

Event: Public Hearing  
Review of the Roles of the Crown Officers

Date: 5th May 2010

Review Panel: Lord Carswell, Chairman  
Mrs M-L Backhurst  
Mr G Crill  
Mr I Strang

Witnesses: Mr N Le Cornu

**THE CHAIRMAN:** You are very welcome, Mr Le Cornu and we are glad to have you assist us in our work. I think you have probably heard before the opening statements, so I need not repeat them. We can simply go straight into matters.

We have had the benefit of your written submission, thank you, which we have read and taken into account. Is there anything you would like to add to or amend in that submission?

**MR LE CORNU:** I would like to thank you for inviting me and for taking on board a number of opinions. I do not have anything to add to it. I hope that you will ask me some pertinent questions relating to it. It is intended to be more of a political commentary on what I have heard and generally on the role of the Crown Officers. There is no apology for that. It is an alternative opinion and view and I think it is important that that needs to be heard because it is a view from another aspect of civil society.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There are two or three aspects of the role of the Crown Officers that you have addressed. The first one is the position of the Bailiff as President or presiding officer of the States which you consider should not continue. Would you like to expand on that at all?

**MR LE CORNU:** As in my submission, I have indicated that power is held very much through the Royal Court and the Bailiff and those associated and that that power holding is maintained by virtue of these multiple roles, hence the reticence of the power holders to see any changes to that. There is a great deal of fear and that is very evident in the submissions.

To address the actual question that you have put to me, yes, the Bailiff should no longer sit as

President or the Speaker. That is contrary to this idea of the separation of powers. It does give too much power to the Bailiff as a figurehead, as a person, because he straddles these three posts of the state. I suppose the question is who would replace the Bailiff, and I think I addressed that and said the States Members were quite capable of electing their own Speaker. It is particularly important that it should be accountable to the States, that they can appoint and remove that person. That gives it democratic legitimacy. Appointing persons from outside might also be possible, but so long as it is possible that they can be removed if the States' will changes.

**MR CRILL:** There was a vote of censure that was moved against the Bailiff and the Bailiff at the time said that he would have resigned if that motion had been carried. The motion did not follow through. Would that not itself be adequate control, if you like, within the States' hands, the power to dismiss through a censure vote?

**MR LE CORNU:** I take your point, but I think we are going to be looking here at the structure of the States and whether it is acceptable that the Bailiff, who has these other functions, should be sitting in the States. My position would be that it is not appropriate, that the constitution should be actually changed and he should no longer sit there.

I take your point about the way it could possibly have happened, but I think that was very unlikely to occur and the point of this review is to look at the various structures and the way they interrelate and the consequences of change.

**MR CRILL:** Would you, if there was a States' appointed President, would you envisage him being removed by anything other than the full States Assembly and a vote of no confidence,

censure or whatever?

**MR LE CORNU:** I think that is precisely how the Speaker would be removed, yes, the States exercising its democratic will. It is the highest sovereignty in the land, in a sense.

**MRS BACKHURST:** The Deputy of St Martin, who brought the proposition of how this Panel should be set up, mentioned the lack of appeal by the decision of the Bailiff for States Members. How would that be altered if there was a Speaker elected by the States? How would an appeal against the decision of the Speaker be done?

**MR LE CORNU:** Well, I think as Lord Carswell mentioned, in other jurisdictions it would appear that the Speaker's decision is final and perhaps that could not be challenged. The great problem is who decides...the attitude of the Speaker and their powers and how they exercise them. The problem at the moment with the Bailiff is that he wears other hats. Those opinions or views that come from holding those other posts affect the way the Bailiff carries out the role of Speaker. It is not simply a chairman of a meeting, it is someone who is very conscious, internally conscious, of other duties and functions elsewhere within the state.

**MRS BACKHURST:** We said that if it was a Speaker who had no legal qualification, they might require legal advice and it was suggested earlier today that that might come from the Attorney General, I am not sure about that.

**MR LE CORNU:** I do not think a legal qualification is essential. What are required are people skills, managerial skills, and I am sure that any chief executive of a large company would be able to do that sort of job: someone who has the gravitas to control a meeting.

**MR CRILL:** The Bailiff's function with regard to the States Assembly is dictated by the Standing Orders which are set down by the Members. Do you think that there is anything that you would perceive as requiring changing in the Standing Orders if there was a differently appointed Speaker?

**MR LE CORNU:** I am not sufficiently familiar with the Standing Orders and the way they function. I do not think that is the problem. The problem stems as I mentioned before from the very fact that you have an individual who wears other hats and has internalised certain values, certain traditions, certain loyalties and ...

**MR CRILL:** But that can only stand depending upon his application of those Standing Orders and the room for manoeuvre, if you like, that those standing orders might give, unless you think it is purely a matter of perception.

**MR LE CORNU:** I hear what you say. I think that is rather naïve because in reality it is about power and about keeping control over the States. That is the critique of the Bailiff's role; that it is a power holding bloc around the Royal Court. Historically that has always been the problem: the great debate between the States as democratic and legitimate, and on the other hand the power of the Bailiff and Royal Court and the tension between the two that initially broke out with democracy in 1771 with the new Code. That is where it begins. It has an historical precedent and it is ongoing because the democratic movement is still on its way.

Indeed, we today are part of that. I am conscious in what I say today is almost historic because the constitutionalists will look at what we do today and ultimately at the report that you produce,

and it is very useful from a constitutional point of view to be able to see inside the Crown Offices because otherwise they are extremely opaque and the public simply has no idea of what goes on. That is why if you ask me about Standing Orders, I mean, I am not a Member of the States so I would not need to be familiar with it, likewise any of the functions, how the Attorney General's office is set up; but now we know. We have some awareness because clearly they looked at this issue ten years ago. Nothing changed. Today not a great deal has changed. I am afraid - and I think as I have made clear in my submission - that further change may not occur. It will be blocked because of that thing: the power of the Crown Officers in the state.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Jersey is not unique in that. I cannot think of very many places where the average citizen has much idea of what goes on inside the legislature or inside the Attorney General's department.

The Bailiff was originally very powerful, indeed was in charge of the whole of the civic affairs of the Island, he himself personally. The Jurats and the States developed out of that, offshoots of the Royal Court, and the Bailiff's powers over the centuries have been slowly diminished or limited. So it is not a question of giving him powers, it is a question of whether the powers which he still retains are undesirably wide. You have given us two reasons for that. One is the doctrine of separation of powers which is more honoured in the breach than in the observance, everywhere. The other is the fact that you consider that he carries too much power through his various roles. Is that a fair summary of how you are approaching this?

**MR LE CORNU:** Yes, I think it is. Also to add something which you mentioned yesterday about the move from absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy, in the sense that that is the process going on here - a democratisation of the state. It occurred and is still occurring in Great

Britain and the phenomena we see here are no different from those within the United Kingdom, within the British state and the way that the Ancien Régime, as I have referred to it - somewhat ironically, because of its Norman connection here in Jersey - is changing and being forced to adapt. I also used another expression here, the mildewed tradition. I am afraid that is still very much there. That is often what holds the power together and there is yet to be a real democratic breakthrough.

Dare I say it that one day Britain will be a republic and perhaps it is a republic in all but name, but it is not there yet. I put that forward because that is the kind of political background to the changes that need to be made in this Island. Unspoken are those who defend the status quo. It is the traditional Jersey conservatism and I am conscious that that political aspect needs to be put, although you will not deal with that in your report and the arrangements for the new structure, whatever that may be, in your recommendations.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There are those who say that the doctrine of the separation of powers is a shibboleth, that it is unworkable and never worked in any polity throughout the world, just there are quiet exceptions to it and even in the United States where it is taken to its most absolute form. It is certainly not observed in France and there are those who said that to change constitutional affairs in England under the banner of separation of powers was disingenuous and unnecessary.

**MR LE CORNU:** It has inspired men perhaps to seek change. Perhaps there are other forces at work behind it when they take up that banner.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It measures into your second proposition, because as I understand it, the

mischief at which the separation of powers was aimed, was too much concentration of power in one person, which meant a distortion of the way in which the several powers were exercised. Now what is the evidence for distortion of the exercise of powers in Jersey by reason of the lack of their separation?

**MR LE CORNU:** Well, historically the Bailiffs were dictators, benign perhaps, but dictators they were. They controlled everything that happened in this Island and it took until 1769 with the intervention of the British government in the form of the colonel of the regiment that was called over to deal with the rioters, to realise that the rioters had legitimate grievances and sought to address them and that the Bailiff who had run off and summoned the troops was at fault and that there needed to be change. There was a recognition --

**THE CHAIRMAN:** As at 1769 then your thesis would certainly appear to have had some force, that the execution of the powers suffered from the lack of separation, but in 2010 where do we stand in applying those principles?

**MR LE CORNU:** You see the contradiction, particularly today from Frank Walker, the former Chief Minister - and this is an analysis of the commercial/political class associated particularly with finance, that has a particular role for Jersey, in conflict with a much more traditional Royal Court and Bailiff who is more concerned with local and domestic affairs perhaps - and there was a former Chief Minister very concerned about reshaping the state, having a foreign minister.

I referred to it jokingly as "Dual Power", this conflict between the Bailiff who has certain roles and duties and a Chief Minister who clearly does not want to be second fiddle. If the individual changes, who is the Chief Minister? I made a reference to someone who has international



ambitions to change the role and position of Jersey. There will be conflict and I would prefer to see a democratically elected individual Chief Minister, accountable ultimately to the electorate as having more democratic legitimacy than an appointed judge, basically. It is very necessary in the modern Jersey to sort out our government. I am conscious of traditions but they must serve modern needs and they cannot be used as a bastion just to maintain power. There is a need for a democratic States that controls the Island and with a separated judiciary that functions along those lines.

To have these multiple holdings of offices is going to cause difficulties and we have already seen it in the cases of McGonnell and Barclays that there are those prepared to take up the issue and it is causing disturbance. The very fact that we are sitting here is a manifestation of the fact that there is discontent, be it not so much locally but certainly internationally, and I am sure that Britain wants to, as ever, has to come in and sort things out. They have to take a view.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Your argument then is premised upon too much power being concentrated in the hands of one person. The Bailiff as a chief judge must have the necessary authority that goes with that. There is an irreducible minimum and nobody has suggested at all before us that there is anything untoward in the set up of the Royal Court or the jurisdiction that the Bailiff exercises there. If the Bailiff is President of the States, he has no vote. He has a set of Standing Orders that he must abide by which are set up by the States, not by himself; and he must allow propositions or questions in accordance with those Standing Orders and as long as they do not contravene them, they must be allowed. Where does that extent of authority confer undesirable power on him in addition to his other work?

**MR LE CORNU:** We looked at the historical role of the Royal Court and the Bailiff and in their

resided power it is still there, tempered by the States which is the legitimate democratic organ, function of government. The Bailiff by virtue of sitting there, still, as I can only say, internalises certain values and practically, in seeking to defend the constitution of the Island, will often interfere in the way that certain members would want to bring propositions for change, for adaptation, particularly of the constitution itself. Therefore someone who holds that authority is going to seek to protect those institutions rather than allow the States its democratic will to decide.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** But he has the Standing Orders which are set up by the States, agreed by them. He must obey them; he must follow them. It does not look as if he has any more authority than the referee of a snooker match.

**MR LE CORNU:** I suggest the referee of a snooker match, were they sitting in the States, would look at matters very differently, they would indeed, and they would not come with the intellectual baggage and values, prejudices perhaps, that come with being the Bailiff. If you are civic head of government, you come with certain values. There is no question of that and we are looking here at dismantling the absolute monarchy in a sense. It is creating a constitutional monarchy, but one that is much more accountable to, with central to power, the States itself elected by the people.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** So it might be said that it is just dismantling it for the sake of it, that proposition, rather than because there is something actually going wrong or something wrong in principle in the way that it is constituted?

**MR LE CORNU:** There has of late, in perhaps the last few years, been increasing friction and

coming from the street is a different view of what government in Jersey should be. There is definitely movement. The giant has started to move and the public perception is the desire for a different form of government: one that is more accountable. We live in a time of crisis. We know that in a broader sense and that is having its impact here as well, that there will be major significant changes in the UK in months to come and years to come and they are beginning here in Jersey. It is the same phenomena. I am sorry to speak like a poet but ...

**MR CRILL:** A blood battle, if you like, that is being fought in the democratic arena. You have States Members being elected who we can say are at different ends of the political spectrum and they are fighting out the power battle between themselves, it would seem to me. What I do not quite understand is how you think the Bailiff is influencing or affecting that battle.

**MR LE CORNU:** Because the Bailiff is part of the forces of conservatism, if you like, with a small c, of defence of the status quo, of the way things have always been done and there is increasing demand from, I think, certain sections of the public, for a more transparent state in Jersey, whereas in the UK of course it has been happening and it can happen in a more structured fashion because it is a much larger state: there are forces that can bring in the necessary legislation; institutions can be changed; government can function in certain ways.

That has not occurred in Jersey. It has occurred in a fairly organic sort of fashion and the contradictions are coming out, but increasingly there are demands for higher standards and it is those, if you like, human rights standards which are now beginning to play out and that is forcing the state, the government in the Island, to reconsider.

**MR CRILL:** Contrary to that, as you have heard from the Centenier this morning, there has

been remarkable change in probably what is the most conservative branch of Island society in the last few years. The change to ministerial government has happened from its own internal momentum, if you like, without these great political movements fighting against each other. So it would seem to me that if there is this great weight imposed by the Bailiff to maintain the way things always used to be, things have been pushing against that quite successfully.

**MR LE CORNU:** An historical parallel: some institutions do come to their historical end and one very important institution that existed in this Island was the Militia, which was compulsory for all men to serve in, except for the Bailiff and the Royal Court. That was an institution which in the 19th century the British government perceived as inefficient in military terms. It simply served no purpose in an age of battleships, steamers and rifled artillery. There was no need to have a militia force but the forces of conservatism maintained it and even after the First World War, when the British government refused point blank to fund it any further, the States carried it on into the post war era.

It does show that certain institutions can come to a logical end and we should not be frightened of that. We should just accept that changes have to be brought about. Unfortunately the fear of change is too great here in the Island, and particularly within the States; they will be very reluctant to accept change. Even though the intellectual grounds will be well put down in your report, I feel they will be, and they will always remain, the intellectual challenge to what exists, because so many of the structures here sort of defy logic and they have a certain quaintness. But increasingly they are found to be not efficient now, as the Militia was not efficient in military terms, the institutions are found to be not efficient in democratic terms and that change needs to come. I think it will come eventually. This report will be a part of that milestone on the path of reform, and it is a rocky road, I think, as Deputy Le Hérissier mentioned.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** One of the suggestions you made in your written submission was that the Chief Minister should then not be the civic head.

**MR LE CORNU:** That is correct, yes.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It really must follow then from the sum of your suggestions that the Bailiff is no longer a Bailiff of a Bailiwick. He is a judge.

**MR LE CORNU:** I think you are absolutely correct. That is what he should become, a judge, but he can still retain the title Bailiff and there will still be a jurisdiction over which he presides which can be a Bailiwick, but he is not the head of state.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Might as well call him the Czar as the Bailiff: it is about as meaningful then if he does not occupy any position except that of a judge.

**MR LE CORNU:** I think the senior judge of Jersey will always carry status.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Yes, but whatever he is, he would not be a Bailiff of a Bailiwick. He would be a different office holder. I am just teasing out the consequences of your proposals and that is a fairly thoroughgoing radical one.

**MR LE CORNU:** Why would Jersey not remain a Bailiwick because of the Bailiff -- we are looking at it from a jurisdictional, legal point of view. It is still a Bailiwick. It is still the Island that has defined limits. What we want to call it perhaps does not matter, but we can continue to call it

a bailiwick: it is a title. The judge would preside over what happened within the affairs of what happened within that area.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If they do not retain the title of Bailiff then it would be an empty one.

**MR LE CORNU:** I do not see how it is empty. What is it empty of? What has disappeared? Only the authority as --

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The concept of bailment.

**MR LE CORNU:** Well, I am trying to fit in here feudal institutions into a modern state. They can be retained. Why not? But we have to ensure that the state remains responsive to public --

**MR STRANG:** You think there is more power exercised as civic head, in your view, is there, than as in effect President of the States?

**MR LE CORNU:** The Bailiff has power because he holds all these positions. It is the multiple office holding that is the issue. Take one away and the power diminishes. If you separate all that ...

**MR STRANG:** If you had a different Speaker of the States Chamber, but the Bailiff still remained civic head of the Island, then that would not satisfy you, would it?

**MR LE CORNU:** I think the Chief Minister should ultimately become the head of the Island and I think that will happen because for democratic reasons the States will assert itself and particularly

if there is a strong, powerful Chief Minister, they will want to have control over the levers of power. They will not want to be second fiddle to others even if it is only a ceremonial power.

If it is a real power that remains with the Bailiff, then they will not find that acceptable, but I think it is just a matter of separating the roles of government. Have a judiciary. Have whatever titles you wish, but it must be strong and well resourced, but simply perform that function and, yes, we are dismantling the old ancien régime here, but be conscious of it. We can do it in a reform way.

**MRS BACKHURST:** If the Chief Minister were to be civic head, how would the relationship work with the Lieutenant Governor, do you think?

**MR LE CORNU:** If the Bailiff continues?

**MRS BACKHURST:** No, if the Chief Minister became the civic head.

**MR LE CORNU:** Well, perhaps we need to review the role of the Lieutenant Governor because increasingly his function diminishes, particularly in the world of high-speed communication. The direct link would be between the Chief Minister's office and Whitehall and what role does the Lieutenant Governor really play? Historically he was in charge of military forces in the Island. There are none. There is no French enemy about to invade. There is no need for a military force to be maintained here. There was that strict division between the military and the civil roles. In the contemporary world it just does not exist.

**MRS BACKHURST:** Who would then protect the constitution if the Chief Minister was dealing directly with Whitehall?

**MR LE CORNU:** I think the Chief Minister would defend the constitution because they would be accountable to the people of the Island and they would very much look out for the interests of what they perceived as Jersey. They would not be betraying it or selling it to anyone. They would be much more accountable than perhaps even the Bailiff because the people would say, "Hold on. You are not protecting our interests. We wish to replace you".

**MRS BACKHURST:** How would we do that?

**MR LE CORNU:** Through the democratic process, that is how.

**MRS BACKHURST:** We do not vote for the Chief Minister.

**MR LE CORNU:** That is another question about electoral colleges and presidencies and how the Chief Minister arrives, but ultimately there is some pressure about those who do get elected about who they are ultimately going to choose as their Chief Minister and the sort of policies they are going to pursue.

**MRS BACKHURST:** The Chief Minister nevertheless, even if they were defending the constitution, would still require legal advice, would they not?

**MR LE CORNU:** They would. It would be political advice. They would be defending the Island politically, arguing their corner in Whitehall, against Whitehall if necessary, or in conjunction with it, hopefully, to make sure that Jersey got perhaps a bigger bite of the cherry than it might otherwise.



**MRS BACKHURST:** And where would they get the legal advice from?

**MR LE CORNU:** Well, they could refer to the Bailiff or to the Attorney General, but practically, I do not think they are taking legal advice. I mean, obviously for those -- that legal advice, that body of knowledge needs to be available and as a resource, as a tool I think it could be made available within perhaps a reformed tradition.

**MRS BACKHURST:** It seemed from yesterday that the Bailiff was saying that in fact the constitutional position is under even greater threat than it had been previously and that he is continuously giving legal advice as to the constitutional position, and if you were merely to be a judge and not a provider of constitutional advice, then the Chief Minister could have problems.

**MR LE CORNU:** I think the legal advisors to the Chief Minister would have to be well informed about international conventions and the external relationships. That is what is changing things in Jersey. It is the external factors that are forcing Jersey to reassess its position and constitution. That is what is eroding it or forcing them to build up the barriers. It has always been those external forces. There is a degree, and I think I have referred to it, of internal up-welling of popular desire for change, but it is the external ones ... because Jersey's ultimately the finance centre, the responsibilities imposed upon it are those of an international state and it really does not have the resources to do it and it is creaking as a result. It is becoming very expensive to maintain those international relationships. The former Chief Minister was aware of those this morning and I am sure he would want to find the resources to create a new institution, the foreign minister for Jersey.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Could I move on to a slightly different topic then? You mentioned a Ministry of Justice. What would it be responsible for?

**MR LE CORNU:** I put that forward because that would perhaps embody the legal judicial functions of the state. It would be under this Ministry of Justice and there would also be the judges and all the Magistrates' Courts and other legal services and it could help possibly to tie up some of the loose ends with regard to the Honorary Police, where they were accountable. I do not have the blueprint. I am just merely ...

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I am just wondering what is lacking that you need to have yet another body created. At least we have had no evidence that the Courts are not satisfactorily run. The administration seems to proceed. What do you need a Ministry of Justice for?

**MR LE CORNU:** One that takes more interest in the wider political requirements for justice in the Island, because I suspect the Bailiff, or anyone who is a simple judge, is not going to have the broader analysis. That is not expected of them. They have certain functions to perform but a Ministry of Justice hopefully will start looking in a broader way at criminal justice policy.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If you have a Minister of Home Affairs to do that, that is his function.

**MR LE CORNU:** Yes, indeed, there is going to be an overlap and perhaps those sorts of areas should be separated out. I am merely trying to apply to it the kind of structure that other states have adopted and see if it has relevance here.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Ministry of Justice or Department of Justice in the United Kingdom has

acquired an amalgam of various functions which are being performed in Jersey, as far as one can see quite satisfactorily with the institutions you have. The Ministry of Justice in London has the old Lord Chancellor's department, which involves running the courts, and that runs into a very big piece of administration: it is the prisons; it is responsible for all sorts of things which if one were to set up a constitution with a piece of paper and a pencil one might think of making part of their remit. So, yes, it is sensible to look at the structure but I would suggest it is not sensible to create a new ministry unless there is something that is not being properly run.

**MR LE CORNU:** Point taken. I confess my ignorance in that I do not have the blueprint to roll out.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There will have to be a submission about it.

The Honorary Police and the position of the Attorney General: we have had a certain amount of evidence in the last little while about the Honorary Police. Somebody has to have the function of deciding on disciplinary matters relating to the members of the Honorary Police because it cannot be done by the States of Jersey police. They are a separate body. It cannot be done by the Police Complaints Authority because they do not impose discipline. It cannot be done by the Police Authority, if one is brought into existence, because it is involved with resources but not with discipline.

So there has to be the equivalent of a chief officer who decides on disciplinary matters; arranges for hearings and sanctions if a person is found guilty. The Attorney General does that at the moment really because there is nobody else to do it and they are quite clear about that, but who else in your suggested scenario would take that on?

**MR LE CORNU:** I do not have the answer to that, but you have highlighted the problem and that is the important thing for those that will ultimately make decisions in the Island, to be confronted with the intellectual construct that says what exists at the present is unacceptable and cannot continue. It is against that that the forces of conservatism must argue if they wish to retain things as they are and the very fact that you have put them out, plainly very clearly, poses a challenge which has to be met.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** A challenge means that you are showing that there is something wrong. Is there something wrong about the Attorney General holding that position?

**MR LE CORNU:** He does not sound as if he is very happy with it because it is described as a titular function. It is like an honorary colonel of the regiment. The regiment is actually run by its real colonel and he does not have titular power, he has more than titular power. He has real powers and controls everything. There is the disciplinary function. It sits unhappily because of the other roles that he has to play. It is for the States to find a role, a way of dealing with the Honorary Police. The Honorary Police is very anomalous in this Island and they have retained their power historically by virtue of always exercising special pleading and they have survived into the 21st century and it is very surprising that they have done. If they continue longer, then their functions must be sorted out. The great criticism of the Honorary Police is that they are not, to refer to the military analogy, efficient.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Well, if your basic complaint is about the Honorary Police, it is outside our remit. We are not tasked and we certainly will not offer views as to whether there should or should not be Honorary Police. But given the fact that they are there, we have to decide

whether it is a good idea or a bad idea that the Attorney General should be their “titular head” or else to suggest somebody who could be responsible for the ultimate discipline of members. I have not yet had any suggestions that jump off the page at us as a substitute.

**MR LE CORNU:** But having sat here and listened to the argument and read the submissions, it has teased out a lot of issues which I think will then have to be addressed by the States, and that is very useful because it will then begin the public debate based on a concrete analysis of the structures as they are, so there can be no mythologising, no dreaming of tradition that we cannot possibly change it. We have to look at it from: “These are structures. Are they efficient? Are they practical? How much do they cost? Are they democratic?”

**THE CHAIRMAN:** We shall work within our terms of reference and when we have finished hearing the evidence, then and then only will we proceed to conclusions of our own. We will prepare a report and submit it to the States, which I am sure the States will publish for the citizens.

Thank you to you as well as everybody else that has appeared before us for your contribution to our work. It will be transcribed. You will see the result before it is published to make sure it is accurate and we will take it into account with all the other material.

Thank you very much, Mr Le Cornu.

**MR LE CORNU:** Thank you very much for listening to me.