

Thanks for your e-mail. I have cc'd in Jayne on my reply as the seconder of the amendment.

The majority of your questions pre-empt the work that the amendment directs to be done. Modelling, quantifying possible revenue, impacts, etc. would all be part of it, if approved.

The amendment is a matter of both principle and evidence. In terms of principle, we cannot as yet say to the community that every stone has been turned before asking them to pay GST, which is the commitment we both made during the election. The sub-committee explored corporate taxes, but its terms of reference were limited to only that and not the possible alternatives that our amendment covers.

In terms of evidence, we are proposing an independent review to assess the full range of options for Guernsey. While high-net-worth residents make a valuable contribution to the island, it is important to independently assess both the economic benefits and the wider impacts to ensure future policy is based on evidence rather than assumption.

This is a cautious and measured amendment; it introduces no new tax, delays no part of the tax package, and prejudices no future decision. It would however ensure that these options are explored, and an evidence-based approach is taken to an area that is often anecdotal. If we are genuinely committed to leaving no stone unturned, then we cannot begin by placing a large stone behind a 'Do Not Disturb' sign.

If the P&R tax proposals are approved, approval of our amendment would ensure that before future assemblies are asked to consider increasing GST, or introducing further broad-based taxation, they have available robust evidence on whether wealth and asset-based taxation measures could form part of the solution. Further work is already planned under P&R's proposals; our amendment simply states that this should be included in that work.