

## Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

Minutes of 16<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16th June 2006

Present Deputy P J D Ryan, Chairman  
 Senator J L Perchard, Vice-Chairman  
 Connétable J L S Gallichan  
 Deputy J Gallichan

In attendance Deputy J. Reed

Apologies Connétable D Murphy

In attendance Mr. M. Haden  
 M. de la Haye, Greffier of the States (for a time)

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
<p>1. Item 1 23.06.06</p>	<p><b>Review of Financial Framework of States Strategic Plan</b></p> <p>The Panel met to consider its strategy for the debate on the draft Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Senator B. Shenton. Senator L. Norman was out of the Island. The Panel invited Deputy Reed to attend in order to co-ordinate its strategy with the Deputy's amendment No 13. The Panel received a note prepared by the Deputy setting out points of agreement and differences between the two amendments.</p> <p>Both amendments sought to restrict States revenue spending to the limits set out in the 2006 Budget report. Deputy Reed's amendment No 13 was a single package, to be voted en bloc, whereas the Panel's amendment was designed to allow three separate votes on (i), (ii) and (iii) of Action 1.2.3. The Panel received confirmation that three separate votes would be permitted.</p> <p>It was noted that the Panel's view of the use of the Dwelling House Loan Fund was in conflict with the Deputy's amendment which sought to ensure that the DHLF would be used only for capital expenditure and thus would be under the direct control of the States Assembly through the annual States Business Plan. The Panel's amendment on the other hand sought to apply even stricter control of spending through the use of a Stabilisation Fund which would establish clear criteria for the use of any funds contained therein. The Panel therefore felt that it would not be able to support the Deputy's amendment</p> <p>It was noted that the Deputy's amendment would precede the Panel's amendment in the debate in virtue of the fact that the Deputy sought to introduce a new Outcome at 1.1, whereas the Panel's amendment addressed 1.2. The Panel, conscious that Deputy Reed amendment had a material effect on its own amendment, asked the Deputy to consider allowing the Panel's amendment to be debated first, subject to States agreement to suspend Standing Orders. Deputy Reed agreed to consider the request.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>20% means 20%</b></p> <p>The Panel received a submission from Mr. R. Bryans, Personal Finance Society, regarding raising the limit for life insurance premium relief to £10,000. It noted that the financial impact of the proposal would be a loss of £1.3 million in tax revenue.</p>	

	<p>The Panel agreed that the proposal merited further consideration. It was not prepared, however, to introduce an amendment without investigating the matter thoroughly. Accordingly it agreed to request the States to defer the debate on P.58/2006, scheduled for 4th July 2006 to enable a review to take place.</p> <p>It was suggested that this investigation might be the prelude to a broader review of savings and pensions and that Senator Shenton might be able to advise the Panel on the implications of these issues. The Chairman undertook to speak to him.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Fiscal Strategy Reviews</b></p> <p>The Panel received confidential notes of a meeting between the Treasury and Resources Minister and the Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>The Panel was informed that it was intended to hold an in principle debate on the Zero/Ten Design proposal in September with the law being debated in December. The Panel expressed surprise at this information as it had drawn up a work programme based on a single debate in December and did not believe that a meaningful review could be carried out in time for a debate in September. It was agreed to request a deferral in the in-principle debate to allow time for the Panel to prepare a report.</p>	

Signed

Date

.....  
Chairman, Corporate Services Panel

.....