite passionately that that should be an extended green space rather than a school. But I do listen and I especially listen to my colleague Deputy Gardiner, who has laid out the reasons why a school is so desperately needed there. Of course, that is Deputy Gardiner advocating for her parishioners, and the Ministers have spoken about the need for that school as well. I would like to just hear, I think ... I am not sure if there are other relevant Ministers who are yet to speak on this. I want to really understand if we approve Deputy Warr's proposition will it 100 per cent certainly delay that school? I am not certain that it will delay the school and I need to hear a bit more on that. The concept of meanwhile use I think is a really good one and, as other Members may have also had conversations with Islanders who are passionate about children's play, I was shown a video of different types of meanwhile use. It is a really exciting concept and I think certainly for teenagers ... which when we are talking about children we do not often factor in the teenagers, do we? I think that the facilities that could potentially be put in place quite quickly on this site are really exciting. If this proposition is not approved, which I am sensing it is probably not going to be from the speeches that have been made - which does make me a bit sad because I had that feeling of excitement about the potential use - I would really like Ministers ... and Deputy Morel, I liked his speech because he also seemed excited about it. I would like Ministers to go away and consider how this could be done, perhaps with some more certainty around funding. Because I hear what Deputy Ward said - I think it was Deputy Ward - about needing that certainty around funding. That is another factor in my thinking. That is where my thinking is at the moment. I have not decided which way I am going to vote. I want to keep listening but those are the principles that I will be using when I make my decision.

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

I would like to thank Deputy Warr for bringing this proposition. I do think meanwhile use is a really good idea. If there is an open space and we can utilise it for children's play and teenagers, that is great, but in this case I think there is a very important need for this new school. It is also going to have a special area for children with special needs, La Passerelle, and I am a real proponent of that because they are not in a good place at the moment. Unfortunately, I am not able to support Deputy Warr on this occasion but I commend him for bringing this to us.

2.1.13 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

The previous speaker said it very well and very concisely. What I would say to Deputy Doublet is that if she thinks she needs to choose between a new school or extending an existing park ... which, okay, it is not Hyde Park but it is a substantial park already in a much needed area of town, one which would not have happened were it not for a ring-binder and for many proponents of that park. If she needs any convincing about which is more urgent, I do not know if she has been already but I encourage her to visit La Passerelle in her own constituency. She is nodding to say she has. I only went there last week for the first time myself, and I must say it was a complete eye-opener. It is something that I cannot unsee now that I know it. While we are talking about extending a park for people in that area of town to enjoy, the children at La Passerelle do not have any actual physical grass space they can go on. I should not say this, but I was so appalled by what I saw, not because the work that is going on there is not great, and there are some great teaching staff, they are in cramped facilities. We often overuse the word "vulnerable" children and "vulnerable" people perhaps too glibly, but these are literally vulnerable children, not just with special educational needs but also much more complex behavioural needs because of the start they have had in life. I was told about ... I think the staff there used the analogy about the cards that they have been dealt, not the greatest cards to start with, and then we as an Island have basically then dealt them completely insufficient portacabins, which are shoved into the corner of a car park and literally some astroturf which has been patched together, which is supposed to be their play area. I understand they cannot even access the shared facility of the small strip of Highlands' grass there, although they may have access to another tarmacked area for playing. I was really heartbroken to see that. In my mind, the choice about whether we give a little bit of extra park ... and, of course, these children will then have access to that park. They will have a school which is purpose built and is as good as they are going to get in terms of getting close to mainstream education. So there is that facility which, if you like, is bolted on which will no longer make them feel that they have to be hidden. Again, I do not like to use these terms but it feels to me - and I think I said it to the staff - as though this is Jersey's dirty little secret, that it is hidden away from the mainstream and that most people ... they seem to be forgotten about. So that is completely unacceptable. So for me if it is a choice between those 2 I know where firmly I do not want to see any possibility of delay, which I think this proposition certainly would cause. The other point is that we are not talking about the concept of meanwhile use. I think maybe the last debate was more to do around that. We are talking about a specific instance of meanwhile use which would have all these complications and have these knock-on effects. So when I hear Deputy Morel speaking about: "Oh, there are so many empty properties in government ownership which we need to do more with", if only there was a Minister who could do something about that. I do not know, maybe we would call him the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. If only that person had a way to influence government policy, I do not know, by maybe sitting round a table with other Government Ministers. Let us call it the Council of Ministers. He could advocate, and if only he had a budget where he could say: "What shall we do with these empty properties?" But, of course, that does not seem to be the case. Similarly, when we come to Deputy Warr's proposal, I am really concerned. Other Members have perhaps been too nice about this, and I thought Deputy Coles gave one of the best speeches I have heard him give. Because it was clinical. It was concise. Yes, it was incisive but completely necessarily so. Because what we have before us today is we have a proposition from a member of the Better Way, and looking at the page on the internet on Wikipedia

it talks about the Better Way as a group of independent politicians in Jersey. It does not enforce the party whip. Well, that is pretty obvious. But it did have 4 members who were elected, and it does say that they share values, and they pledge to work collaboratively together. Well, I do not see much evidence of that collaboration so far because I know Deputy Curtis stood up earlier in this debate and said that yesterday he was disappointed ... I will take a point now.

The Bailiff:

A point of clarification?

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

If the Deputy could clarify whether he believes I am a member of an affiliate independent party at this current time I would appreciate that.

Deputy M. Tadier:

How do we unpack that? A member of an independent, affiliate party; I am not sure I know what that means. All I know is that there were 4 Deputies who got elected under the banner of Better Way and they pledged to work collaboratively together to the public, and I think 4 of their 5 candidates got elected. What I do not see is any evidence of that collaborative working because rather than the way that Deputy Curtis portrayed it, what we have got here quite clearly is an unworkable - and I would say irresponsible - proposition that is being lodged by the former Minister for Housing, somebody who is well-known for his current stance of not wanting to build a much-needed school there, which I think I have made the case for, along with others who have done that much better than I have.

[10:45]

Because they cannot even support that policy, presumably he has not even discussed it with them. I think what we have seen is a face-saving amendment come forward to try and ameliorate it, to save the blushes of perhaps other Members who would have wanted to have seen something better come along in the first place. It is really unfortunate because what that means is that when we as Members get emails from members of the public, and we did get one recently because of course Deputy Warr set lots of hares running. I think he has promised things which ultimately I suspect in his heart of hearts he knows are not deliverable and certainly not politically feasible, promising all sorts of uses for climbing walls but also skate park uses. So we get emails from members of the public, well-intentioned and great people who do good work in the community, saying: "Would you be likely to support this use that is being lodged? I think it looks brilliant but I am keen to understand more perspectives." Of course we then have to go back and reply, which is fine, but say to them: "There are so many problems with this that it is just not viable." I think a lot of those problems have been listed. So I think rather than some colleagues being too harsh I think we do need to give this a quick dispatch. I think it has probably had a flattering amount of debate, to put it politely, and I would encourage to move to the debate and if we want to talk about general meanwhile uses there are lots of meanwhile uses. La Folie Inn I know is something that the Deputy started his speech with. That is something which if he or others do not think Ports of Jersey are acting quickly enough or in the public interest, that could certainly be transferred to general usage as public Jersey Property Holdings, and Government could get on making a use of it that they want to. But this is not what we are talking about today. We are not talking about generalities; we are talking about specifics. As we started yesterday and the day before, I think this is about putting children first and ultimately this irresponsible proposition does the very opposite of putting the most vulnerable children in our community first. The way to do that is to get the school built as quickly as possible and not to give false hope to groups who might otherwise seek to use the site and then be reluctant to give it up at a time when that building work is ready to go ahead.

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

I did want to speak on this because we are talking about my neighbourhood. I live there. I was looking on Google Maps before to work out if I was in the 50-metre parameter to be eligible to put a third party appeal in and I think I might just about be. I say that because this is my neighbourhood, my community, I am there all the time, I am in the Millennium Park multiple times every day and I stop and speak to constituents and neighbours when I am there. I see the playpark - obviously not at the moment because it is being redone - being used to its full extent all the time and people out there enjoying themselves when the weather is good. What a vital amenity space that is for that community. That is why I do think that it is right that in this Assembly we are frank about this proposition and the calibre of it because this Assembly is a serious institution which makes serious decisions, which can have a serious impact on the people who we represent. It is because of that we have a duty to make sure that what is debated on the floor of this Chamber is as credible as possible. The Deputy in his opening speech spoke about positive politics. Of course, who could disagree with the concept of positive politics? But politics is not positive if what you propose is not underpinned with credibility. If it is not underpinned with that then what you are offering people is false hope, and that is corrosive to politics. The reason I oppose this proposition is because it simply is not credible and we have been given - even by its proposer - so many things that are contradictory. We received the other day an email from the Deputy purporting to try to debunk myths around this proposition, which in fact confused the matter even more. That email comes with a timeline of how this might be delivered, which - as Deputy Coles pointed out - involves time travel because part of that timeline includes time that has elapsed. It shows stages in the delivery of the new school and a potential meanwhile use that are completely incompatible with parts of the timeline that have been explained in the Government's comments to this, which say that the site is already being used for something and at the point that site stops being used for what it is currently being used, is when some of the enabling works will then begin for the school. Which means that there simply is not time for a meanwhile use, so that part of his explanation is not credible. He then wanted to talk about the funding of this because his proposition under its financial and staffing implications says that there are not any. I just imagine if one of my party members brought forward something like that, that made such a claim, the short shrift it would be given. But his makes this claim with no credibility underpinning it at all. In his email to us he provides a line, 2 sentences from a charity suggesting funding will be made available. Members can read those 2 sentences themselves. That absolutely is not a clear and defined funding offer which can be reliable in any sense at all. It also ignores the fact that if somehow we manage to magic out some time for a meanwhile use to be allocated for this site, and that goes towards some kind of youth facility, there will be all sorts of things that will need to be done to ensure that is safe and appropriate for the young people who would use it. That will include all of the assessments needed on safeguarding and it will require staffing to make sure that any children or young people using that facility are well supervised and kept safe by professionals who know what they are doing. Where are they coming from? Are they going to be sourced out in the private sector using private funding, of which there has not been a credible explanation for where that is going to come to. Or will they come from government resources and government staffing, in which case there are financial and staffing implications which are not given adequately in either the proposition report or subsequent correspondence from the Deputy. So the reason that I vote against this for my neighbours and for my community is because I think they are being sold false hope on something that has not been credibly put together. I do not think that is a fair thing to do for them. Absolutely we should be looking to get the best use out of the sites that we own and everything that goes with that, and that will include building a brilliant new primary school on that site for the children in our community to benefit from, and we must not be diverted from that at all. But it must not involve tantalising those people with a prospect of something that will never come to fruition. I think that is an unfair thing to do to them. It is something that frankly Government already does too much and I worry that we let things get in the way of that new primary school and it becomes the next hospital project where we end up pushing things over the line into a new term of office and they just get reset again and again and again. In the meantime facilities deteriorate, costs go up, and people

do not get to benefit from those facilities that frankly our political system should be enabling to take place. So I think it is right that we are stern with the Deputy for providing what may at first glance look like a nice idea but we should castigate him for not having done the proper work underpinning it and for giving false hope to people on something for which there is simply no credibility could be delivered. That is why we should give this short shrift and vote against it.

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

I am pleased to follow Deputy Mézec, but I would also like to comment, I wish we were all so perfect, in terms of what he has just said. I would like to begin by recognising that this proposition originates from a place of genuine intent. It has been brought forward by the Deputy, who is making a sincere effort to help others appreciate the potential opportunities at Gas Place. It is ... sorry?

The Bailiff:

Perhaps we could avoid anything that might be an interruption.

Deputy K.M. Wilson:

Thank you. It is during the interim period while we are waiting for a new school. At its most basic level it is asking the Government to sweat its assets and to put the space to good use while we are waiting. We are waiting. We have been waiting a hell of a long time for something to happen. Nothing more than that. We have all walked past boarded buildings and vacant lots in the Parishes and asked ourselves: "Why is nothing going on here?" In many cases the answer is that the development is coming but it might take one, 2, 4, 5 years, even 15 years in some cases. But what is at the heart of this are the plans for educational estate, which do need to be clarified. I also feel that these are at the heart of the resistance to Deputy Warr's proposals. Deputy Millar has said funding for the school at Gas Place is available up until 2028 but we have got no certainty at the moment as to what happens after that. The question is, are we seriously saying that we will start to build something without any guarantee that money is going to be available to take a capital project through to completion, because that is what it sounds like. So in the meantime why do we not test the concept of meanwhile use. Gas Place is an ideal test bed. It is a hugely political site, as we have witnessed this morning, and the arguments made as to why the school needs to remain there have been well made, but it is also a site that gives opportunities to create something different, to bring some vibe and energy in the space for a short term. It is a proven and effective means of activating space and if any of us have had the opportunity to visit some of the major capital cities across Europe you will see this all over the place. One of the things that is really good is these spaces engage young people and we have got a problem engaging young people, so why do we not think differently about how we are engaging young people and look at initiatives like this to see whether this would be a lever for change, to get them engaged in understanding the importance of the public realm and even thinking about the public realm for the future. There is nothing wrong with pop-up approaches in cities and towns. As I said before, it has been an idea that is well-evidenced all over the place. Neither is it a case for defending the plans for the school. As I have said before, the arguments have been well made but this is a proposal to unlock the value from assets that are otherwise lying dormant at the moment. Having spoken to young people I do not accept that will disappoint if we raise expectations. I think my point is that having spoken to young people about the sorts of ideas that can go on here they would be very excited and engaged to be part of something new and different. On that basis I think we have to test this and I do think we have to think differently, be less risk averse, and create and encourage civic participation in this sort of space. That is the reason why I am supporting Deputy Warr's proposition.

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

I was pleased to read this proposition because it took me back in time about 20 years, when I was working for the Arts Trust and was fortunate enough to attend the Trans Europe Halles conference

in Berlin, which focused on the use of disused buildings and art spaces and facilities that were then in those disused buildings in Berlin.

[11:00]

I had a very good time visiting a number of those facilities. But what was apparent from that is they were buildings and spaces that had no other purpose and what did start off as temporary uses did in fact turn out to be long term and permanent uses. But we did come back from that conference and think about what we could do for the Island and look at where there were disused spaces and how they could be used for the arts and cultural sector. I remember at the time one project that we set up was the use of the Westmount Quarry space for local artists. But that was set up under very clear parameters, very clear agreements with the artists around what they would be responsible for, what the Parish as the owner of that space would be responsible for, but also when a vacation of that space would be required. We also looked at lots of pop-up art spaces. Some were more suitable than others and we had a lot of fun setting up those art spaces, and I think opened up public art to lots of people that would not have seen it. But my problem with this proposition is that what it is requesting us to do is spend an untargeted use of public service time and money. What the proposition is asking us to do is request the Minister for Treasury and Resources to get her team to do work and Andium Homes' team to do work with unnamed stakeholders on an unknown project for a timeframe that appears to be - for reasons that have been outlined by my colleague Deputy Coles and Deputy Mézec - completely unreasonable. I do not think that is an efficient and effective use of public service time or public resources. I would rather the Treasury officials and Andium Homes be able to focus on the job that they are set to do. Deputy Doublet asked about delays. Yes, I do firmly believe that this is a tactic to delay and debunk the school plans, but further than that, I think that putting resources into this when we have no clear plans would have the possible cause of delaying other work that is being done by Government. We do not have civil servants sat in Union Street twiddling their thumbs, waiting for a project to do. That said, I look at this proposition and what it does and what it does not do. What it does not do is set up a project that is feasible, but if an independent group with actual plans brought forward a business case, nothing currently would prevent consideration of it. So passing or not passing of this proposition does not prevent future meanwhile use if somebody comes up with a feasible business plan or business case. But that business case needs to ensure public safety, funding sources, and staffing solutions as well as details about how the site will be made good and return to the public so that it can be used to build the school. We do not have that at the moment so I cannot support this proposition. I cannot support a proposition which effectively asks me to waste public sector time on a pipedream. To answer Deputy Doublet's question, Deputy Doublet was talking about the benefit to children; children cannot benefit from a pipedream. They can benefit from us budgeting and using our resources well to get the very best outcomes but this proposition does not do that. I also want to answer Deputy Wilson because she almost described the need to increase vibrancy in the area. Well, it is my constituency and St. Helier Central is incredibly vibrant. The park is incredibly busy and we have got lots and lots and lots of children and families that really do need that new town primary school, and I will object to anything that will cause delay to that very needed school. But if a group had a decent business case and they knew where the funding was coming from then I would absolutely support any intent for meanwhile use of any of our buildings. But that is not what we have got in front of us at the moment. I do feel sorry for the people who have been encouraged to spend their time and effort on this and I think that this is a waste of a States proposition and States time. If people can put together a business case I think that would be the way to go, but it certainly does not require a proposition in the Assembly to take that forward.

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

I was going to start by saying that I was pleased to follow the Deputy and what I thought was a very professional approach to her speech and the way she was explaining things until I think the last sentence, to say that it should not be in the Assembly and take up the time because I have quite

enjoyed some of the contributions today and the thoughts that it has sparked among some. I think there is quite a clear message from this Assembly today to the Government that meanwhile use is something important that a lot of us feel quite strongly about, that there are opportunities there. I particularly like Deputy Catherine Curtis's idea that perhaps there should be a more formal structure that Government could use to look at meanwhile use, maybe some guidance and way to approach it. I think that certainly warrants some further consideration and I would be very happy to try and work with the Deputy or others, or maybe Government could take it away themselves to work on. I wanted to share a couple of examples of meanwhile use that I have come across in the last couple of years. The first is the skatepark down at the New North Quay. That was very much a meanwhile use to the point that the planning permit for it had an expiry date on it, and when it did expire the skate park closed, and everybody knew that was coming. Yes, there were a couple of people who said: "Can it not stay for longer?" but, no, Ports wanted the land back, there had been an agreement, there was a planning permit, it closed. It is a shame Government had not quite got its act together and had a town skate park to replace it by then but I am reassured by the Minister for Infrastructure that those plans are very much in the pipeline. That was a meanwhile use and it worked well. The other one that I was directly involved with was finding a home for the special needs gymnastics club. That is effectively a meanwhile use of a space up at Fort Regent that was not all entirely being used, and for a club that really needed a home. That again was made very, very clear to the club and to everybody else that was a meanwhile use until Fort Regent closed for work to begin. Again I would say I think that has worked well. The one where perhaps it was a little bit trickier was around Les Creux and when notice was given by the Bowls Club up there. I certainly encountered first-hand how it is not always easy to get meanwhile use agreed. There are lots of different considerations, lots of different things at play and sometimes you really have to fight for that discussion to even be had in the first place. That is just a few reflections on that. I really do hope that we take some of the positives from this debate about meanwhile use going forward because I think there is widespread agreement in this Assembly that we do not always do it as well as we could do and there are huge opportunities there. I wanted to just add in response to Deputy Coles a little bit about pump tracks because it is mentioned in the proposition. Pump tracks are really important for development of things like co-ordination and balance in small children, older children, adults even as well. They provide really simple but very effective ways to exercise, to have fun, for mental and physical well-being. We do have one up at Les Creux already, although it is a kind of slightly unofficial one in places, and I think there are aspirations from some in the Island that every Parish should have its own small pump track, that small children can go and learn to ride their bikes on, and older children can learn to be a bit more adventurous on as well. They are certainly very valuable things in a community that can be very effective in quite a simple way as well. Far from wanting to ... I think the words were "be stern" and "castigate" which the definition is "to reprimand severely" so I am not quite sure it is the job of us to be telling each other off in quite that way really in this Assembly. I think it would have to take something extremely serious for to want to feel that way towards one of my colleagues and I think it is shame that those words have been used. I would like to take the positives from this debate today and look forward and, like I say, with Deputy Catherine Curtis's idea I think there is some merit in looking at meanwhile use in a wider form.

2.1.18 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

If I start with perhaps a small digression but I hope the relevance to this proposition will become clear pretty quickly. Yesterday we had an unedifying display. Ministers at war with each other. One Minister accusing another of not having discussed a proposition with his colleague, and the Chief Minister reduced to pleading in public with his Ministers, first to support the Residential Tenancy Law proposition and then a second time to reject a referral to Scrutiny. Those pleas of course fell on deaf ears. I think it was 12 Ministers rejected his entreaties; a majority of the Government.

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

Sir, may I ask the Deputy to give way for a point of clarification please?

The Bailiff:

Would you give way ...

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, I will, yes.

The Bailiff:

Yes, Chief Minister.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Could the Deputy give tangible evidence to support what he has just said because I do not recognise any of it?

The Bailiff:

Well, are you able to clarify with reference to numbers and individuals I suppose, Deputy?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, well, I can reference the speech by ...

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Just to be clear ...

Deputy J. Renouf:

Sir, I am trying to reply to the Chief Minister's point.

The Bailiff:

Yes, if you will give me a moment, Deputy Renouf. Chief Minister, do you want to clarify your point of clarification? In other words, do you want to clarify what it is you are asking for from Deputy Renouf?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I think Deputy Renouf once again was grossly embellishing the facts that he was referring to ...

The Bailiff:

Well, no, Chief Minister ...

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

... and I would like him to clarify and provide evidence ...

The Bailiff:

Please switch it off.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

... of what he said, thank you.

The Bailiff:

We can switch it on again, thank you. Chief Minister, it is not a time for a speech in the matter, whether you believe that your position has been misrepresented or not. If you wish for Deputy Renouf to give clarification then you must please specify the clarification that you wish him to give. If you would like to withdraw that intervention then of course that is your prerogative to do so.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Well, he presented a picture of Ministers at war and I think that is quite wrong and ...

The Bailiff:

No, Chief Minister, what you are doing is saying you do not ...

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

... he should not be able to say things like that ...

The Bailiff:

Chief Minister, the Chair is speaking. What you are doing is simply saying you do not agree with what the Deputy has said, and often Members use a point of clarification because they do not like what has been said. But a point of clarification is exactly that. It allows Members either to clarify what they have said in their own speech, or to seek clarification from the person who is speaking at that moment or has immediately stopped speaking. If you are merely seeking to correct the Deputy but it is not asking him to clarify anything then that is not an appropriate use of this particular procedural tool. So, Chief Minister, on the assumption that you have said what you would wish to say then we can proceed, otherwise if you wish further clarification perhaps you could simply ask what it is you would like the Deputy to clarify.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Well, Sir, I think I perhaps stand corrected but I just think it is important when Members speak to the Assembly they portray an accurate picture. There is unfortunately nothing in Standing Orders to allow us to address that so, thank you, and I apologise for wasting anybody's time.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much, Chief Minister. Would you like to continue, Deputy Renouf?

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes, Sir. I would reference the speech by the Minister for the Environment which very clearly accused the Minister for Housing of not having raised something. I would also reference the fact that a majority of Ministers - I think it was a majority, I will stand to be corrected on that if I have got my sums wrong - voted against the Chief Minister and that does sound suspiciously like what could at least colloquially be called a war. I will accept it was not a rebellion; we do not allow the word "rebellion" because luckily everyone had permission to vote against the Chief Minister.

[11:15]

The point I am trying to make here is that after the debacle of that debate it is good to see the Ministers find themselves in a much happier place today with unity restored, all playing together because, by good fortune, the current item of business offers something around which they can all unite, which is attacking Deputy Warr's proposition. Is that a harsh claim? I do not think so because of this simple reason. Every speech we have heard today from Ministers and their supporters are attacking the proposition for faults which would have been remedied had they accepted the amendment yesterday. They could not accept the amendment because that would have made the proposition dangerously acceptable. Much harder to argue against. I think it is clear why there were hardly any speeches from Ministers yesterday. They did not really have a case against the amendment at all, they just wanted it to go away. The Minister for Infrastructure did not offer any arguments against the amendment. Deputy Millar at least stood up to try and make the Government's case against the amendment, kudos for that, but since she sat down again after 16.5 seconds I think it is fair to say that he speech was not a full and detailed rebuttal of the arguments. Incidentally the speech was so short it is quite hard to find on the recording for me to get the timing. Deputy Rob Ward was the

only other Minister to speak on the amendment but as far as I could see the substance of his speech could be summed up by the phrase “guilt by association”. The whole enterprise, proposition and amendment, was just a bit too school adjacent, smelling, as it did, of the potential whiff that it might cause a delay to the school, which would be a valid objection of the amended proposition would have taken control away from Ministers, but of course it would not have. Had the amendment been passed then Government would have retained complete control of all the options. So where have we ended up in today’s debate? Exactly where Deputy Alex Curtis said it would, with a whole load of speeches raising objections that could have been avoided if the amendment had been supported. Deputy Ferey talked about the danger a meanwhile use could overrun its stay and be hard to remove. Well, the amendment would have left the type of meanwhile use to be decided by the Government, which could have been a commercial use and, therefore, defined in a contract. Just to remind Members, the amendment said “provided such meanwhile use does not impede any long-term plans for future development”. That amendment would have removed, at a stroke, most of the Ministerial objections. Deputy Millar’s second intervention mentioned the use that ROK is putting to the site and raised the prospect that it might be ended if the proposition were passed, and that the empty spaces currently on the site are not suitable for the proposed uses. Well, again, had the amendment been passed all these arguments would have fallen away. Commercial uses could have continued. She said that Andium would implicitly have to raise funds, but not if the amendment had passed because that would have widened the criteria to include commercial uses. Deputy Coles went down a rabbit hole about the Eiffel Tower when nothing in the proposition suggests a new building. More to the point, the amendment would have allowed the Government to continue the existing meanwhile uses which would not have needed planning permission. Deputy Rob Ward also raised questions about funding and so on, which I have already dealt with. Deputy Le Hegarat mentioned that she would not support anything that damaged the prospect of building school but, as I said earlier, I repeat the key clause that could have been supported by the Government: “provided such use does not impede any long-term plans for future development”. Could it have been any clearer? The inescapable conclusion is that the amendment was rejected in order to maintain clear lines of attack on the proposition, to keep Ministers and their supporters in their comfort zone with a clear target to aim at. In my view Deputy Warr perhaps did not do himself any favours in this regard by allying himself a bit too closely with people who want to stop the school at Gas Place, and pursuing his agenda in what you might call perhaps a rather partisan way. Although I do not think I am the person to tell anyone how to navigate a proposition successfully through this Assembly so I am not going to pursue that line any further. The Government has come up with some objections to the proposition which, thankfully for them, does not now include the amendment otherwise they would all have been struggling to find arguments that kept them on their feet for more than 16.5 seconds. But of course it is easy to come up with objections if that is your desire. Most of them, I have to say, take aim at the report that accompanies the proposition, rather than the proposition. It is disappointing that nobody in the Government put their foot on the ball and asked themselves the question: “Is there something positive we could get out of this? What could we do to make a really positive signal that we are rising above the petty stuff? That we hear the significant public support for the ideas that Deputy Warr has raised?” If they could not bring themselves to support the proposition why not support Deputy Alex Curtis’s amendment, and if they could not support the amendment why not amend the amendment, or amend the proposition themselves? It is a shame that Deputy Morel’s more positive comments did not find expression in a more positive action by the Council of Ministers, although at least he made a notably generous speech. This whole debate and this whole proposition feels like a missed opportunity. I have to confess there is a sense in which I think I inadvertently contributed to this proposition. A couple of years ago I visited friends of mine in Copenhagen and wrote a social media post about a place they took me. I know the proposer was among several people who picked up on that post. It concerned an area of Copenhagen called Reffen. It is a former dock area adjacent to the now famous energy from waste plant in the city. Many Members may have seen it. It has a climbing wall up the outside of it, it has a dry ski run down the slope of the roof, a garden leading up to that roof and a bar

on the top to enjoy the view. Nearby is this area of Reffen, it was a ship yard with buildings that were no longer in use and it was surrounded by a fairly large open area. It has been turned into the largest street food market in Europe with the disused buildings being used for an art gallery and some sports facilities. It is eventually zoned for redevelopment as housing but in the meantime they have put the site to good use. It is a much larger scale example of what we could be doing here if we really put our minds to it. The difference in Copenhagen is that their starting point is to build in meanwhile use. It is axiomatic that sites will be used; it is the starting point. That of course I do not think we can say, with the best will in the world, is the case here in Jersey. I think that was a challenge the Council of Ministers could have risen to, rather than choosing to vote against an amendment and then choose to defeat the proposition. We did not cover ourselves in glory as an Assembly yesterday. Last night I went for a restorative swim and met some parishioners as we bobbed around out in the bay, and I tried to explain what had happened in the day's debate on the Residential Tenancy Law to them. They laughed their heads off. What did I expect, was the thrust of their commentary. We continually find ways to disappoint them and I fear we are doing it again today. The proposition is another missed opportunity. Accepting the amendment would have made the proposition eminently acceptable. There was a more uplifting response from the Government that could have been reached for. I would say the Government has achieved its objective in a rather dispiriting way. The debate has been shifted on to terrain around which the Council of Ministers can happily unite. It feels to me they prefer to get into their comfort zone and, as I say, it is successful. I will as a consequence abstain. I do not think I can support the proposition unamended. I will abstain but with sadness at the missed opportunity.

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

I am impressed by a number of the speeches that have been made and I know that the public after this week will be wondering what on earth is going on in our Assembly because there is, from a Back-Bencher's point of view, a lack of clarity on a number of issues which one looks to the Executive. I know the Executive is in a difficult position. I thought it was unfair, if I may say, to single out the Minister for Treasury and Resources in any critical way. She has, I know, a difficult job, as all Ministers have, but those Ministers who have to put together ... which is my point in wanting to rise to say a precautionary support for Deputy Warr's proposition is I think where I have ended up on this. The lack of clarity about ... Deputy Renouf said the Government has got what it wanted. Yes, the Government has got what it wanted but we are not any clearer, and I am not any clearer ... as I am a Deputy of St. Saviour with St. Luke's school - I am going to get my geographies wrong for a second - Springfield, Janvrin, and the former d'Hautree School and special education needs facility being in our constituency and needing undoubtedly investment. But then I am not sure that we have had clarity, if I may, about the budgetary arrangements for these important schools that do need - as other Members have said - investment because there is not sufficient outside space. Rouge Bouillon, when I was a Deputy of St. Helier needed to have outside space and they have done a marvellous job since then. But I think where some of us are confused, because we have not been told, is where are the heads of expenditure for Gas Place School, what is it replacing, where is the head of expenditure and what is the priority that the Council of Ministers are making for the upgrade or relocation of Rouge Bouillon? The Constable of St. Helier is not here today and I realise that he has got a difficult position being an Assistant Minister, he has got a longstanding view that the Millenium Town Park should be extended and, as I understand it, extended in a way that is not in line with the extant approval that the Bridging Island Plan did, which is to give an education use, which was previously a housing use, which caused Andium to buy the site for £10 million. There needs to be a timeline of what has gone wrong so that we can learn to make better decisions. Debating is a good thing and I really do feel for Deputy Warr because, like other Members ... and I am sure that is the case for Deputy Curtis, and I apologise if I did not quite get the right issue, but I thought that I was voting against Deputy Curtis and in favour of the underlying proposition because of what the recital of the proposition says. There has been a lot of talk about the ancillary issues of the report

and the subsequent chitchat, either in this place ... sorry, we do not chitchat, we speak to you, Sir, and other Members listen, but the stuff that is outside that has gone on in email or whatever. Members discuss about a proposition, it is not a principle but it is a request that a Minister or the Council of Ministers do something. That proposition is: "Upon vacation of the current users until such time as a long-term development commences, meanwhile use shall be beneficial to the community." I am not going to repeat it all because we have heard it from the Assistant Greffier. That is the point where it was not beneficial to the community, now, what is the definition of that? I took the meaning and still take the meaning, and look forward to the Deputy summing up, that it was basically a community use. A community use is not, I do not think, a commercial use. Have I bored people so much?

The Bailiff:

I am sorry; we are not quorate.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I am so sorry, Sir.

The Bailiff:

It is not your fault. We are not quorate. Could I invite Members please to return to the Chamber? It takes a while to establish whether we are quorate or not because we have to check online as well of course. We are now quorate. Please do continue, Deputy.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Thank you, I know the Assembly has been sitting for a long time. But there is an oddity of the last sitting before the summer break in all sorts of ways in propositions being heard. But Members from different constituencies and representing different interests do need to be heard.

[11:30]

Whatever Members may vote, they have learnt a lot from this debate on issues that matter to the people that they represent. There are some important questions which, whatever the outcome of the vote, are absolutely clear as a result of this debate about the clarity that is needed on the funding of Gas Place School or otherwise. I do not know. The Minister for Treasury and Resources helped us well; thank you for her comments. I am not clear that the Government's very strident and incredibly it has been said ... we have had a debate for a long time so I am not going to go through it but there are a lot of holes and a lot of really quite unfair holes, if I may say, towards the Deputy in the Minister for Infrastructure's comments. It is not a personal comment to him but there are a number of things that are not really fair. It is not that they are not true it is just that it is stretching a point at great extent. The indicative funding; at the end of the day what we are only going to get certainty about is when we have an approved head of expenditure for a school on Gas Place and we know that it can be built. In the meanwhile, a meanwhile use is what we need, and I favour a meanwhile use for community benefits. We are going to know what the budget is. I lament the fact that it is not a multi-year budget. We know that we are not going to get certainty and some members of the Reform Party have said that it is going to be an election issue. I think we know we are not going to get certainty about the funding for this school on the gasworks in this Budget. All we are going to see is an indicative arrangement, at the moment £34.5 million is I think put in for the future, but I cannot see this school getting built even if at the maximum stretching of what the Minister for Treasury and Resources has helpfully explained to us is there, I am not sure that £34.5 million (a) is certain, and (b) is never going to be disputed with other allocations that are going to be needed because we know the Minister for Treasury and Resources has got a very difficult job. So in the election that this issue may be about we are not going to be certain that the gasworks school is going to be built. I am not going to be able to tell, my Constable and my other representatives in St. Saviour are not going to be able to tell our constituents - and of course St. Helier too - that St. Luke's is going to be rebuilt. We are not going to be able to give any certainty because we cannot. So this is going to largely potentially

be an election issue. I urge the Council of Ministers to do whatever they can to give us clarity, as Deputy Wilson said, on the school estate. It is very difficult to close schools and it is very difficult for the children and parents of those schools to not know whether or not those schools are going to be closed or not in the decisions about whether or not they move house or get in the right catchment area or whatever. These are real people. We have got a falling birth rate. Those parents that are thinking about where their kids are going to go to primary school have got some decisions to make and they will make decisions, but we cannot give them any certainty because we are not going to be able to give certainty for the parents of St. Luke's or otherwise who do a great job in difficult circumstances. There is going to be no certainty for the future primary school children in Rouge Bouillon. It is a bit of a pickle. I am going to be voting in favour of Deputy Warr's proposition because until the facts change I am going to support Deputy Warr and I urge Members also to support him, to say what ... not is said outside anything else but what the proposition says, which until there is certainty for the future of gasworks - I am mindful that the Constable wants to change it to a thing - of a school, a meanwhile use for community use should be made. When the Council of Ministers ... hopefully in the Budget debate we can hear the certainty of the absolute clarity of what we are going to do, then I am going to change my mind and say: "No, we do not need meanwhile use because we are now going to have that budget" or: "A meanwhile use for community use should be advanced." But there is no reason why meanwhile use for community benefit cannot happen. We all know that the commercial use at the moment is only half the use of the site and that development is going to come to an end because it is going to be finished building quite quickly. So an alternative meanwhile use for community benefit seems to be absolutely the right thing to do. I congratulate Deputy Warr on getting forward a charitable organisation that is well-resourced, as I understand it. I do not know what he can say or cannot but I understand it is a well-resourced charitable organisation whose very essence is doing this kind of thing. Well done Deputy Warr for doing that, if I may say. It is the best solution out with certainty for all those other primary schools. I do not think there is a single Member in this Assembly that can predict the future past one year that is going to give certainty for all of these primary schools, particularly in the special educational needs world, and the understanding of how kids need to be educated with proper outdoor space. I do not think the Assembly has done itself any favours in hacking apart a Deputy's well-intentioned proposition, having worked on it, he is a constituency representative of the area and he has been basically dissected and thrown out and, as Deputy Renouf has said, maybe what the Council of Ministers had in their mind. After this week's shenanigans, because one does want to say it is a shenanigans when Ministers are basically ... albeit sometimes there are majority votes and they have got collective responsibility and sometimes they have not. We want a Government that is stable, certain, knows what it is doing and is giving Members clear impressions, clear indications, clear budgets and clear planning so that we can either hold them to account, propose different items or not. At the moment we are in fog. That is the reason why I thank Deputy Warr for having done ... I know the Constable of St. Helier is not here but I know his views about the Millenium Town Park, and when the facts change again I will change my mind. Would I have changed my mind on the ring-binder vote? I do not know. I would have liked an underground car park but I was not there. When facts change we can have a meanwhile use ... but at the moment, meanwhile use for community benefit until the Council of Ministers brings up the certainty of what that site can be used for. Otherwise we are forced into a difficult position, and I refer to the remarks made by Deputy Renouf, which is quite correct.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the proposition? If no other Member wishes to speak then I close the debate and call upon Deputy Warr to respond.

2.1.20 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

We got there in the end, and I thank Members for their contributions today. My last count is that for a proposition that is a waste of this Assembly's time we have had 18 speakers on it so it is interesting

to be summed up as a waste of time because sadly that means those 18 people who have spoken have wasted their time. I want to start at the end because I think Deputy Ozouf hits the nail on the head. The fog of funding. The whole point of bringing in a meanwhile use is to have something going on productively on this site. He talks about the clarity of budgeting arrangement, clarity of funding. We have got only indicative funding. We do not even know if we are going to get this school built. We do not even know if there is the money to start it and kick it off. There is just absolutely fog, so thank you to Deputy Ozouf for coming out with that in a straightforward way. Thank you also to Deputy Renouf. I take some of the battering but the other main point he makes is it is a starting point. It is a starting point. Let us start somewhere. When are we going to start doing stuff? When are we going to start doing stuff now? The challenge here - as he correctly says - is we always seem to find a way to disappoint the electorate and the public and no wonder doubt what we are about and what we are doing. There is so much in here. Deputy Wilson, level for change, unlocking the value, less risk averse. Yes, all of that. Let us just get a bit more creative on it. All I see from Reform is delay, fear, angst, no good ideas, no vision, just negativity right the way through every single speech. It is not even worth dissecting the speeches because they are all so negative and they fundamentally make me depressed. The word "can't" keeps coming to mind. To come back to Deputy Millar, Deputy Ferey, Deputy Gardiner; this is about now. This is about doing stuff now. We know there is going to be a school built. We want to get on and deal with stuff now. Therefore, I am going to just carry on. I will not bother with any other commentary on here I am just going to read the speech I have prepared for this. Meanwhile use is about action. It is about using assets we have at our disposal to solve a need today. I think we all get the principle, the need for action now, but for some weird reason we are getting caught up in the minutiae and seeking to vote down a proposition that could be a wonderfully collaborative community healer. Rather than thinking of ourselves as political adversaries, let us imagine we are all friends working together. What could we achieve together? Never before have we needed action today for our teenage population. The evidence is right in front of us if we choose to look at it. We have an existential problem with our teenage population today. In yesterday's debate at no point did anyone mention the word "data". It seems a fearful word in this Assembly, data. Here is the data. In the C.A.M.H.S. annual report of 2024 the number of young people open to C.A.M.H.S. at the end of 2024 was 1,949. Back in 2019, before COVID, that number was 721. The problem has nearly tripled in size. Tripled. This is not anecdote or in my inbox; these are cold, hard facts. We have an existential problem. In addition to that we have a waiting list to get a diagnosis of 2 years. A meanwhile use provision can at least start to make some roads into this crisis. Never forget that behind every statistic is a real human being. A family in crisis. A child in crisis. Surely we need to be doing something now while longer term facilities are provided. I remind the Assembly that the annual price tag for running C.A.M.H.S. is just under £6 million, and only going in one direction: up. What are we doing to stop this disaster? Why do I say that? Because new referrals are running at 100 per month. Which part of the word "crisis" do people not understand? The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning in the Assembly recently bemoaned the fact that despite falling numbers in schools the cost of education was not going down. Why? Because of the huge increase in special educational needs. Minister, what is it that you do not get about "meanwhile use"? What is it you do not get about doing something constructive now? You have done it with mobile phones; why not show leadership here as well. We all want to put children first, well, let us do that by voting for this proposition. The Minister for Social Security yesterday in the R.T.L. (Residential Tenancy Law) debate referenced the *Life on the Rock* publication, telling the Assembly: "We should be listening to our young people." I absolutely agree. But, Minister, do not just talk, walk the walk. Vote for something positive, vote for meanwhile use. Actions speak far louder than words. I remind her that in one of the surveys, 42 per cent of young people selected "better places for young people to spend time and play in their local area" as one of the top 5 things that would improve life on this Island. A plug and play modular facility on the Gas Place site now surely goes some way to acknowledge the need. I remind Assembly Members the need is now. The Minister for Social Security failed to mention other commentary made by our young people.

[11:45]

The Jersey Youth Parliament has produced 2 reports to which I would like to refer. One in November 2022, and the other in September 2023, entitled the Right to Play campaign. They are incredibly powerful, and there is a consistent theme that runs through both of them. The cost of accessing suitable spaces, the accessibility of these spaces, and, finally, their location. To quote: “First of all, lower all the prices, we are kids. It is not like we have a full-time job, and our parents cannot give us loads of money.” Did we listen? No, we did not. We are shutting down the largest free indoor space in this Island, namely Fort Regent, for the next 3 years and replacing it with absolutely no alternative provision for at least another 3 years. This year, aMazin! maze closes. We have already seen the loss of Tamba Park. Why are we so incapable of doing something positive now? When asked: “What would you like to see in Jersey?” It was quite a simple request: “Just more hangout spots for teenagers. Preferably just a space where we can meet up and sit in, maybe like huts, benches or something. Somewhere we can go during cold weather.” It is not a huge ask, but here we are debating whether creating an interesting meanwhile space now is necessary. It absolutely is. I remind Members this report is dated 2022, and we have done nothing to accommodate this request. We have done the complete opposite. We shut down the only town skatepark 18 months ago and only now are thinking about a South Hill location for which there is still no planning permission. We have simply not been listening to the voters of tomorrow. It is all jam tomorrow. Meanwhile use is jam today. We know we have a health system in crisis, one that is currently consuming more and more of this Island’s resources. Dr Andrew McLaughlin, the Government’s chief executive, stated in a recent Scrutiny hearing that what Jersey decides to do with health will be seen as its sixth historic policy choice. It is as big as its choice on tax and spend. Not using this brownfield site now, while further plans are developed, is an incredible waste of resources. We must do all we can to prevent poor health and well-being outcomes rather than waiting 3 years for them to surface. Surely that is a major policy choice. We are so incapable of joining up the dots. How much more evidence do we need before we realise that we have an existential problem that is only getting worse? The health statistics in the Children and Young People Survey 2024 also makes for sobering read. Forty per cent of year 6 children in urban areas are overweight or obese, while 82 per cent of teens do not meet physical activity criteria of one hour a day. A play provision in the centre of town now is surely so obvious that in reality we should not be having this debate at all. The Minister for Health and Social Services and Assistant Ministers, meanwhile use can help reduce the burden on your department now, not in 3 years’ time, but now. The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, if we have fitter and healthier kids, that is a more productive future workforce. The Minister for Treasury and Resources, if we have fitter and healthier young people, that saves millions on your budget. Everyone wins. Voting against this proposition means everyone loses. The Island loses, families lose, young people lose. Meanwhile use is about doing something now. It is not political, it is simply the right thing to do. It is time that the Council of Ministers and the Chief Minister demonstrate leadership and backbone, look our youth in the eye and tell them you are doing something today to improve their well-being, taking action today that will make a positive impact on their lives. You have seen the timelines, you know it is possible. If we were friends, you would be with me on this. Let us deliver meanwhile use, not meanwhile useless. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity ...

Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

Sir, my thing is not working.

The Bailiff:

Sorry, just your voting button. Are you prepared to indicate how you wish to vote, in which case, Deputy? How would you wish to vote, and we will count.

Deputy P.M. Bailhache:

Pour.

The Bailiff:

Pour, right. If Members had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been defeated.

Pour: 6		Contre: 30		Abstained: 6
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of Trinity		Connétable of St. Mary
Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf		Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy K.L. Moore
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy J. Renouf
Deputy D.J. Warr		Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy H.L. Jeune
Deputy K.M. Wilson		Connétable of Grouville		Deputy A.F. Curtis
Deputy M.B. Andrews		Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson
		Connétable of St. Saviour		
		Deputy G.P. Southern		
		Deputy M. Tadier		
		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		
		Deputy K.F. Morel		
		Deputy M.R. Le Hagarat		
		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
		Deputy R.J. Ward		
		Deputy C.S. Alves		
		Deputy I. Gardiner		
		Deputy L.J. Farnham		
		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
		Deputy T.A. Coles		
		Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		
		Deputy H.M. Miles		
		Deputy M.R. Scott		
		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
		Deputy L.V. Feltham		
		Deputy R.E. Binet		
		Deputy M.E. Millar		
		Deputy A. Howell		
		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
		Deputy B. Ward		

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS, COMMITTEES AND PANELS

3. Appointment of member of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel

The Bailiff:

I beg your pardon, Deputy, I had overlooked the fact you wish to ask the Assembly to increase the size of your panel, and then you have someone to propose, presumably?

3.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour (Chair, Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):

Yes, Sir. Thank you. I wish to increase the size of my Scrutiny Panel, which is the Health and Social Services Panel by one member. Do we do that first and then ...

The Bailiff:

Shall we just do that briefly first. So, you are proposing that. Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Do Members agree ... does any Member wish to speak? Sorry, the Greffier has very kindly educated me on that, as per the Standing Orders quite rightly. It is within your prerogative to increase the number. There is no vote upon it. Do you wish to propose an additional member then?

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Yes, thank you, Sir. I am delighted to propose the Constable of St. Martin as an additional member to the panel, and this nomination is enthusiastically seconded by the entirety of my panel.

The Bailiff:

Is that proposal seconded? **[Seconded]** Are there any other individuals proposed? No. In which case the Connétable is duly elected to the panel. **[Approbation]**

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

4. Continuation of Annual Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey (P.49/2025)

The Bailiff:

That takes us to the next item of Public Business, which is the Continuation of Annual Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey, lodged by Deputy Doublet. The main respondent is the Chief Minister, and I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to request the Council of Ministers to take the necessary steps, including the provision of sufficient funding within the Proposed Budget 2026-2029, if required, to ensure that the Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey can continue on an annual basis

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

Members might be pleased to know I have just Googled the length of my speech, and Google tells me that it will be approximately 6 to 7 minutes, so I hope that helps Members. First of all, what does this proposition do? It is asking Ministers to make provision for the J.O.L.S. (Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey) survey to be held every year instead of every second year, which was a recent change made due to budget constraints. What is J.O.L.S.? It is the Jersey Opinion and Lifestyle Survey, which used to be called J.A.S.S. (Jersey Annual Social Survey). It is produced and published by Statistics Jersey and, as we all know, they are the independent body serving the people of Jersey. Incidentally, Members will have seen yesterday they published their annual report, and I want to state that this is a brilliant organisation and we are so lucky to have the calibre of individuals who have the intelligence to work in this area on behalf of the public. J.O.L.S is one of many outputs from Statistics Jersey, and this survey covers employment, retirement, well-being, health-related behaviours, housing in Jersey, local neighbourhoods, elections in Jersey, financial struggles, and other areas. It is used to understand what life is like for Islanders in all of these areas, but also to test out new policy ideas and then to measure the effectiveness of policies. I feel it is one of the most critical outputs of the Statistics Jersey because it is a social survey, and, for me, social issues are something I am passionate about, things that impact children and families, equality and well-being. I feel this survey is really vital because all of these things are measured within the survey. The data from J.O.L.S is reliable, partly because it goes to thousands of households. It is a huge dataset. Every

year, around 3,500 households are invited to take part. Indeed, over the last 18 years, more than 50,000 Islanders have taken part and had a chance to fill in the survey and have their say about what their life is like. So, this data is really good quality. We can rely on it. That is what J.O.L.S. does. Approving the proposition today would ensure that that can happen every single year. What is it going to cost? Members may have seen the financial implications at the end of my report. I have got some bad news and good news, and I will start with the bad news. There is an error in that part of the report. But the good news is the error is that I have over-estimated what this is going to cost. I have been reliably informed that the cost of implementing this proposition is around half of what is quoted there, so it should cost around £40,000. To be honest, I think even if it were to be £79,000 that is great value for money. But at half the price it is even better value for money, which I will hope to demonstrate as I will lead Members through why it is really important. Data is really important, and Members across the Assembly I know feel this. I know some of us may think it is boring, but personally I love it, and I know colleagues around the Assembly feel the same. Certainly, Deputy Rob Ward with his science background, he has spoken frequently about how important data is. I had an incidental conversation this morning with Deputy Barbara Ward, who mentioned her lifetime of using an evidence-based approach in her career. Deputy Scott has spoken in debates previously about being a stats user group member, which I found really interesting, and I might like to talk to the Deputy about that outside of the Assembly. All of my Scrutiny colleagues, it is embedded in our approach, is it not, this evidence-based approach. I am proud of how Scrutiny is starting to more and more collect our own data and produce our own stats, and indeed applying to put questions into J.O.L.S. Deputy Southern, a Scrutiny stalwart, has historically spoken up for good quality data, and one of our newer members on Scrutiny, and fellow Scrutiny chair, Deputy Miles really embodies this approach on the importance of data with her academic background. Indeed, it was Deputy Miles and her panel who tried to prevent the budget cuts that resulted in J.O.L.S. being moved from an annual survey to a biennial survey. Data is important, not just because I like it, because it reveals the evidence to us. It makes the situation clearer, and it guides us.

[12:00]

It is fair to say that data is important to the Government, and I am really grateful for the comments published by the Council of Ministers, and for the conversations that I have been able to have with the Chief Minister and other Ministers. It has become really clear to me that the Council of Ministers agree with this evidence-based approach, and I thank Deputy Farnham for having the ability to listen, and for the consideration that he has given to this. In outlining why this survey is so important, I want to finish by just focusing on 2 big issues which I care about, and I believe many Members care about. The first one, which J.O.L.S. can help us to understand, is the falling birth rate, and we had some questions on the first day of this sitting around the falling birth rate. Members may have noticed on the front page of the *J.E.P.* today, there is a headline that states: "We want kids - but not here." It is a big issue, is it not, and we do collect some data around this. That is how we know it is a big issue in the first place, because of the data. It is another publication from Statistics Jersey, the births and breastfeeding profile. But how will we understand the reasons for this decline in the birth rate? I have to say the media is having a really good go at it, and certainly helping to increase the awareness, and our anecdotal understanding of this big policy issue. I just want to give a little plug for Scrutiny as well, because Scrutiny has a big part to play, and we do have a review currently running into the Minister for Social Security's family friendly employment legislation. We have extended our survey, which is still open this week, and I would urge members of the public to please fill it in and have your say. But we need that robust longitudinal data that is within J.O.L.S. that will help us to analyse the social reasons behind this decline in births and, when we have that understanding, we can start to plan how to tackle it. The second policy example that I want to give, which was the reason that sparked my desire to lodge this proposition, Deputy Southern touched on this in the Budget amendment debate that Deputy Miles's panel brought last year, and he stated that stats was the single most important thing that needs to be gathered if you are going to make any statement about your

economy or about the state of, say, poverty on the Island. I recently had a meeting with a local expert on children's issues, because I wanted to find out what the situation was with child poverty in the Island. I was told that we do not really know. One of the publications that we do not currently take part in is an E.U. (European Union) data collection activity, and it is called the Statistics on Income and Living Conditions, which collects timely and comparable cross-sectional and longitudinal data on income, poverty, social exclusion, and living conditions. Apparently, that is the gold standard if we want to understand child poverty, and we do not have that. I was told that the data within J.O.L.S., that is our best chance at understanding this problem. If the data within that survey only comes to us every second year, then we are lagging behind in our understanding of it. Deputy Bailhache and I, at a recent hearing to the Minister for Social Security, directed some questions, and I know from the Minister's responses that she wants to understand this, and I believe she mentioned some robust discussions that she had had around the need for data in this area. If we want to make well-informed decisions on these 2 policy areas and others, for Islanders in every single one of our parishes, we do need these stats on an annual basis. Why is it important that it is run every year? Because it still exists, but it is every other year at the moment. But I want to remind Members that the survey does not run exactly the same questions every single year. There are a core set of questions that are run for every survey, but there are many questions which occur in every second survey. Some questions are common every third survey. If we stick to a biennial survey, then some data points will only be revealed to us every 4 years, potentially every 6 to 8 years. That is just not frequent enough when our political terms are 4 years. It means we might only have one single data point in our political term at which to make a decision, and we cannot track a meaningful trajectory of the impact of policy decisions. While we are talking about political terms, I want to empower all Members to consider that any one of us can request questions to go into this survey. It is not just important for government departments, and this is something I have done myself. I did it in my, I think, first or second year as a Member when it was then called J.A.S.S., the annual social survey, to help me inform a Back-Bencher proposition, and the data is openly available. It is owned by Jersey; it is owned by the public of Jersey. For example, Constables, if they wanted to, can request questions to go in there, and even all the questions that have been requested by other people, they can be disaggregated by Parish. It is a really powerful tool to understand and compare needs in different Parishes. Charities, also, I believe, use this survey to understand the social situation in Jersey. They submit questions to it, and it is just as important to charities to guide their work and measure their impact. Finally, I want to thank Government for supporting this and ask Members to give it serious consideration and to please support this measure, which would help us make evidence-based decisions on an annual basis, with a survey which is really excellent value for money and aids government departments, Scrutiny, Back-Benchers, the Parishes, and charities in making efficient use of funds and making good decisions.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? [**Seconded**]

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

In 30 seconds, this proposition is one where trust in Government relies increasingly on transparency. Good data is not a luxury, it is a prerequisite. The Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle survey is not a statistical exercise in that sense, it is one of the few structured ways that this Assembly has, and the public has, to hear from what Islanders think on the ground. Annual data ensures we can understand what Islanders think about cost of living, housing stretch, social hardship, or, as the Deputy advancing this proposition, which is accepted by the Council of Ministers, great. This is a good pre-summer break, good joined-up proposition, that Members do not have to speak about, and I can sit down because I am delighted, and just express the hope that the Council of Ministers will be also as kindly looking on other Budget amendments that are needing to give our Statistics Unit what they need to do the job that they do both in qualitative and quantitative terms. I congratulate both sides and everybody for agreeing this, and hope that it is a unanimous vote.

4.1.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

I am very grateful to Deputy Doublet for bringing this proposition. I am also grateful for her to point out yet another place where A.I. (artificial intelligence) is replacing skills, because we used to work in television on the basis of 3 words per second for the scripts, and so we could calculate the length of a piece, and obviously now there is no need to do that calculation, A.I. does it for you. I would just say if anyone wants to know, about 2,000 words is generally a 15-minute speech. The main thing though I want to say is to thank the Government for rising to the challenge of a positive response to this, and in a sense, I suppose, learning from the debate last year, which was a tied vote on the Corporate Services proposition, sensing where the mood of the Assembly was, and reacting accordingly. It is a good outcome all round, and I thank you for that, and all praise for it, and let us hope we can have some more of that.

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

While I might bite back occasionally at Deputy Renouf when I think he is wrong, I am happy to accept his praise when he has right. So, thank you for that. Council of Ministers, after further recent discussion, is supportive of the view that the Opinion and Lifestyle Survey should continue on an annual basis, and that is why we are pleased to support Deputy Doublet's proposition. Ministers recognise the importance of good quality statistical data, especially now, as we are seeing changes to our forecasts moving forward, where to create new policies to tackle these challenges, statistical data production is perhaps more important than ever. The purpose of this, as Members will know, is to provide benchmark data to measure change, to provide information to assist the development of policy, and, importantly, to gauge public opinion. This survey has a set of core questions covering demographics, economic activity, and household structure to ensure that key census variables can be monitored annually, and, of course, that will help us to plan into the future. The Opinions and Lifestyle Survey is currently open for 2025, although it does close tomorrow, but members of the public can still participate on the Statistics Jersey's website. The survey for 2024, was published in December, and it provided a useful set of data where around 3,500 households were able to present their views on a range of social and economic matters. On that note, Council of Ministers is pleased to recommend to the States that they support the proposition. As Deputy Doublet said, it is an additional £40,000, which will be found and included in the forthcoming Budget for the Assembly to approve, and I urge Members to support the proposition. Thank you.

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

I will be brief, but I did want to take the opportunity to thank Deputy Doublet for bringing this proposition. I know that she shares the thoughts with me that the data is really important, and particularly within my remit as the Minister for Social Security, I find it incredibly useful, and I would like to say how valuable I find the questioning of the Scrutiny Panel in challenging my thinking around what data we do have and do not have, and where we can plug the gap. I am incredibly happy to be supporting this proposition today.

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

I am going to be very brief. This proposition, and I thank the bringer of this proposition, and its approval is vital. We already have too little data on the view of Islanders, and the Opinions and Lifestyle Survey is one of the few documents we have that seeks to meet the challenge on an annual basis. We need data to make decisions. Removing the survey with no plan for a replacement would be detrimental, not just to understanding Islander's current views, but also providing an historical record for years to come, and this is really important. If we want a more active and engaged public with greater trust in us, and the institutions we represent, then surveys like this one, and the information they provide for groups in and out of Government to review and make recommendations, cannot be cast aside.

4.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Before we get too self-congratulatory, the question does need to be asked is why this was ever proposed to be cut in the first place, especially if it is for such a paltry sum for something that gives such good value, to not just Government but to Scrutiny, as Deputy Doublet has very ably outlined in her opening proposition. I congratulate the Deputy on spotting this and bringing it forward, but it should not have been necessary for a Back-Bench Member, Scrutiny chair of this Assembly to bring it forward, only to have the Government say: “Yes. That is a great idea.” Well, why were they cutting it in the first place? That needs to be answered. I also value the value of statistics, if you will exclude the clumsy language. It is something that our Scrutiny Panel also had some experience with, when one of our recommendations from the recent cash use review, recommendation 3, was that we asked and recommended that the relevant Minister should include questions in the survey about cash usage and changes in cash usage, and other methods of payment so that we could all build up a picture of what is happening in trends in the Island, and that was kindly accepted. Of course, it is really important to remember that the Stats Unit has independence, so it is really them who decided what the appropriate questions are, but they were kind enough to consult with our panel about what they were thinking of, and we were very pleased to see that the next J.O.L.S. survey this year will feature some questions about that topic. It will be really important for us, and for the wider societal conversation, for example, if ever in the future, a Government needs to decide on a particular policy around protecting cash use, or indeed, dare I say it, if there is ever a referendum maybe at the time of the next election to do with whether or not cash usage should be protected, as it is increasingly in other countries, then I think having a firm basis of opinion and statistics will be very valuable in informing those debates or any other hypothetical debates that may be coming forward.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? If no other Member wishes to speak then I closed the debate and call upon Deputy Doublet to respond.

[12:15]

4.1.7 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I am pleased to have those contributions from the Members who have spoken. The Chief Minister mentioned that the survey is still open, and I would remind Islanders to maybe search through their piles of mail at home, because it comes to your home in a big A4 envelope, and you can fill it in by hand and then pop it in the post. But I believe there is also a code on that survey so you can then go online and fill it in that way, if that is more suitable for you to do so. It is really important that people who receive that, because you might not get another chance to do it, it is randomly distributed, and I think it is a privilege to be able to receive that survey and fill it in. So, I would encourage Islanders to do so. Deputy Feltham mentioned the challenge that we present at Scrutiny, and we do in a firm and, I believe, a constructive way. I have to say that the Deputy, as a Minister, does rise to that challenge, and I know that she has supported this proposition, and I am grateful for that. Deputy Tadier, I agree. I wish to see Statistics Jersey protected from cuts in the years to come, and, in fact, I am just going to finally, before I sit down and ask for the vote, I am going to just state a very brief wish list, because I think J.O.L.S is the bare minimum. What I would really like us to do is to start doing what the E.U. are doing and collecting those statistics on income and living conditions so that we can have a deeper understanding of child poverty and all types of poverty. I would really like us to be able to do a time-use survey, which is something that way back was the Scrutiny recommendation. It keeps popping up in other situations as a recommendation of something that would really help us understand various social issues, and I understand it is quite resource intensive, but the quality of data it would give us would be so helpful. So, that is my wish list. I will end on that. But I hope today that Members will support this, and we can have what I think is the very

basics, the essentials of an annual social survey, and I urge Members to vote in favour of this proposition.

The Bailiff:

Those in favour of adopting the proposition kindly show. The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been adopted.

Pour: 38		Contre: 1		Abstained: 0
Connétable of Trinity		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Can I thank Members for their support, Sir.

5. Joined-up public infrastructure framework for an ageing population (P.50/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Joined-up infrastructure framework for an ageing population lodged by Deputy Gardiner. The main responder is the Minister for Infrastructure. An amendment has been lodged by the Council of Ministers. Deputy Gardiner, do you agree the amendment?

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to take the proposition therefore, as amended? Very well, it will be read as amended, and I will ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – (a) to request the Chief Minister, in consultation with the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Infrastructure, to develop and introduce an Age-Friendly Infrastructure Framework (the “Framework”) by 31st July 2026, to be delivered in conjunction with the existing “Delivering Investment into the Public Realm”, the Framework to include, but not be limited to – (i) inclusive design standards reflective of nationally accepted best practice, including age-friendly design guidelines incorporating, but not limited to step-free access, anti-slip pavement materials, high-contrast signage and tactile surfaces and adequate lighting on walkways where appropriate; (ii) accessible public transport networks, following liaison with the bus provider, that seek to include an increase in the number of bus shelters and, as replacements are due, upgrades to shelters with real-time audio and visual updates at key interchanges and high use stops, where appropriate provide benches with armrests, shelter from weather, encouragement to accept priority seating, and ongoing training for staff on senior accessibility needs; (iii) Continue to develop the concept of “liveable neighbourhood”, as can be interpreted in the Bridging Island Plan, and work towards, wherever possible, providing neighbourhood facilities for older adults, with an encouragement of development where all essential services (GP, pharmacy, grocery, park or green space, community space) are within 10 minutes’ travel time of the development, and partnering with local businesses to provide age-friendly store layouts and customer-service training; and (iv) public toilets and rest facilities, where all future developments and refurbishment projects should ensure that accessible public toilets and shaded seating are provided in Town, Parish centres and in parks within 500 metres, where possible; and (b) that political oversight and responsibility for the Framework should be allocated to a single Minister (or Assistant Minister), to ensure co-ordination between all Departments and provide continuity of approach and oversight.

5.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Following Deputy Renouf’s contribution 2000 words, 15 minutes, I think that my speech will be around 7, 8 minutes, but we need to see how quick I speak. Members, I bring this proposition today because we are standing at a turning point. We know that Jersey’s population is ageing. We know this will reshape how we live, how we travel, how we use our public spaces and services. We also know that if we get ahead of this change, if we will plan now, not later, we can support all the Islanders to stay independent, confident and connected in their own communities for longer. An age-friendly Island is a people-friendly Island, and it will allow other groups to enjoy the facilities. This is why the proposition matters. I want to start recognising by the very good work already happening in Parishes, in Infrastructure, in the Planning Department, there are projects ongoing and we can see projects investing in workability, in public realm improvements, and we know the Island Plan talked

about a better neighbourhood design. This is what I am grateful to the Minister for the Environment for engaging with me and the officers. I think we did have a really, really constructive meeting. The Chief Minister and the Minister for Infrastructure are working on it. This amendment is making it workable at the minute to ensure that things are moving forward before the next Island Plan, when it will be debated. It makes it clear that developing age-friendly infrastructure framework will be a joint effort led at the highest level and covering the physical environment, transport planning, public realm as part of systematic holistic and multi-agency approach. It is not just a language. It is a foundation where we can stop working in silos and working together. We do have already, and this is what was raised in the meeting, how we got through the planning to the framework, and it is important to explain to Members how we got to this amendment. We already have excellent work undertaken by public realm strategy town centre masterplan, overall cover a winning programme. But the point about the framework, to have it all co-ordinated, we are not starting from scratch, but we also see time and time again where the public development meets the private development, and the system not always works joined up. A well paved street ends at the kerb without crossing. A new housing development goes in, but there is no nearby bus stop or shop, which elderly can access easily if it is held in development. A bench is added in town, but there is no shelter nearby, toilet access within the reach. It is not because the people are not trying, it is really important to understand that I know that everyone individually is really working hard. It is about, because of this framework, just we need to bring it together, and this is exactly what this proposition, with accepted amended proposition, aims to create a structure to co-ordinate what is being done and plan more effectively for the future. Before this debate, I visited Age Concern and a meeting of the Alzheimer's Society. I also hope to visit Dementia Jersey and Good Companions to learn from the people what really matter. I created this survey 10 days ago and I had until now 54 responses. I am sure the Government can get more responses, and mostly from the Islanders aged 75 and over. Messages are clear. I will share some of them with the Members. The lack of facilities was a constant theme in the survey carried out. Over 90 responded. It was, would you believe, the toilets got the top mark with all responders. Ninety per cent of the respondents saying the toilets are not accessible, not easy to find. Over 70 per cent that they do not have enough spaces to sit and rest in public areas, and this is why they are thinking not to go out because just they need the space. And when they were asked what would encourage them to be more active, the top answers were well-maintained footpaths and benches and rest areas. This has echoed the comments that they put in this survey. "There are no buses near me, so I am not going to town because I cannot walk to the stop." "Shops and pavements are too uneven. They do not work for wheelchairs and prams." "To have fewer cobble streets because it will make life easy if we do not have cobble streets who use mobility aids or have balance problems." This is what I experience when I was in the wheelchair, and I remember the situation when I left the States Chamber and I knew that on the scooter to get to the Broad Street, and as I was walking I rolled myself into the churchyard, a town church. Once I realised, and there was a step at the end and I cannot get out other end, and I needed to do U-turn and go around. These are small things you discover when you need, and this is small things that do make a difference. It is not about the rules, it is more about building the framework, and this is why I accept it. I believe the officers need more time to bring the things together, and this is why their time was extended and it will work with the review of the next States Island Plan, which will come in the next States Assembly. Another comment somebody made, and I would like to emphasise, it is not just about older people, it is about everyone. A bench helps someone with arthritis and someone with a toddler, a bus shelter helps a pensioner and a student in the rain, an age-friendly Island, as I said before, is a people-friendly Island. I want to say, it is also good for public policy. Enabling all the people to stay active, connected and mobile, reduce risk of loneliness, lower demands on hospital and delays of needs for the care. I would like to bring attention for my paragraph (b), and given the enormity of the challenge, it is sure vital there is oversight and co-ordination by one person in all work to prepare the Island together for the projected increase in an ageing population. This is the person who needs to join the dots, and the Council of Ministers will be able to decide which Minister or Assistant Minister will have specific

oversight for this framework, and will be able to ensure accountability and strategic integration of age-friendly principles across all departments. This will provide effective resolution across department action, and could also provide visible political leadership to champion cause of all the Islanders. So, Members, I ask for your support. I am looking forward for your contribution. It is not an endpoint, it is developing a starting point. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? [**Seconded**]

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

This proposition affects a number of different Ministers. For some reason unknown to me, I seem to have been selected to be the one to respond. No, in all seriousness, I am aware that I am part of an ageing population, a big number of which will be affected by this proposition, so I am grateful to the Deputy for lodging the proposition, but brings to the forefront of our minds when considering new developments and our current Island communities, how to best support and encourage a framework for the ageing population, of which I am one. The Deputy was kind enough to accept my proposed amendment that seeks to make minor changes to her proposition. These proposed changes are a result of positive consultation, and a lot of it. I thank her for it. It is going to allow us sufficient time to undertake the work required if the proposition is adopted, which I very much hope it will be. The integrity and sentiment of the amendment still reflects the original intentions of the Deputy, which is to ensure an age-friendly framework is produced that signposts and potentially supplements existing government policy in one easily accessible document. In undertaking this work unrelated to age, friendly infrastructure, I would like to confirm that this will be conducted in line with the broader work already in place relating to disability and inclusion, to avoid any duplication. The amendment outlines what can be reasonably delivered without putting too much of a strain on current resources or raising expectation, and suggests that our hard work continues in developing the concept of a liveable neighbourhood, as can be interpreted in the Bridging Island Plan, and works towards, wherever possible, providing neighbourhood facilities for older adults. While not explicitly expressed as such, the local living concept is already well established in Jersey's Island Plan, which seeks to concentrate development activity and the provision of homes and services within the Island's existing built-up areas.

[12:30]

This will be where most Islanders live and where there exists a greater range of facilities and services, limiting the need for travel, while offering genuine access to sustainable transport modes. The delivery of this more sustainable development pattern is assured by the plan's spatial strategy. The policy framework provided by the Bridging Island Plan also encourages and enables the provision of new services and facilities in the Island's existing settlements, including local shops and community facilities, and it seeks to protect the retention of those that are already there. The framework will consider all matters proposed by Deputy Gardiner and, if needs be and appropriate, set a requirement in this regard where possible. I absolutely agree with the Deputy that this work is of great importance, and I will do my very best to endeavour that the framework adequately and empathetically supports the ageing population. I would urge all Members to support it.

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

As the Minister responsible for implementing the disability strategy, I would like to thank Deputy Gardiner for bringing this proposition. I chair the Disability and Inclusion Advisory Group, which works very much in collaboration with relevant charities, who feedback to Government via the cluster, and I am pleased to say that the Scrutiny Liaison Committee is also represented on the advisory group by Deputy Catherine Curtis. It is important to remember that while an ageing population is likely to acquire more disabilities, disabilities do occur within all demographics of our

population. Such a joined-up way of thinking will benefit more than our ageing population. I always see inclusion as a collaborative piece of work, and that is why I think that this proposition is important, but I do want to say thank you to my team that work in the Disability and Inclusion Team for the work that they are already doing in this space with the sector and the relevant charities. Collaborative working is very important to that team, and we have got some really, really good examples of collaborative working, whether it be through working with charities, like EYECAN, around accessible and suitable paving around housing developments, or working with other government departments such as Infrastructure in the work that has been done around a digital map of disabled parking spaces and what accessibility those particular spaces provide for different disabilities. I am really very welcoming of this proposition to bring everything together in one framework, and I look forward to playing my part as the Minister responsible for the disability strategy in bringing that to fruition.

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

Just very briefly in support of the proposition. I completely agree with everything that the previous speaker said as well, and I wanted to speak up for those with disabilities, because as well as helping the elderly population, it will help those with disabilities and parents. It is almost a shame that we are not going to have probably a very long debate on this because I am really keen to see us being a bit more intentional about how we design our communities. The one short point I wanted to make was that I want Government to go beyond this and to think not just about groups in isolation, but what I would like to see is our communities being more intentionally created so that young and old can live together more closely and to support each other, which I think will reduce loneliness, especially in the elderly and for those with young children, and I think that is important in tackling some of the big social issues that we have today.

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

I would first ask if the Member will take this in parts, as while I acknowledge the comments made by those who have briefly spoken, I am slightly more cautious towards this proposition. I understand the intention behind creating a framework, what does concern me in some ways is we are starting the creation of a framework, within some ways a bucket list of items that a Member would like, and I think if we are to co-ordinate these areas, it would have been better to keep this as a work item or workstream and kept it very open for delivery. There are some things that do cause me a little concern. I recognise access and inclusion, but I do not think necessarily the “nationally accepted best practice” as phrasing the wording is necessarily the right way to go. We know that different cultures, and different western cultures, have very different attitudes to risk and health and safety, and I for one think in the way we do public realm and many areas of public infrastructure, the U.K. (United Kingdom) approach, which we have adopted a lot of, is not the correct one. Examples of this would be the tension that the Minister for Infrastructure has highlighted before. He has said his officers push him to fit 1.8 metre-wide pavements. His pragmatism is a Jersey pragmatism of: “Well, if 1.2 is better than nothing, let us go for that.” So, I am concerned about the general trend we take in our infrastructure that, in essence, puts all the responsibility on the States. There is clever design we can do, there is thoughtful and empathetic design we can do, but I am concerned about the way we approach infrastructure and certain areas of this. Likewise, setting immediately the arbitrary number of 500 metres in public toilets and rest facilities in all places, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister realises one could provide a caveat in a proposition, which I think I might have made the point about yesterday. So, with that, I am struggling with the fact that it starts with being a framework with, in essence, as I say, a wish list of areas to approach. As such, I would not support the implicit reinforcement of (i) in this. So, if this is taken on a whole, I will vote against the whole thing. I will then part by part, on parts (i) to (iv) make my decision. But I will be quite plain in saying that I do not mean anything to the Deputy, I think it is an important topic, but I think we could approach this slightly differently and I will take a nuanced approach in voting if that is permitted.

The Bailiff:

It is a matter, of course, to the Deputy as to whether things are taken in part or not.

5.1.5 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

Very briefly. I am broadly in support of this proposition and, likewise, the amendment by the Minister for the Environment. There are obviously problems here. I know most Constables are trying to make their Parish Halls more user friendly, but this has to be done while preserving the integrity of listed buildings. We are trying to put in in St. Saviour a disabled ramp at the moment. We have temporary ones, but it is something that needs to be accessed by the person using it on their own. So, there are problems, as I say, but we are very much meeting those challenges. I was a member of the Jersey Blind Society, a committee member for 7 years, and I know that we have several issues there with making things, street furniture, et cetera, more accessible. I am one of the ageing populations, even though I identify as 42-and-a-bit, but I do appreciate the problems there, but broadly very much in favour of the proposition.

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

It is just very briefly, because I think Deputy Alex Curtis has made some very relevant points, and certainly made me perhaps think a bit longer. But I just wanted to point out that in (i), the amended version does say: “Inclusive design standards reflective of nationally accepted best practice.” In my opinion, reflective means “looking towards”. I know it does not, but does not mean necessarily just taking those best practices as is. It is to reflect on them and deliver them that way. So, with that in mind, I am personally comfortable with that, rather than it just being a “must take the best practice”, which I would agree we should never do, Jersey must just take U.K. best practice, because it is often not best practice and often not best for Jersey. But I think the wording on this probably works.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? No other Member wishes to speak, then I close the debate and call upon Deputy Gardiner to respond.

5.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Thank you for all people who contributed, and I will probably start with a comment from Deputy Curtis because it was very specific request. As the proposition was amended, and this is what we worked with the Minister, and the Minister worked with other Ministers to ensure this is not tied to specific national standard, there is an option you would like to aim, but if it does not work to Jersey, and I can see at La Pouquelaye we have sometime metre and a half and sometimes we have one metre on the same road, whatever is allowed. So there is lots of flexibility was allowed in this very carefully drafted amendment, and this is why I accept it. I am happy to take part (i) separate, and I will take other stuff together. Thank you for Deputy Morel, the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, raising the same points. The Minister for the Environment, thank you for his work again, and support going forward. He mentioned as the work will progress it will show the gaps, and gaps will be filled. At the beginning of the work and framework as it will go forward, will be developed, it will not be one and go. We will not fix it immediately. Something that the Minister mentioned, and I did not mention in my closing speech, it is not looking back, it is going forward. When the next bus shelter will come in, it will be bus shelter maybe with the benches and armrests. But when the next Jersey Electricity dig in the road, and making the roads new one, everything will be installed. So, any new refurbishment, it will be able to enhance. Thank you, the Minister for Social Security for your contribution and raising the disability as myself, I am very, very aligned, and I know how much progress was made, because I remember bridging amendments around accessibility into the Bridging Island Plan and lots of work been done, and we can see the results outside in our public realm. The Connétable of St. Saviour, about the historic building can access, it is absolutely right. If Connétables remember, we did accept my amendments to the Bridging Island

Plan that we need to have a balance between keeping the originals and public social access, and I hope we can see some results there. In general terms, Members, I really would hope you support the proposition. It is not the end point. Let us commit to systematic joined-up multi-agency approach that all Islanders have asked for. Let us build Jersey that works for every age, every Parish, and for everyone, and I am asking for the appel.

The Bailiff:

You wish to take it separately in terms of the vote?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

If we just take (i) separately.

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Could I ask if the Member would allow (iii) taken separately as well?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Okay. Let us take everything separately. It will be easy, I think, to do.

The Bailiff:

You want to take everything separately? And you would like to do that ...

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Yes. I usually can follow the request of them.

The Bailiff:

You would like to do that on the appel?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Yes.

The Bailiff:

Very well. The first vote then will be on (i). In other words, any Members voting pour will be taken to have voted pour for paragraph (a), and then we will deal with the individual votes on the Roman numerals. Otherwise, the Roman numerals cannot stand alone. (a) is just the precursor of all the other Roman numerals, so that is fine. So, we are just going to vote on (a) alone, not the Roman numerals at this point. We need to clarify whether the precursor itself is accepted. So, I will ask any Members to return to their seats if they are not already. Then to open the voting, and the vote is on (a) alone, the precursor. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The precursor has been adopted.

Pour: 39		Contre: 1		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy C.S. Alves		
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				

Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy C.S. Alves:

Sorry, Sir, that was my mistake. I misheard how we were doing the vote.

[12:45]

The Bailiff:

Well, nonetheless, I am afraid you are registered as a contre vote, but fortunately it was not the vote that tipped the balance, Deputy, so you are all right. The next is on paragraph (i). I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and the vote is on paragraph (i), and Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. (i) is adopted.

Pour: 39		Contre: 1		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				

Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The next vote is on (ii). I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. That has been adopted.

Pour: 39		Contre: 0		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				

Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

I ask the Greffier now to open the voting for a vote on paragraph (iii). Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote. Then I will ask the Greffier to close the voting. That paragraph has been adopted.

Pour: 38		Contre: 1		Abstained: 1
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy A.F. Curtis		Connétable of Grouville
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				

Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

We now come to the vote on paragraph (iv), and I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. That has been adopted.

Pour: 38		Contre: 1		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				

Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Then we come to vote on (b), and I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. Paragraph (b) is adopted.

Pour: 39		Contre: 1		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy H.L. Jeune		
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				

Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Standing Orders require me to ask Members if they wish to continue, or they wish to adjourn for the luncheon adjournment.

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

Yes. Can we continue please.

The Bailiff:

I am detecting there is a slight mood to continue.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I would like really to say thank you for the Members for their support.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone want to argue against continuance? No. Fine, which we will continue until the final matter.

6. Channel Islands Lottery Distribution of Proceeds 2025 (P.51/2025)

The final item of Public Business is the Channel Islands Lottery Distribution of Proceeds 2025 lodged by the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. The main responder is the chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to agree, in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 4(5) of the Gambling (Channel Islands Lottery) (Jersey) Regulations 1975, to allocate £857,410 to the Jersey Community Foundation, the Association of Jersey Charities and Jersey Sport for onward distribution in support of the Island community. The allocation is to be as follows: 50 per cent to the Association of Jersey Charities £428,705 solely for charities; 30 per cent to the Jersey Community Foundation £257,223 to be split between arts, culture and heritage (65 per cent to 75 per cent) and; applied science or applied research in the fields of engineering, biology, physics, chemistry or mathematics, provided that the funds are either to be used locally or for the direct benefit of Jersey, including any education from which local residents may benefit (25 per cent to 35 per cent); 20 per cent to Jersey Sport £171,482 for sports and active lifestyles

6.1 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

I would like to thank all Members for agreeing to hear this proposition early. As Members will be aware, this proposition is brought to the States Assembly every year, as it is the responsibility of the Assembly to approve the distribution of proceeds from the Channel Islands Lottery. This year, we have a total of £857,410 to be distributed and have proposed that this be split across 3 organisations for onward distribution to charities. Members will be aware that the proceeds have historically been split 50:50 between the A.J.C. (Association of Jersey Charities) and J.C.F. (Jersey Community Foundation), where the J.C.F. allocation was divided between arts, culture and heritage, applied sciences or research, and sport. The 2023 review of sports and physical activity recommended that when the conditions are appropriate, the function to distribute funding from the Channel Island Lottery for sports projects should be given to Jersey Sport. Having engaged with both Jersey Sports, the A.J.C., and the J.C.F., we now consider that it is appropriate for Jersey Sport to take on that sports element that is currently managed by the J.C.F. Both organisations are supportive of this transfer, which will reduce administrative costs and provide better access for sporting organisations to seek support. As with previous years, each distributing entity will have a service level agreement with Government to ensure proper oversight and reporting as well as regular meetings with Ministers and officers. It is indeed that the addition of Jersey Sport to the kind of formula that led to the slight delay in getting this out, and hence the request to hear the proposition early. Finally, I would like to recognise the excellent work done by our local charitable sector and by the Association of Jersey Charities and the Jersey Community Foundation. Their work supports a huge range of good causes and makes a valued impact on our community, which I know all States Members will have had throughout their time in the States they will have worked with the A.J.C. and with the J.C.F., and indeed with Jersey Sports at different times. I am sure that all States Members agree with me that we do value their work and we hope they can continue it long into the future.

The Bailiff:

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

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

I just want to take a quick moment to thank all those involved in the work to get us to a point that we are today with the proposition that includes giving that proportion of the funds from the lottery proceeds to Jersey Sport for onward distribution, rather than having, as the Minister explained, a separate body to do it, as has been the case previously. During my time as Assistant Minister with responsibility for Sport, I commissioned the review of sport and physical activity, which was delivered in November 2023, and as the Minister pointed out, this move was one of the recommendations from there, and it referred to “when the conditions are appropriate”. The conditions were not appropriate at the time, but I am encouraged that the Minister and his team clearly think that they are now. In order for that to be the case, a lot of hard work has to have taken place by a lot of different people in different areas and working in different organisations. So, I just want to say thank you to them, and I look forward to supporting this proposition and wish Jersey Sport all the very best in distributing these vital funds to local sports.

6.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

In all the thanks that has been given, I think one key thank you that is often missed out is the ... we need to ask the question, is how does this money come about in the first place? The money is there because private members of our community put their hands in their pockets and they buy lottery tickets. This is not government money, it is money that members of our public gamblers, if you like, choose to give when they are playing a game, and they know that a proportion of that is going to go to these very worthy causes, knowing that as a by-product. The main driver for them may be, of course, to try and win some money, but they might also be doing so mindful of the fact that they are

helping some great causes. I think it is important to put that on record. Speaking from a Scrutiny point of view, the panel is quite comfortable with what is being proposed here in terms of the changes in the formula, because that has already been agreed. I certainly, on a personal level, look with some interest to see especially how the 10 per cent or so, which is going to be allocated towards science and research fields, biology, engineering, ecology, physics, chemistry and math; I think there is a great potential there for some great use, and it would be good to keep an eye on how all of these funds may make some tangible differences in the future. One of the comments that we have made as a panel is, I suppose to keep an overall view of the direction of travel on the health of the lottery, so a health check, if you like. We have published in our comments a table showing the last 5 years, but I have also got some statistics for a couple of years before that. So, going back to 2019, for example, the revenue from the Channel Islands Lottery was £1 million; in 2020 it was £1.4 million; and then as our table shows in 2021, there was a £1.5 million total that was available for distribution. That seems to have dipped, so it does fluctuate. But in 2022, it was less than a million, 2023 it was only £633,000. It just tipped over £1 million again in 2024. But this sum that is being distributed this time is £857,000. When we take into account inflation over that period, there does seem to be a downward trend in the amount of money that the Channel Islands Lottery is raising. We do not have the details as to why that may be the case, but I would encourage the Minister to be vigilant of this. It is not necessarily a priority for him in a sense, it is not government money, it is something that Government has, I suppose, quite a strange role in, meaning he needs to bring this proposition, but it is something that does not necessarily even need to involve Government. You could argue it is private gamblers giving money to charity via all of these bodies. I will leave that thought for him. But the question does need to be asked as to whether or not some kind of novelty needs to be introduced into the Channel Island Lottery, whether, for example, and these are just initial thoughts, not necessarily been well thought through, but do we need to have a Channel Island Lottery now? Would it be better if we just had a Jersey Lottery, would it be better if we maybe reverted to something of the past where you had tickets which could be split? So, you could give somebody the other half of the ticket, as I recall, when I was younger, and also where there would be guaranteed prizes, because you knew that in any 100 numbers, that is depending on the last 2 digits, you would always be guaranteed a certain return. So, there may be some work that could be done in recapturing the public imagination around the Jersey Lottery, if it were to be rebranded as such, but albeit that needs to be countered, of course, by a wider governmental consideration of what the gambling strategy is in Jersey and what kind of encouragement, if any, Government wants to be giving to members of the public to gamble in what is a rather traditional way, of course, in the face of increasing online, dare I say, temptation when it comes to gambling. Online gambling that happens in Jersey, it does not go into a pot which is distributed by the Association of Jersey Charities or the other bodies that will be distributing. If we can encourage gambling to take place, then why not do it in such a way that it benefits the Island rather than going into perhaps the pockets of big multinational corporations? Other than that, I leave with both my personal and Scrutiny comments, and do say that certainly I am happy to support this, and I am sure the rest of the panel are as well.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? If no other Member wishes to speak, I close the debate and call upon the Minister to respond.

6.1.3 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I thank Deputy Stephenson and Deputy Tadier for their comments, and the Scrutiny Panel for their work on this as well. I also thank Deputy Stephenson for her work as Sports Minister, doing the review that was mentioned, and Connétable of St. John for his work in helping Jersey Sport get to the position where they can take this on as well. Deputy Tadier raised some really interesting points there, and I am pleased to be able to say that I have been working with my colleague in Guernsey for the last few years, the president of the States Trading Board, which has obviously changed recently.

So, the previous president of the States Trading Board in Guernsey, and we are working to bring, effectively, the 2 lotteries much more close together, because while there is one lottery, in many ways it is 2 lotteries.

[13:00]

At present, both Islands use separate distributors with separate marketing, and therefore we have established a joint political kind of oversight group to merge the co-ordination of that distribution and marketing into just one entity, rather than 2 separate entities. I am pleased as well that lottery players will have seen, and see over the course of this year, a rollout of Channel Islands-based technology. It is a Guernsey based technology for the point of sale aspect of lottery tickets. So, that is a fantastic use of a Channel Island company and their technology to support that. So, that will be going into tills. So, we are, from that perspective, trying to make the Channel Islands Lottery much more of a Channel Islands entity, and much more effective in some of the ways that Deputy Tadier has pointed out. It is an interesting and a very technical matter, but the differences that Deputy Tadier quite rightly pointed out in the amount of money that flows through to be distributed is not necessarily about sales so much, as about where we are in the timeline of particular games. It is quite complex, and I am happy to have officers explain it to Members at any point, if anyone wished to understand it in more detail. But depending on when a new game is bought, that is a cost to the lottery. So, if that falls in a particular year, then the proceeds from that year will be lower than a year where new games are not bought, and so the actual amount to be distributed is not necessarily just about the amount of sales made, but also about the operational situation that sits behind the lottery. So, with that, if the sales remain equal this year as they were last year, then we will not expect so many games to have been bought this year, so we could expect an increase in proceeds to be distributed next year, for instance. So, that is something which is likely to happen. On the health front, because I think it is really important as well, I am aware that Deputy Tadier is absolutely right. This is private citizens in Jersey playing a gambling game and money is going to charity, and obviously gambling is a double-edged sword. It can be fun if done responsibly, but there are people who struggle with gambling, and gambling addiction, and that is something that I have been for a while in live discussion with the Jersey Gambling Commission, and they do provide support, and they work to provide support to Islanders who feel they are caught up in that gambling addiction. Those resources can be found on the Jersey Gambling Commission’s website and the Channel Islands Lottery website, which promotes responsible gambling. But I think it is a discussion that, as States Members, that is one that we are quite rightly involved in. With that, I do ask Members to support this proposition, and I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting, and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been adopted.

Pour: 40		Contre: 0		Abstained: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				

Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business, and I call upon Deputy Ahier, the chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose the arrangements for future business.

7. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

There have been a few changes to the arrangement of public business since the publication of the Consolidated Order Paper. As I informed Members in my speech on Tuesday, the Draft Elections (Senators) (Amendment) Law has been lodged and listed for the first meeting in September. Can I remind Members of the message circulated by the Greffe that any amendments should ideally be submitted as soon as possible, and preferably by Friday, 22nd August, in light of the August bank holiday. Given what has happened this week with referrals to Scrutiny, there are a number of items that have been moved to meetings after the summer recess. The Draft Residential Tenancy Amendment Law, P.24, has been moved to 9th September. The Draft Bank (Recovery and Resolution) Amendment Law has been listed for 30th September, and the Draft Harbours (Inshore Safety) Amendment Regulations have been listed for 21st October. I would anticipate that the meeting on 9th September taking some time, as we have both the residential tenancy legislation and

the Senators legislation to be debated, alongside other matters of public business, not least of which is the proposed revision of the Code of Conduct proposed by P.P.C. ourselves. We will therefore likely need Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to address all the business. I would recommend that Members leave Friday open as well, because in all probability we will be sitting on Friday. All of these should already be in Members' diaries as continuation days. With that, I propose the arrangement of public business for future meetings.

The Bailiff:

Do Members approve the arrangement?

7.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Does the Minister consider that the sitting ... Minister, not yet, he says. **[Laughter]** Minister for P.P.C., the chair. Does he consider that the sitting that starts on the 9th will be so long that it may be worth considering that we come in half a day early and start on Monday afternoon?

7.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Yes, I thank the Deputy for that consideration. We are having a meeting of P.P.C. next week, on Tuesday, I believe. I think it would be necessary for us to discuss that, and if there is any changes, obviously we will notify Members in the usual way.

The Bailiff:

Very well. It appears that Members agree the arrangements for future business. That concludes the business of the Assembly, and we stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on 9th September 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

[13:06]