

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 5th FEBRUARY 2025

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	3
1. Modern Languages in Schools (P.74/2024): amendment (P.74/2024 Amd.) - resumption.....	3
1.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	3
1.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	3
1.1.2 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	5
1.1.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:.....	6
1.1.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	6
1.1.5 Deputy M.E. Millar:.....	9
1.1.6 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	10
1.1.7 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	12
Deputy M. Tadier:	17
Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:	18
Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	19
Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	19
Deputy R.J. Ward:	19
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:.....	21
Deputy M. Tadier:	22
1.2 Modern Languages in Schools (P.74/2024) - as amended (P.74/2024 Amd.)	23
1.2.1 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:	24
1.2.2 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	25
1.2.3 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central:	25
1.2.4 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	26
1.2.5 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:	26
1.2.6 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:.....	27
1.2.7 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	27
2. Draft Children and Young People (Independent Advocates) (Jersey) Regulations 202-(P.87/2024)	33
2.1 Connétable R.P. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):.....	33
2.1.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	34
2.1.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	34
2.1.3 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:	35
2.1.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:	35
2.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:	38
2.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:	38
2.3.1 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:	38
2.3.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:	39

3. Draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.89/2024)	40
3.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):.....	41
3.1.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:.....	42
3.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	42
3.1.3 Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf of St. Saviour:	44
3.1.4 Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:	45
3.1.5 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:	45
3.1.6 The Connétable of St. Peter:	45
3.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:	47
3.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:	49
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	51
4. Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	51
ADJOURNMENT.....	51

[9:30]

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

1. Modern Languages in Schools (P.74/2024): amendment (P.74/2024 Amd.) - resumption

The Bailiff:

We continue with the debate on the amendment to P.74, and I have next listed to speak, Deputy Catherine Curtis.

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

Later this morning I expect to speak as chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel, but right now I speak as an individual member. I love learning languages, and it was very useful when I lived abroad. There is no argument that learning foreign languages is not useful. But this is not about me or other States Members' individual experiences. It is about forcing language study on those 14 to 16 year-olds who do not wish to continue studying language. We heard yesterday from many States Members who spoke of their own experiences in learning foreign languages and how useful that had been for them. Well, that was then and this is now. Things change and we are living in a different world. There are new ways to learn and many of our young people are feeling overwhelmed. But our schools do offer language teaching and it is accessible for older children who wish to continue learning a foreign language. Jersey children already receive instruction in a foreign language. They already have access to learn French. The difference is that this proposition will make a foreign language compulsory for 14 to 16 year-olds. So that means all those who do not want to continue studying a foreign language will be made to do so, and that is not a good idea. I am not comfortable with more compulsory subjects being imposed on this age group. They can choose to continue studying a language which is right. At this stage it should be a choice not an imposition. We must all be aware of the increase in anxiety and mental health problems in children and young people and we should enable them to make their own choices. Imposing further study on this age group, for those who do not want to study a foreign language, is going to add to their stress and anxiety. It is no use referring to the example of other countries, they will have different ways of study set up. If we want to be more like them it would take an overhaul of how children are taught and not just tinkering at the edges. For these reasons, I support the amendment which will ensure that the Curriculum Council reviews this matter and will consider the effect on 14 to 16 year-olds of having more compulsory subjects they must study. If there is a way to make foreign languages compulsory for this age group that will fit in with all their other subjects and can be done without causing distress that would be really good. But we will not know that without the review. As Deputy Alves has already said, it would be irresponsible to proceed without a review and therefore I support the amendment.

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

I was listening with interest to the debate yesterday as I had not made up my mind about which way to vote on this. As a qualified teacher, when we have debates about schools and the curriculum I am usually very interested, and this is the only thing that I will probably say about my own personal experience. I am not particularly proficient at languages myself so this is not an area that I am as passionate about in terms of education. But I do want to speak about passion because something that came across to me from several of the speakers yesterday, and indeed Deputy Tadier himself, was the passionate desire to have this in our schools. Deputy Tadier has brought several propositions along these lines over the years, and I do have respect for Deputy Tadier and for the basis of his work. He is a very experienced States Member and I think he has a level of understanding of what our population needs. So I did listen yesterday and it was interesting to hear lots of personal experiences from States Members and I am not going to speak about my own. But what I am going to speak

about, and this is something that I like to base as many decisions as possible on, is research. As well as being a teacher, I studied psychology at university and part of that was child development. One of the things that I learned when I was studying child development was that children are predisposed, even before birth, to learning language. First of all, I wanted to challenge some of the statements that were made yesterday. I think one statement that was made was we are not all linguists. Actually, the research on the human brain says the opposite; that we universally are all linguists. Even me. I do not feel particularly good at speaking French, but I can speak a bit of French. All of us, all of our brains from before birth were predisposed to picking up the language of whichever culture we happen to be born in. Studies have shown that babies, even very soon after they are born, the way that they start to babble and make pre-speech sounds follows the cadence and the rhythm of the language that those adults around them are speaking. I just find that fascinating. So our brains are set up to do this, to acquire language that we hear around us. Now what I did not know about ... so my area of specialism in terms of child development was very much early years. I have to admit, I do not really understand teenagers. We are talking about this age group, are we not, the 14 to 16 age group. I did some research and what I found is that around this age, in fact just after the cut-off period that Deputy Tadier is proposing - age 16 - around age 17 something happens in children's brains and there is a critical window. We see these critical development windows in other areas such as writing and reading. Around age 6 to 7, many children just suddenly ... children who struggle with reading just suddenly pick it up. That is why in many countries they do not start to teach children to read until they are 6 or 7, because those education systems have a really good understanding of child development, they know that actually they need to play until up at that point. I have learned something from this debate. This has sparked some learning for me. I was not aware that around age 17, children, young people, are highly skilled learners of language. There is a critical window which falls off a cliff around age 17, 18. I think that giving young people the opportunity to have that language learning before their brain changes and that critical window passes; and it is gone for ever, that critical window. The research says that people can acquire languages after this age but it is much harder, it requires a lot more work.

[9:45]

In terms of us making a decision based upon ... and I like to make my decisions based upon research, and also by listening to the views of my colleagues, which I have done today. I think this would be a really good thing to do and really beneficial to our young people because another thing that is universal to every human and every Islander is the need for connection and while children, yes, they will show preferences for different subjects and for different ... going into different industries, what is universal is the need to connect with other human beings. That is the other thing that has convinced me on this, is that giving children that skill and teaching it to them at the right time when they can more easily acquire it gives them the ability to connect more widely, not just for our Island and for our economy but for themselves to be able to communicate with other human beings. For those reasons, I am convinced on the need for language teaching up to age 16. As well as the research, I am also convinced by some of the data about other countries in the E.U. (European Union). So 87 per cent of pupils in upper secondary education learn English as a foreign language, and I think it is also about respect. Because I think we have a certain amount of privilege as a jurisdiction that mostly speaks English. When we travel, most of the time we can get by using English, can we not? But if we have an additional language when we travel or when we interact with people who have English as a second language, it also shows that we have gone that extra mile and it shows respect to try and communicate with people, with our closest neighbours, France, in their own language. The research on child development has convinced me, the stats that I have seen about the rest of the E.U., about our neighbours in Europe, about what is happening there, has convinced me. I am going to be voting against this amendment for reasons stated by I think it was Deputy Gardiner that ... I have the greatest respect for the Curriculum Council and they give very valuable advice to the Minister. But today I

would like the Assembly to advise the Minister. I think we have examined this issue very thoroughly during the debate and I would like the Assembly to advise the Minister to go ahead with this.

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

May I raise the défaut on Deputy Farnham, please?

The Bailiff:

The défaut is raised on the Chief Minister.

Connétable R. Honeycombe of St. Ouen:

It was just to advise the Assembly and yourself that I have a hospital appointment at 10.30 and I will be away for approximately an hour.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much for that, Connétable.

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

I have been drawn to speak following several contributions yesterday. The debate is in danger of swinging from what should we do about languages for our young people to more of a debate about our heritage. Later this year we will be celebrating with our V.I.P.s (very important people), those people who lived through the Occupation. Many will have memories of being taught German in school, and not through choice. Many would have arrived at school not being able to speak English, but speaking either French or Jèrriais and some would have got into trouble if they spoke in their first language at school rather than English. Back then 3 languages causing a problem. Fast forward to today. Last night's *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* reported on a recent visit to Rouge Bouillon School. The article spoke about the fact that there are 31 - yes, 31 - languages spoken at that school. Unfortunately, not all pupils arrive with a good grasp of their home language, making learning English difficult for some. Last weekend, while I was driving, I was listening to the radio. An article that piqued my interest was one about A.I. (artificial intelligence), a subject that came up in questions yesterday. Today, there is technology that can translate immediately into many languages, and the example given in the programme was Japanese. The ability to scan a page and get immediate translation, and the ability for people to speak their own language and have it translated so as to facilitate a conversation between 2 or more people who have no understanding of others' languages. Should we be compulsory teaching our youngsters a second language or should we be teaching them how to embrace A.I. and other technologies that will open up new exciting horizons and, at the same time, open up those commercial opportunities that the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development spoke about yesterday? I have experience of working in a school and when I did there was a lot of interest in Mandarin. Parents were happy to pay for their children to learn this language after school. To my surprise, the lessons proved popular. They were popular with those who wanted to do it, those who wanted to try. It certainly was not for everyone, as other clubs proved more popular. The main thing was that there was a choice. In this debate, where is the voice of the child, the parent and the teacher? Are we, as has been suggested the 49 experts, going to tell these groups what is best for them without engaging with them? Have those Members who have spoken against the amendment and who signed the pledge to put children first forgotten their commitment? The Minister is not saying he will not look at languages. If he was, he would have encouraged us to vote against this proposition. The Minister is asking us to allow him to work with his department to see what is achievable. I would hope that the Minister has heard the feedback about the Jersey Curriculum Council and would encourage him to take a look at this in the coming weeks and perhaps review their terms of reference. As one former headteacher explained to me, if you have got additional revenue, use it to support the children who are falling behind. In closing, I urge Members to support the amendments and then to support the proposition as amended.

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

I think, like the Constable of St John, I had a light bulb moment on the way home last night. When I arrived home I did a little bit of research too, and I am certainly no expert, unlike Deputy Doublet in what she has in relation to qualifications. However, this is a little brief: “The debate surrounding the compulsory study of languages for teenagers encompasses various arguments that highlight potential drawbacks of such a mandate. One significant argument against making language study compulsory is the varying levels of language proficiency and educational needs among young people. Research indicates that young people from socio-ecologically disadvantaged backgrounds often face difficult challenges that can impede their academic performance. Forcing these students to engage in language studies without addressing their additional foundational language skills may exacerbate their educational challenges rather than alleviate them. This concern is often underscored by findings that suggest a lack of tailored support for adolescents with language impairments, which could lead to feelings of inadequacy and disengagement from the educational process.” More research goes on, but I do not really want to continue with it. My view is straightforward. We need to ensure that all of our children that go into education come out of that process with the most appropriate levels of their own abilities. That may not be a language. It may be an ability to make a cupboard out of wood. It may be an ability to make a very nice weather vane out of a piece of metal. It may be all sorts of different things. Young people are very computer-minded. I, like the Constable of St. John, on the way home thought about young people and their choice. We provide them with a lot of rules and a lot of advice about how they need to behave, what laws they are and what they have to do in order to keep out of trouble with the police, et cetera. What my fear is, is we are now trying to step on their toes in relation to their choices within the educational system. I fully accept that students will have to do maths and English, but I think they should be allowed to make their choices, alongside their parents, and what their actual aspirations are moving forward. I think that we, as an Island and as an Assembly, need to ensure, and I would be fully supportive of all of the elements in relation to providing as much education in relation to their own language, ensuring that they are able to do languages and able to do 2 languages if they choose to do so. But I am not in favour of making our students do compulsory language at G.C.S.E. (General Certificate of Secondary Education) level. From that aspect, I think it is important that they are choices for young people and choices for them moving forward, not for what we think is right for them. I did not sign the pledge that originally came up in relation to putting children first. I deferred that decision and that decision was deferred until the Assembly at the time banned the smacking of children. That for me was the turning point to which I said, and I genuinely believed, that people were going to put children first. For me, I am going to put the child first. I do not see anywhere in any of the paperwork, and I can be corrected. Have we spoken to the Children’s Commissioner? I do not think we have. Does the C.R.I.A. (Child’s Rights Impact Assessment) suggest that this is the right thing for children? Yes, I genuinely believe that if we can all speak a second, third or fourth language there are benefits, without a doubt. Somebody else also mentioned yesterday about our heritage and how important it was to speak a language and culture. I do not necessarily think that that is the case, because not everybody can have those linguistic skills. Yes, I fully appreciate what Deputy Doublet said about the fact that our brains are geared in that sort of way. I have been learning French for many years. I am still not proficient, but I managed in the last 2 years to get my first exam in it. So, from my perspective, I think we have to allow our young people to make the choices that are right for them under the guidance of their families and parents and their teachers and the school. I am very supportive, as I said, of the facilities to be able to provide them to do those language skills if they choose to do so but I will not support compulsory language skills, even though I think it is absolutely valuable for people to be able to speak a second or third language.

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

We have heard a lot yesterday about everyone’s own experiences and a lot of reflecting back to the past but I do not think this proposition is a romanticised proposition about Jersey’s past. It is about

clearly stating what we need to equip future generations. The world is rapidly changing around us and I am not talking about a gradual change; the world is literally imploding in the last week alone. If you are not worried now, you should be. We need to look to the future and what skills are needed for all children on this Island. What are we actually talking about in this proposition? It is just an extension of a skill that children are already forced, told they need to have between the age of 7 and 13. What this proposition and not supporting this amendment would mean is just extending it for 2 years. All this language we have just heard this morning makes it sound like it is a huge imposition on our children. We are talking about an extension of 2 years. We already force our children from the age of 7 to 13 to learn another language. Why? Why do we do that? Is it a waste of time? Is it imposing something on somebody? We do not speak about forcing students to study physics or biology or maths. The Connétable of St. John just talked about using A.I. for learning a language so we would not need to. Maths, there is a calculator. Why do we have to have maths as a core subject in G.C.S.E.s? We could stop that at 13 because we could do our G.C.S.E.s perfectly well with a calculator. Does this also mean, because I hear from the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs, I heard that we are forcing children and she wants to put children first. Well, I would like to ask the Minister, what about uniforms? Children definitely do not like to wear uniforms. Should we give them the choice now? I hope so, so we can say from the age of 7 you do not need to have a uniform.

[10:00]

I can also tell you if we are putting children first that every day in the car when I take my 11 year-old to school he says to me very clearly he thinks he should be paid to go to school because he hates it. If we are putting children first are we now going to listen to my 11 year-old and say: "Okay, that is fine. We will pay you to go to school." I give that opportunity to any of those children that are hearing this debate outside to put that to their parents and then also to the Minister that maybe they could get paid to go to school. What is it? Why is this proposition asking us just to extend the language by 2 years? It is because from the age of 14 you should probably start understanding why it is important to learn a language. You are becoming more mature in understanding the world outside of your front door, outside the world of your home, and understand there are huge benefits to learning another language, not just because of being able to speak but also about culture, about hearing amazing different kinds of music, about exploring the world, about understanding each other, maybe even falling in love with someone that does not necessarily speak your first language. Language is also about ... speaking it is about confidence, and many of you yesterday talked about that and I would say most of you could probably speak another language but it comes from confidence and understanding that it does not matter about making mistakes. We hear mistakes all the time with those who are speaking English as a second or third language. It does not matter. But a lot of us who speak English as a first language do not have that confidence to be able to speak it because we think: "Oh no, I do not want to make all the mistakes." And a 14 year-old and a 15 year-old suddenly that ... what benefits they can have from starting going: "I have the confidence to make mistakes. I have the confidence to speak out and it does not matter if only 50 per cent is understood. The point is that I am trying." So those skills are extremely important I think because it opened doors to different cultures, it sharpens your mind, it gives you confidence, it helps you with the cognitive abilities like problem-solving, creativity and even memory. But it is not just about that because I come back to what I said at the beginning, the world is changing. The competitiveness in this world is changing, jobs are changing and if we want to equip our students with skills that give them that competitive edge to go in the future job market, and I know there is a lot of discussions about keeping youngsters on the Island, but they also have a choice to leave if they want to and can we give them those abilities to go not just north, and they probably will not want to go to America. So where else are they going to go? They can go just across the way to be able to go into Europe and actually find different job markets out there. Because as we heard from Deputy Doublet, most European countries and students speak 2 or more languages. So it is the norm. Actually we are undermining our youngsters by not giving them an ability for another language. I just want to say that the Connétable

of St. John talks about the fact that in Rouge Bouillon there is ... I cannot remember, is that 36 ... 31 languages spoken. Wow. So those students already are more competitively advantaged than our monolingual students Jersey. This proposition gives the equality of those who do not have the advantage of speaking another language at home because it is an advantage in having bilingual children. I am sorry, it is not a disadvantage that you have second language. You may be longer time understanding and gripping many different topics but, wow, once you get it you go and you have all those abilities that the research says about cognitive memory, et cetera. So we are actually disadvantaging many of our own students who do not speak another language because more and more ... there are those in the Island who speak more than one language. I think we are absolutely giving those with monolingual a disadvantage equipping them for the future language. Just as an example, my husband speaks 5 languages - English is his fourth language - we can go pretty much anywhere in this world because of that. I will have to catch up with him but I am trying. But that is normal. That is completely normal for him and the Netherlands that they can do that. I want to just bring that back to what I have said earlier as well about the world imploding around us. Part of learning a language, and I am talking about we already impose, force, our children to learn a language from the age of 7 and 13. We are talking about extending it for 2 more years and why is that? It also fosters empathy and global awareness, helping us to understand and appreciate the perspectives of others, and we absolutely need that now. In the world that is happening now I cannot believe anyone would think that we need to be a closed off English-speaking country without having 2 years more extension to help those who are getting more mature, more understanding of that global awareness to be able to say yes, actually we are global citizens. We absolutely respect other cultures, we respect and empathise with those who are going through the hard times and you have that from just understanding language. I looked up G.C.S.E. French and the themes that students learn in G.C.S.E. French. The themes over the years is: theme one, identity and culture; theme 2, local, national, international and global areas of interest; and theme 3, current and future study and employment. It is exactly what we are talking about. It is exactly what we are talking about is that French is not just about learning the structure of a language and being able to communicate. The French G.C.S.E. is put into a structure that helps you understand that wider implication of another culture, another understanding, and not just France because there are many other places who speak French around the world. We know that because we are members of A.P.F. (Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie), so we will ... it is not just about going to one country. We are talking about having access to so many more cultures and understanding and you get that through the understanding of not just learning the structure of a language. For me, as dyslexic, I can tell you structure, English, is the most painful thing. But learning languages and learning that through understanding about culture and about the kind of views of the other country from looking at global things or national identity or all those things, really makes you understand and get to know French much better. So I come back maybe to something, and I finish off with something that is really close to my heart. I suppose it comes back to Jersey and something that I picked up as soon as I moved back to Jersey, is the twinning associations. I absolutely love our twinning association in St. John, the Connétable knows that we have a great time with Le Teilleul when they come here or we go there. We do not speak very well French, they do not speak very well English. We have the best time because we are learning from each other, because we are supporting each other and know that the languages are not that ... we do not have to be perfect in our language. We can use a lot of hands and a lot of laughter to get what we ... to understanding. We share. We share understandings. For example, my family from Le Teilleul, the husband works in inseminating cows in Normandy. So when he came to Jersey, I took him to a farm. He was very gracious to phone up one of our local farmers and we went round and it was fantastic trying to translate how Jersey farmers work and how you inseminate cows in Jersey in French. I learned a lot that day. How are we going to recruit or make the twinning associations thrive? Just a small part of our culture and our connections and how are we going to do that if we do not have youngsters who at least feel confident that they can make the hand gestures and laugh and have that communication even if it is not perfect. For me, that is why this extension of the 2 years to

make it into when youngsters are that more mature and understanding of why it is important for a language is why I will not be supporting this amendment and I will be supporting the full proposition.

1.1.5 Deputy M.E. Millar:

I was also not intending to speak in this, so my speech will not be as coherent as some of the ones we have heard over the course of this debate. I would just like to make the very obvious point, with my Minister for Treasury and Resources hat on, that there is no pot of extra money for this. If we want extra money for this then the Minister will have to make a growth bid in next year's Budget and for this year he will have to reprioritise his spending from another area in the department. That is the fiscal position that we are in. I do not have a pot of money to devote to this, so the money will have to come from elsewhere. Secondly, and I feel I have said this before, I do not think anybody here is challenging the usefulness of learning a language. This is not about whether or not we should learn languages and whether it is good for us. Of course it is good for us for our thought processes. I went to a presentation, or I spoke to somebody only last week who had some slides that I think suggested that the youthful brain in terms of language skills was fully mature by the age of 5 or 6. So the notion that they are sucking up like a sponge any language at 16 or 15 may be misplaced. We have a continuing obsession in this Assembly, I believe, with French. I have no objection to French. French was the language I learned at school, with the other option being German. I read a very interesting article some years ago by John Simpson, who was a very famous, you will all remember, foreign correspondent. This article was about the decline of French as a language of diplomacy. Someone mentioned French as a language of diplomacy yesterday, I believe,. He said in this article, yes, that was the case. All diplomatic engagement was done in French, but for some 30 or 40 years that had been changing because the wealthy ruling classes in numerous countries in the Middle East and Asia, instead of educating their children in France, decided to start educating the children in Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Yale. They were sending them to English-speaking countries to be educated both at secondary and further level. So the language of diplomacy is rarely French. It is now English, because that is how people are educated worldwide now. Deputy Jeune says that the world is changing. Yes, it is. Absolutely. We want to equip our children for the jobs of the future. But what are the jobs of the future? Actually, we have no idea. Children at school now may very well be coming out of school, coming out of university in 20 years' time, to jobs that do not exist at the moment. We need to focus on I.T. (information technology) and technology. Those are the important languages that children need to learn, as well as another spoken language, if they wish. If they wish to speak Spanish or German or Italian, any one of those languages may be of more use to them than French. A friend of mine wanted to go and work in New York several years ago and was told he could not unless he spoke Spanish. In large parts of the United States people grow up speaking Spanish as the first language. If you want to be a doctor and go and work in the Middle East or South America, French will not necessarily help you. If we were really looking to the future - I have said this before - I firmly believe that the languages we should be teaching our children are Mandarin, as the Constable of St. John mentioned, or Arabic. That would open up the world to our children, not just French. I absolutely support, and I am sure the Minister ... we all support the teaching of languages, but what I struggle with personally is the teaching of French as a compulsion. Someone may want to ... people have limited things they can study. If you want to be a doctor, you will be expected to have a heavy focus on sciences, and people can shake their heads. You are expected to focus on science. If you want to do a language, why should you be forced to do French? If you really want to do Spanish, people have to have a choice.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Would the Minister give way as a point of order or correction?

The Bailiff:

Do you wish to give way?

Deputy M.E. Millar:

Yes, Sir.

[10:15]

Deputy M. Tadier:

It is just that the Minister is talking about being forced to study French, but this does not force anyone to study French. It is about giving a choice of ...

The Bailiff:

I think that is a speech, Deputy.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It is just a point of fact, Sir. This is not what we are debating.

The Bailiff:

I am sorry, points of fact can still be contained in speeches. The nature of the communication does not determine whether or not it is a speech. If you are going to put corrective information in, then that must be done in the ordinary way.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I was just asking ...

The Bailiff:

This is a debate on the amendment. It is not a debate on the main proposition.

Deputy M.E. Millar:

I apologise to the Deputy. I have slightly misread what he is saying in paragraph (b) is all secondary schools should continue to offer choice of at least 2 modern languages other than English, one of which must be French. That therefore does create a preference for French, and a school may decide that they want to do German and Italian, or Italian and Spanish, or Russian, or Mandarin and Spanish, but they are being compelled to teach one of those choices must be French. I do not think that we are setting our sights widely enough by insisting that of the 2 modern languages one must be French. Schools should be free to offer other languages if that is what they want and if that is what their communities want. Portuguese and Mandarin. Anyway, there is still a heavy focus here on French. Nobody is arguing about the benefit of modern languages. I think we are all agreed on that. But I support the Minister on this and I think the element of over-focus on French is not necessarily going to do our children any good in the future.

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

May I raise the défaut on Deputy Alves?

The Bailiff:

Yes, the défaut is raised on Deputy Alves.

1.1.6 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

I appreciate this has been a long debate and there have been some excellent speeches so I hope not to take too much time. But bringing the point back to the amendment and the rights and wrongs of it. I do hope that the Assembly will vote against this amendment. It strikes me that we heard yesterday from the Minister for Children and Families that he described this proposition and voting against the amendment as supporting something which he called a blind leap of faith. If we compare that with the current situation with the proposed health reforms, which have been described as being

entirely experimental, it appears to me rather incongruous that we should adopt this amendment because, on the one hand, when something suits the Council of Ministers it is based on fact and evidence. On the other, when it suits them, they prefer not to listen to the evidence in the research. I know that the Minister in this event is a scientist himself, but that Minister has also, at a later stage in his life, learned an additional language. I believe he has enjoyed his French lessons. But would it not have been more effective, and does the science not back it up, that his brain would have been better conditioned had he maintained the study of that additional language at an earlier stage?

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

May I have a point of order? I actually studied O-level French; it was O-level. I was quite good at it actually. My brain is quite good ...

The Bailiff:

That is absolutely not a point of order unless you want me to rule that you have studied O-level French or have not studied O-level French, which is not a matter for the Presiding Officer.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I think it was quite disparaging that I had not.

The Bailiff:

I think points of order, Deputy, you will forgive me for saying, should not be used as an opportunity for giving information. It is not a point of order. Please carry on, Deputy.

Deputy K.L. Moore:

Thank you, Sir. I believe I was making a speech. We heard an excellent speech from Deputy Doublet about the science of the brain and the impact of language learning on that brain. I hope that the scientists in the Council of Ministers will think deeply about that evidence and that research, which suggests that the proposition is absolutely in order and there is no need to revert back to the Curriculum Council for advice on this matter. Because if we really aspire to deliver the very best in education for our children, and that has always been one of the U.S.P.s (unique selling propositions) of Jersey, the standard of education that we have provided to our young citizens as a small Island community has always been something that has drawn Islanders or drawn people to the Island to work and to contribute to our economy and to keep our children here also because it has been a fine thing. If we all value education then we should be certainly voting against this amendment and supporting Deputy Tadier because we aspire for better for our children. We do not want to meet the standards of the United Kingdom, we want to meet a Jersey standard, and the use of language is something that has enriched our Island for many, many centuries. It is something that when we look forward to the future we should be broader than the Minister for Treasury and Resources, we should embrace languages and the benefits that that provides, not only the personal experience of the person who develops an additional skill and is able to go out and communicate with others around the world. I certainly, for my own part, being a fluent French speaker and also dabbling in a bit of Italian and Spanish too, understand that great benefit and have enjoyed being able to communicate with others around the world in our work with the A.P.F., in particular, but when meeting other members of the worldwide community on a political level it is something that brings us together. It is something that strengthens the person and it is something that I am very pleased to have in my array of skills, however limited they might be. I do hope that Members will aspire for a better future for our children and to defeat this amendment, which it certainly deserves to be done.

The Bailiff:

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

1.1.7 Deputy R.J. Ward:

A flashback to O-level French then, Mr. Cawley. I was convinced he was French because it was immersion French in those days. I was very convinced ... just a little story to start with, lighten the load. I have got as long as I want, have I not, Sir?

The Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Marvellous.

The Bailiff:

And you will undoubtedly endear Members for using it.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Merci, Monsieur. Get yourself comfortable everyone and sit up straight because you need to listen carefully. I am only joking. I can remember French, it was a wonderful subject and I did do it, but I also did sciences and I did sociology, I had 11 O-levels, 11 Bs. I am very proud, B for boy is what my teacher said to me, not a scrap of homework, but I got through exams. I was good at exams until I got to A-level, but there you go. What does that mean? That means, yes, of course, this lad who grew up in east London did O-level French, it was ... I do not think it was compulsory, it was an option. My art teacher said to me: "Do French", which really upset me actually, but we will not go into that now. So, I took French as an option because it was an interesting thing to do. But what I want to do, is to look ... let us get back to the debate, I have started this slightly flippantly. I want to speak seriously at the beginning of my response. The first thing I want to do, I want this on Hansard and perhaps the ... I notice members of the press here, I have a chance to get something across. I want to start by offering an unreserved apology to the hardworking, skilled, experienced, voluntary members of the Jersey Curriculum Council. It is not a paid post. It happens after they have finished their day jobs, from 4.00 to 6.30, usually the meetings are. Sadly, yesterday, several Members chose to call into question the integrity of these individuals that make up the Council. Thirteen individuals from across key stages from ... and it is chaired, not by myself, but by the lead person in school improvement, I believe. That is the last person who chaired it. On behalf of myself, Deputy Alves, and Connétable Vibert, I can assure you, we do not share the views of Deputy Tadier that any review into this would be a *fait accompli*. We do not share the view of Deputy Bailhache, who thinks that they work at a leisurely pace. We do not share the views of Deputy Kovacs, that teachers on the Council could be biased based on workload. The members of the Curriculum Council know about curriculum, the reality of what a curriculum is. They deliver it, the content, the way it builds over the years, the way it is assessed, whether it is formative assessment, is it going to be a terminal assessment, is it going to be assessment as it goes along, which percentage of that curriculum will be terminal assessment, which will be continuous assessment? These are all things that I am sure you all know about in this Assembly, because you are making judgment on them. I am sure everybody in here is an expert on the way that a curriculum works because you are about to make a judgment on it. That is great. So I will explain it. I know I am already preaching to people who know, but we will go through it anyway. Myself and the other members of the team respect the professionalism of the Curriculum Council. I would invite Members - Deputy Kovacs, Deputy Tadier, Deputy Morel - to come to the next meeting and explain why you see their role as so biased, unprofessional and inappropriate for this type of work. Because I know that I am going to have to have that conversation, even though I do not agree with it. In terms of minutes of meetings, minutes of meetings from the Curriculum Council. I will tell you what the Curriculum Council produced over the last year and a half. They produced an entire syllabus, an updated P.H.S.E. (personal, social, health, and economic) syllabus, which is applicable and deliverable. They produce deliverables, not just ideas and

conversations like some parts of Government do in nice little reports that were put on to a shelf but actual documents that are delivered in the classroom. That is what the Curriculum Council do. They do so with professionalism. Also I think it is section ... it is not called "section", 59; I cannot remember what it is, means that the Curriculum Council can get people ... I cannot think of the word. Co-opt, that is the word. Co-opt any members that they want to on to the Council. What I would expect to happen in this is that we have a lead adviser for languages, we have a whole language team, that they will be co-opted on to whatever work goes on into whether this is viable and how it can be delivered. How could this be delivered realistically? Where are the teachers coming from? How would that be done? That has not been answered. How would it be paid for? That has not been answered. Will it be one syllabus for all schools which will mean a change for some schools and also a competition as to which one is the most appropriate, but obviously the experts in this room would know the answer to that. Perhaps when people speak in the main debate, if we get there, they could talk about which syllabus they would choose because they know it so well. There seems to be an awful amount of knowledge in this Assembly about what is going on here and these judgments being made, so let us hear it later. Let us hear what syllabus would be advised, what is best for our children with a range of needs because without some sort of a view in terms of the way this will work realistically, we are going to stumble into a change that will have a profound effect on what our children can choose. I want to pick up on something else, analogies about crisps, which I found quite insulting for our young people. Our young people at the age of year 9 now enter into a process of choosing options. Teachers work incredibly hard on this for careers, for form time, for P.H.S.E., for the work they do and what these options mean for them, open evenings through options evenings. All of this work that goes on in our schools I am telling you, but I am sure every single Member knows because they are experts. It is fine, everybody already knows this but I will just point it out. What they do is they make a choice and these students in year 9 are looking ahead and thinking: "Okay, what do I want to do? What will I do at 16? What are my options open to me?" Good to see Deputy Miles mentions the I.B. (International Baccalaureate) again. The reason I.B. was lost, there were not enough students, and there were not enough students because there is not enough joined-up co-operation at post-16, some of the work I am trying to do now. This will not make any difference to whether or not we do I.B. but I think it is a great qualification, absolutely. What those year 9 students do is they make a choice and they think: "I will do this and this and this. I want to do that as well, it will take me to that pathway." Lo and behold, they might do one subject that they simply enjoy, like music or dance or drama. Or they might want to go into drama, they might want to be an actor, they might want to be famous, put Jersey on the world stage, which is a wonderful thing to see. What we are about to say if we are not careful is: "Oh, no, no, no, you cannot do that because we know best. We know best." With some science - I am not a neurobiologist; I do not think there are any neurobiologists in this Assembly who know so much about brain science - I would say my view of most of the research in that is modern day phonology and we have to be very, very careful about the data that is produced, so let us take that with a pinch of salt. Now, our language is useful and, Deputy Moore, who I will point out, many of the people who spoke in favour of this were in Government for 2 years and did not act on this at all, did not take the opportunity, including the previous Minister and Assistant Minister.

[10:30]

It was not a priority then but it will be made a priority now because it just seems the right thing to do and the political football that is education will be kicked around a little bit more, which I think is a real shame. What we are going to do here, if we are not careful, is without any form of investigation, research, consultation with teachers, staff, parents, other bodies, whatever they may be according to the Curriculum Council, the professionals who look at that, to just say ... I am very interested to hear from the Deputy when he spoke that this proposition is in principle. This is not a proposition that is in principle, the main proposition, it is telling me as a Minister and the department and schools - mainly the 11 to 16 schools, by the way, who it will affect - that you will deliver a language to every

single child in that school, September 2026, regardless if it is appropriate for them or not. Or are we saying that is not the case? Because we are full of dichotomies here in what has been said so far in this debate and I would like to point them out - well I would point them out but I have lost my bit of paper; I can remember it, I wrote it - and we are full of them. It is really interesting that what we are going to do is we are going to make a decision, if we are not careful, to say: "Do not undertake any sort of investigation as to the way this works, just do it" because there is a heritage part. Well, as we just heard from the Deputy, this may not be French that is delivered, it could be any modern language. It could be German, it could be Italian - I am pleased to see that Deputy Renouf would be very pleased if his son could do German at last, it would be marvellous - it could be Spanish, could be Mandarin. What will happen in reality - and the reality of schools is what needs to be understood here - is that schools will deliver what they have because recruitment of our significant number of teachers which just gives us massive choice across the curriculum is a fantasy land. I, as Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning, do not want to employ teachers who are substandard, unable to deliver or not fully qualified. I want to have the best teachers who are fully qualified, know the way the schools work, can differentiate - that is a nice word - and can be part of the inclusion agenda to include children with particular needs. I am sure, because everyone is an expert on there, they will understand what I mean by "ordinarily available support" within the classroom. People can comment on that how you would use ordinarily available support in the classroom when you teach for these children who you are forcing to do a language. Perhaps when you talk in the main debate you can explain how you are going to do that because if you cannot, then simply we should not be making this judgment. This judgment should be made by those who know the best about it. There were so many other things I could say - and I am going to because I have got the stage - this notion that this is an amendment to kick things into the grass and then the juxtaposition with the hospital. We are back to the hospital again. Marvellous. We are using our children as a political football and we need to stop doing that. This is not kicking something into the long grass, this is looking at a way in which we could deliver, if this is generally the will of this Assembly, a provision that is correct, sustainable and realistic. What I envisage doing, as I have done before with the nursery staff, is when we produce a report, I will make a statement to the Assembly and face questions. I am very happy to face questions. I did not have any this week, I felt a little bit left out. I am very open and transparent in the way I do my job. I know my remit, I know about education. What I would suggest I would do is that the report will come to me in December, I will publish that report, I will make a statement to the Assembly and then you can ask me questions and we have got a way forward. But instead of this, what this Assembly wants to do is to say: "No, I am the expert, we are the experts, we do not need to do this. You do not need to see how this will work. You do not need to include those people. Just get on with it and we will hope for the best." In the original proposition there is nothing, nothing at all, about staffing, costs, the impact on other staff because if you take away an option, what are you doing with the staff who teach that option? Which options are at risk? I would suggest R.S. (religious studies) is at risk. There is usually only one group in a school, what are we going to do with those teachers? That is a fantastic subject if you took it, it is more like philosophy. There are subjects that are at risk: geography will probably be at risk. Music. Perhaps we will get another proposition from the Deputy to make music compulsory. This has implications and unless we look very carefully and find a way to work that, then we are not going to get anywhere. I will say, the reason that some schools, Hautlieu is the ... I am amazed by what the Minister said, the previous Minister, because I would have thought it would be understood that selective schools can offer more subjects in a way because they are selective. They are selective according to ability. It is the non-selective schools of children who have been selected, they cannot go to a school because of their cognitive tests, they will not go to a school because of their financial ability, but what we are going to say is: "But we know best for you and we are going to get you to do a language because it is best for your brain." There have been many examples of things that are best for your brain; I can give you a couple of examples. There was something in science called "cognitive acceleration through science education". What it does - ready for the lesson here - is it addressed Piagetian thinking levels. Because one of the

problems we have in our society, according to the researcher, proper research, was that 50 per cent of our population never enter formal operational thinking, i.e., you can hold one variable in your head while you are addressing another one. The idea was that if we addressed this early in children, they were designed lessons - because I used to teach and we incorporated it - that we will bring children through these levels and they will be better at science and other subjects. It had some significant success but it fell out of favour. There was a maths version with a rather unfortunate acronym, which I will not go into, but that one worked as well, and it was a process, so we have been through these. But the silver bullet of education: "If you do this, everything will be better" we have to be extremely careful about. Bilingualism, I have got to say, that G.C.S.E. is not going to make you bilingual. Twenty-five per cent of it is an oral exam in some of the syllabuses - but I am sure everybody knows what is in the syllabuses because everyone is an expert, so I do not have to tell you that - and 75 per cent is a written test, most of them being terminal tests after 2 years which certainly do not suit some students. But do not worry, because if you have low literacy and you are struggling with all your other subjects, we will put you into a high literacy lesson and stand you up in front of the class and build your confidence when you cannot respond to it. That is a great way to teach. That is the teaching from Victorian times and modern teachers will be pulling their hair out and saying: "Do you have any idea what happens in a modern classroom and the challenges that we have with every single student to engage them?" There are so many more things that I could say. I have got my apology into the Curriculum Council and when I meet them I will apologise to them again because that was entirely unfair. I have got to mention one thing; we talk about bias. The Curriculum Council will be biased because it knows about the curriculum but the A.P.F., which is being used as a political tool in this interaction, that is not bias. A group set up to promote French will not be biased in any way in its interpretation on whether or not this is a good idea. We will replace a supposedly biased group, the Curriculum Council - which is full of professionals of all sorts of levels from higher education all the way down to early years and beyond - with people who just simply want to provide French. But this is not about French, it is about any language. It is mandatory but I have heard the Deputy also say it might not be mandatory, it might be for those who cannot be ... so is it mandatory or not and how much would it cost? Well we do not worry about that. What we have got is a situation where we could be voting for something when we have absolutely no idea as to what it is going to look like. Or we have an amendment where I will come back next December and say to you: "This is what it is going to look like. This is what it could like. This is the way we can implement it" but as an Assembly we do not want to do that, it seems. That troubles me, instead we will impose. I will finish off with one thing, in terms of the voice of the student as the previous Minister talked about, I have only one voice of the student that has been sent to me. It was conducted last school term at one of our 11 to 16 schools because when this was first lodged - which was last summer, it was a long, long time ago, it has been hanging around for ages - they did a survey of their year 9s and 85 per cent of them said: "No, we do not want this to be compulsory because it will get in the way of our choices that we are being asked to make right now." So there is a pupil voice but we will not listen to that one because it does not fit our way. I ask Members to think very, very carefully: are we going to look at this in an appropriate way before we make a significant change to our curriculum and the opportunities in most of our 11 to 16 schools, those who face the biggest educational challenges, or are you going to let me do my work, let me and this Curriculum Council ... let the Curriculum Council do its work to come back with appropriate ways forward which I will bring back to this Assembly? That is the choice you have in front of you. If you want to ignore that and just move on regardless, then be careful and be sure as to what you wish for. I will come back in the main debate with a lot of questions that I supposedly can answer. I ask Members to support all parts of this amendment and then we can move forward.

The Bailiff:

Do you call for the appel?

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

May I raise a point of order? I am not sure if it is a point of order or a request to give way. It is something the Deputy mentioned in his speech. He referred to a study that I quoted and he used the term “phrenology” and said that it was like modern phrenology. I just wanted to ask whether that was appropriate language to use.

The Bailiff:

I think the reality of it is that anyone who understands the expression “modern phrenology” will realise that the Minister is expressing a view that these kinds of researchers should be treated with caution and he does not trust them. He is entitled to express that view; Members are entitled to decide whether they agree with him or not, it seems to me.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Would the Member give way for a point of clarification of my own speech?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

I have asked for the appel.

The Bailiff:

Well you have not, I asked if you wanted the appel but nobody said anything. But the reality of it is that, Minister, as you know, at the end we normally encourage if there is going to be a request to give way, not to interrupt the flow of the speech but to do it at the end. It is a matter for you if you give way. The Deputy wishes to clarify what she said in her speech, which she is entitled to do if you give way, but not if you do not.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, fine.

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I thank the Deputy for giving way. I just wanted to add some further detail. The study that I mentioned in my speech was in fact a peer-reviewed study which was published in the *International Journal of Cognitive Science*. It has nothing to do with phrenology, which is a debunked racist pseudoscience.

The Bailiff:

Well, I think the first point, which is giving more information relating to what you were quoting is a clarification of what you were talking about, but I think when you move on to comment about phrenology, that is rather turning into a further speech.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Yes, so I will not say anything else about phrenology. The methodology was a computerised test and that the sample size was 670,000 people worldwide, so it was a very robust study.

The Bailiff:

Very well. The appel is called for?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, please.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on the amendments as read out by the Greffier at the beginning of the debate, 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. The amendment has been adopted:

POUR: 24		CONTRE: 20		ABSTAIN: 1
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy C.F. Labey
Connétable of Trinity		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of St. Martin		
Connétable of St. John		Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. Mary		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy M. Tadier		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		
Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy I. Gardiner		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		Deputy K.L. Moore		
Deputy S.M. Ahier		Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Deputy D.J. Warr		
Deputy I.J. Gorst		Deputy H.M. Miles		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		Deputy J. Renouf		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Deputy H.L. Jeune		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		Deputy R.S. Kovacs		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy B. Ward		
Deputy R.E. Binet		Deputy K.M. Wilson		
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy M. Tadier:

Could I just ask for leave of the Assembly to withdraw part (d) in its entirety and I will explain why, is that I think that part (d) now is so completely removed from what I had intended it does not give any clear direction to the Minister about whether the States wants him to do this piece of work.

The Bailiff:

Is this part (d), are you saying?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Part (d), so the one that has just been amended. But that would ...

The Bailiff:

A review of the consultation of the requirement to study at least one modern language?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Yes. That would then leave us to have a clean debate on parts (a) and (b) which there is consensus around. Otherwise I think that ... although if there is a debate I will obviously listen to it. I am probably in the strange position of having to speak against part (d) and encouraging Members to vote against part (d) because I do not want them to have a pointless review which nobody seems to want.

The Bailiff:

So you wish parts (a), (b), (d) and (e) to continue, is that correct?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think (c) has already been removed, has it not?

The Bailiff:

(c) has already been removed, you have not proceeded with that.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think (e) is contingent on (d), so I think (e) and (d) would both fall away if (d) is not debated. Then we would effectively just have a debate on (a) and (b). I do not think it is a waste of time, I think we have had a good debate.

The Bailiff:

Well, so it is true that (c) would fall away if (d) is not proceeded with. If (d) is proceeded with then fall away. You require the leave of the Assembly to withdraw (d), Deputy, because the debate has technically opened. You ask to withdraw, is that request seconded?

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

Vote on it, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Well there can be a debate because it is something that requires the leave of the Assembly and therefore the Assembly ...

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I am happy to second it but I would ...

The Bailiff:

Well that is a difference as to how you wish to ... very well. **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on whether or not the Deputy should be given leave to withdraw part (d) of his proposition?

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

I think I understand what the mover is saying. I think - and he may sum-up - he thinks that effectively the amendment as now adopted by the Assembly means it is nugatory, there is no point in it. If he could just clarify so that I am advised to being in favour of the overall issues.

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

Well, I think the thrust of the debate we have just spent the best part of a day-and-a-half was in relation ... I know many Members supported the amendment because paragraph (d) was an undertaking to review this in consultation with the Curriculum Council. I thought that was at the heart of ... and with all due respect to Deputy Tadier, I think it is a case of: "Well we will have a debate and if we win it we will leave it and if we lose it we will pull it out." I am not even sure how that process should be allowed in this Assembly and that is perhaps something we need to review. I have seen it happen very rarely before where a debate or an amendment is lost and then it is pulled. I just think I would ask Members if they are minded to allow the Deputy to withdraw it, then what we spent the last day discussing, that debate pretty much becomes null and void and we start again. I am not sure I am in favour of pulling it.

Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

I must confess that I am not clear what the proposer of the motion is trying to achieve. I do not know whether it might be possible for you, first of all, to give some indication as to what exactly is being suggested.

The Bailiff:

Well, what is my understanding, Deputy, is that Deputy Tadier wishes now, in the light of the fact that it has been amended in a form which he does not wish to see proceed, to withdraw from consideration by the Assembly paragraph (d) as amended and consequently paragraph (e) of his proposition. That would leave quite simply a debate on (a) and (b) and nothing else. I hope that helps. It might be helpful if the Greffier were to read what is left in those circumstances but it may not.

Deputy P.M. Bailhache:

The Deputy has taken some of his supporters - this one anyway - by surprise with this suggestion. I am not really sure that I understand the full implications of what he is trying to do. I supported him very strongly in relation to the amendment which has just been carried but I am not sure that the amended proposition is entirely without value so far as the Deputy's proposition is concerned. I hope that perhaps he will deal with that in his reply in perhaps a little more detail. I agree that the Minister's summing-up on the amendment made it perfectly clear why those Members who did not support the amendment should not have supported it, because he gave a pretty clear indication that there were so many problems that were going to be brought to the fore as a result of the proposition of Deputy Tadier that the aim was not going to be achieved, but I may be wrong, and I am in a quandary.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Perhaps I may offer, first of all, I really honestly want to say to Deputy Bailhache that that is not the case. I just want to get this right because I genuinely understand the demands of education; I spent my life in it. I have been there in the classroom last thing on a Friday having to battle my way through atomic theory. It is not easy, so that was not the case. Perhaps I can offer an olive branch here which might be useful for this Assembly and for the Deputy. I think there is a constitutional point here - and I do agree with the Deputy on this, having brought propositions myself as a Back-Bencher - I always wanted to keep ownership of that proposition. It is up to me what I do with it and it is up to the Deputy what he does with it; I happily support that. But the olive branch is, I did mention in my speech about inviting the Deputy and perhaps Deputy Kovacs, Deputy Morel and others who have spoken about their concerns, to come and speak to the Curriculum Council and do some work with them. Set up a working group with them, come and talk to us, say: "What do you want to see that is different? How can we encourage more people into languages at 11 to 16 schools?" Let us start at that point. Let us really promote those languages. Come in and do some work with us. Show what the A.P.F. does. Come in and work in that way, and then as we move our way forward, if we get a

sense that that compulsory language or those numbers increase significantly, then we can work forward on that. So there is the olive branch, there is the offer from myself as Minister to get this right, to do the most appropriate thing and to move languages forward. But that I think would be a really constructive outcome from this debate so that the debate is not wasted, so we have not wasted our time. Also, it might repair some of the damage that I think has been done to the Jersey Curriculum Council, which I will repair, and I think it will help do that. I would suggest that it is entirely up to the Deputy what he wants to do and I think we should support that but that olive branch is there, that suggestion is there to try and work our way forward in terms of languages so things are not lost from this debate, some of perhaps the political football is put aside, and we have a political sit down and a cup of tea which might be more constructive than *verre de vin*, I do not know, and baguettes. [Laughter]

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Would the Deputy give way?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Saucisson.

The Bailiff:

Minister, you are asked whether you would give way.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, I will.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I am grateful for the Deputy and I am grateful for the olive branch. I wonder if just before the proposal to allow the proposition to withdraw whether or not he would give a clear undertaking that this would be a review that could be conducted before Budget arrangements for next year if there is a financial implication so that we can be ... there is no point in working with something that there are no resources for. If he does that, I am happy to potentially work with ...

The Bailiff:

That is a legitimate point of clarification, are you able to clarify?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, that is a good point. I have to say to the Deputy, I do have priorities that I want to get on with. It would be nice as Minister to be able to get on with my priorities because a lot have been put on me. I have dealt with them, we have moved forward, I have done them constructively and I have got some announcements to come in the next few weeks and months about other propositions that are coming forward. What I will say to the Deputy, I am happy to go through the review work. I think the first stage for the Assembly is to say to work with how we can encourage French in those 11 to 16 schools. Let us uncover together what it is that makes students not want to do that subject in those schools. When we have done that and then a review to say we are getting back to stage 1, is where we are now, well we are just going to impose this at some time. I think there is a middle ground between the imposition, the development and encouragement for languages in the way that so many Members of this Assembly want to do. Perhaps it links in with the stuff about how we are going into schools, because I know we all go into schools all the time. I think there is a middle ground between ... and if later on as we develop that we can say: "This is a time now where ideally we will not need to impose this" because it will become a popular subject again and promoted positively by the Assembly without the conflict. It will be promoted positively by the department. I believe we always have, and I certainly have. I am trying to learn French myself, I am just a bit too shy to speak it. I can offer that but the Budget thing does not make sense to me at this stage because I have a real

priority, priorities of 15 hours of childcare, for example, which is so important to this society, priorities about some school meals for secondary schools, to deal with those, and I do not want to drop any of those but we can still do some work to priorities. I would say that perhaps the 2026 onwards, that is the time to do that.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I do not think my question was answered. I think the answer was no, was it?

The Bailiff:

Well, I think we must let that rest there. I do not want this to get into a lengthy debate. We are simply debating whether Deputy Tadier may withdraw paragraph (d) and as a consequence paragraph (e). Does any other Member wish to speak upon that?

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I do not know whether the Minister would be able to respond or whether one of his Assistant Ministers. In the spirit of an olive branch, would there be anywhere that Deputy Tadier could be involved with the Curriculum Council and meet with them if he is willing to do so? I, like Deputy Bailhache, am not sure on what is the right thing to do here but it seems that Deputy Tadier's passion might sit well with the expertise of the Curriculum Council.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Can I answer that? Yes, I did say at the beginning, the Deputy knows the way Curriculum Council works, as he has been to a number, but I think a subgroup of the Curriculum Council, to say: "Let us look at what the issues are around languages." Talk to A.P.F., talk to language teachers - that is a miracle of an idea - and talk to children. Talk to children. Go into 11 to 16 schools. I will quickly give an example of this ...

The Bailiff:

Well, no, I am sorry, Deputy.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

All right, sorry. I am just trying to answer in full, sorry.

The Bailiff:

This is a point of clarification that you were given and the clarification simply had to be: could Deputy Tadier be involved?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I ask for a point of clarification from the Minister?

The Bailiff:

Really, if it is absolutely necessary, but you will get the chance to speak at the end.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It is; I am hoping it might speed up the end. The Minister said that this is a debate about whether I am allowed to withdraw my part of the proposition, not about whether I get invited to the department. Because he is pro-choice, would he say whether he is in favour or not of me being able to withdraw this part of the proposition?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Sorry, yes, when I said as a ... the answer is yes.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. All right. Does any other Member wish to speak on whether or not there should be a withdrawal of paragraphs (d) and consequently (e)? If no other Member wishes to speak, I close the debate, and ask Deputy Tadier to respond.

Deputy M. Tadier:

The reason I have asked to withdraw this is not to waste anyone's time. We have had a debate but I do think - and I will put it on record - there has been an element of political naivety in the way that some people voted on the amendment. Because effectively what we have done is we are not going to have a debate now on whether or not we think as an Assembly that the requirement for languages should be extended to 16, we are deprived of that vote. The way that part (d) is now worded, it says that we are charging the Minister to do a review and consultation by the Curriculum Council about the requirement for students to study at least one modern language to the age of 16, but we have not given instruction about that. We have not told the Minister that is what we want to happen and that is why this whole amendment was flawed in the first place which is what I explained in my one speech, when I got to make it, about why the amendment should not be adopted. It has been adopted - I am a democrat, I accept that fact - but I also accept the fact this is just the political reality. I know that the Minister does not want to do this because we have had several meetings where he has told me and sat across the meeting and says that I am wrong when it comes to languages. That is fine, I am happy to accept that. He said: "You are wrong when it comes to languages and it is wrong, that they should not be compulsory for G.C.S.E." I have been up to the department and I have had the conversation with the lead person for that and they have also basically told me that it is quite clear that there was no appetite for introducing a G.C.S.E. requirement for 14 to 16. What I am saying is that we have had the debate now, as a democrat - I am a 15, 16 year-old politician - I am used to losing when I need to.

[11:00]

Or not when I need to but I am used to winning or losing and I will take that. I will congratulate the Minister, he has won the debate. Do not waste the time of the Curriculum Council, because they have got other important work to do, asking them to do something that they do not want to do and that we do not even know if we want to do. That is the bottom line; we have had the debate. Maybe in 2 years' time when there is a different Assembly, I might not be in it - who knows? - but there might be other Members who feel passionately that we need to catch up with the rest of Europe and someone else will try and bring it back. But certainly if we leave it to the Curriculum Council or to schools themselves, we are just going to go on as we are. That is fine, that is a decision we have not taken today, and that is what will happen by default. Allow me to withdraw part (d), we have had the debate, it is all on record. I will make certainly comments about parts (a) and (b) and I think we can move on.

The Bailiff:

Very well, is the appel called for on this? The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on whether Deputy Tadier should be permitted to withdraw paragraph (d) of his proposition which will have the effect, because (e) is contingent upon it, of withdrawing paragraph (e) as well. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition is adopted:

POUR: 34		CONTRE: 5		ABSTAIN: 2
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of Trinity		Deputy M.E. Millar
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy R.S. Kovacs
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy S.M. Ahier		

Connétable of St. John		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
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 M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

1.2 Modern Languages in Schools (P.74/2024) - as amended (P.74/2024 Amd.)

The Bailiff:

Very well. Then the debate continues on paragraphs (a) and (b) only of the proposition. The proposition was made and seconded. Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition? If no Member wishes to speak on the proposition ... is your button not working?

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

I do want to say some final remarks because I think that Deputy Tadier has done ourselves a service in relation to the passion that we feel that language education ... and I understand his deafness in now having been defeated. Yes, we have lost the battle to unfortunately ... I think he was right. I think that it is going to be rather strong to say that it was a wrecking amendment but effectively it was a wrecking amendment. That has been done - and I am sorry about that - but I maintain the view that language education is important and I can only draw from the experience that I have had and also the other people who I have learnt languages with. I believe that the Minister in his summing-up on the amendment that was passed did not speak once about Jersey and Jersey's culture and Jersey's history, and I regret that. I regret the fact that Constables ... and I said jokingly that I would now call Constables who do not recognise French, I would call them "Constables" not "Connétables". I would like to call them both because it is both, and the proposition as now brought before the Assembly maintains that, maintains the issue of French. What I would say is that the skill of learning a language is something that, as Deputy Doublet in the amended speech so eloquently made - it is so wonderful to hear Deputy Doublet, a colleague from St. Saviour, speaking with genuine research - I know that if you learn one language at a certain age, your abilities to have the ability to learn another and a second and a third reduces very quickly. There is a number, I cannot think of it, but you effectively need ... if it is 20,000 hours for the first language, your second language is down by a third, and then a half, and again. It is the early adoption of languages. If it is French, it is fine, it does not matter what the language is. I say to all those Members that have a difficulty with French, languages are easy, and we are born with the ability to do them, to hear them. I was brought up with the environment of speaking Jersey French. My mother and grandmother I do not think realised that the children understood Jersey French and of course we understood it entirely. I could now draw from those reserves and I can probably address this Assembly, if I go for some lessons, in Jersey French because it is my legal right. Languages are a different window on the world. It teaches you respect. It teaches you a different perspective. They say French is the language of diplomacy and it is. You can say something in French and the other person absolutely understands it but it is not so brutal. I was sorry - and I want to say one thing - that the issue of compulsion was used in the context of the Occupation. I think we can do better in this Assembly than that. I will just conclude by saying that coercion should not be part of this debate. It should not be something that we should consider because it is not coercion, we do not compel. As Deputy Jeune - who made a wonderful speech - said, we do not always do what children want. I would say to the Constable of St. John, I would ask him to recall the Bailiff's medal that was given to the Rector of his neighbouring Parish of St. Brelade, the late Reverend Halliwell, who was called to serve to reconcile the people of Jersey after the tremendous issues of Occupation, and he did so because he spoke German. To use the coercive issue, and having gone to and studied in Germany, having welcomed my mother and father to Germany, and to see the horror on my father's face, I understand that coercion, that when he met my hosts and he heard the story of the German that had saved people from the ghetto in Warsaw 20 times and is now honoured at Yad Vashem, my father's feelings of fear went away. Let us not use coercion in a negative sense, let us use it in a positive sense, and let us rejoice about the importance of languages, the importance of French, and giving our children jobs of the future, their dextrous ability that young minds can have to develop skills that they would never otherwise have. I can thank Deputy Tadier for a good victory in what I hope is going to be an overwhelming adoption of this proposition. I have not heard ... I am not sensing exactly where this is going. I do not know whether the Council of Ministers is going to now try to not get this proposition adopted. I hope they are not going to do that, this is my only chance to speak. I hope this Assembly is going to give a thundering approval for what is a good proposition - not a perfect one for some of us but we can live with that, we are

democrats - and we can say that we have done a good job because we have thought about our past, we have talked about our present and we have spoken about our future. In future Budget debates, now we are year-to-year funding, not a 3 year, we can put those extra resources, but that is a debate for another day. But I congratulate Deputy Tadier, I thank him and all those Members who, like me, have had an experience of language, and that has given me an opportunity to do different things in my life and different things that I would never otherwise have had to do. That can be for all children and I wish that for all children of this Island, wherever they come from, and wherever their parents have come from.

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

I did not speak on the amendment and I did not speak on the proposition by Deputy Tadier to withdraw part (d), so I have only risen really to ask what the purpose in leaving parts (a) and (b) in are if the substantive debate on part (d) in Deputy Tadier's view was lost through the amendment - and I supported him in rejecting the Minister's amendment - what is he looking to achieve with parts (a) and (b)? I am never a fan of this Assembly rubberstamping work that is already ongoing and the Minister's comments on part (a) suggest that this is in essence either doing exactly what is already happening, so we can accept it. But sometimes we also take a view in this Assembly if it is already happening we should reject it and part (b), likewise, says that they should continue to do something that they are doing. I would really like to ask Deputy Tadier what is he looking to achieve in parts (a) and (b) that make it purposeful to keep this proposition in than what he could have done, of course, which is withdraw the whole thing. We are not debating what is to be withdrawn now. What does he see each part will achieve: should they be accepted or rejected? Therefore, could he also ensure that they are taken in parts at the end? That is all, thank you.

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

I find myself in a bit of an odd position because I am a little bit disappointed that the other paragraphs have been withdrawn but at the same time I am happy. I had quite a lot to talk about based on the other 2 paragraphs that have been withdrawn. But I rise to my feet because I think I am probably in a very unique position and probably the most qualified to talk on this in a sense that I have been through it as a student, I have been through it as a resident of this Island and I have also been through it as a professional, as a teacher. Also as a teaching assistant, but prior to qualifying as a maths teacher, where I worked with special needs children and children who had - back then the acronym was different - which was English as an additional language. I am really supportive of these 2 paragraphs that are left. I was born in the Island in the 1980s at a time where I was probably the only Portuguese person in primary school when I started. At that time it was almost discouraged, I was discouraged from speaking my home language. I distinctly remember my mum being told that she should be talking to me in English at home and that was the policy and the understanding back then. Obviously, we are talking quite a few years ago now and things have changed along the way. I am glad that they have and I am glad that our perception of that and how important having a home language is or speaking in your home language at home. I think just to address the points of Deputy Curtis - and I am sure Deputy Tadier will address them as well - I think for me it is really important that we have a political backing, if you like, that that direction of ensuring that home languages are supported within our schools is reinforced by us because in the past it has not been. In the past it was the opposite that was happening. On that, I think I was really fortunate, my first language was not English, I was born here. When I started primary school I remember understanding English but answering back in Portuguese, which was quite interesting. I was really fortunate that I had that language and that growing up, went on to secondary school. At that time, I was the last cohort at Les Quennevais that was compulsory to do French, but it was also compulsory to do a humanities, that is out of religious studies, geography and history. Now French for me was not really an issue because I am bilingual, although being bilingual I would not say that I am a linguist. I would not say that my forte is in languages because I did not go on and do an A-level in languages like a lot of my

Portuguese peers did, and I did not study it at university; I studied maths and I.T. But what I will say is that I had to choose a humanities and I remember sitting there thinking: “I do not like any of these subjects: geography, history or R.E. (religious education)” and I picked the subject that I wanted to do based on the teacher that was teaching and which one I preferred. As a result, my lowest grade at G.C.S.E. was in that subject and it was geography. To this day, that grade is on my C.V. (curriculum vitae) and I hate it. I absolutely hate it because I know that I could have done better if I had picked something that I preferred and I knew that I could succeed in. With French I got lucky. I was going to go into more detail around that but obviously the paragraphs that kind of relates to have now fallen away but I would say that I am really supportive of part (a) and part (b).

[11:15]

I think it is important that we continue to offer the choice. I think that is a much more inclusive way of doing our education. I think that sometimes the rights of the child and doing what is best is not always just ... yes, we have to listen to children, but we know that children are experts, we are not necessarily experts. Obviously that has been brought up multiple times in this Assembly. I think this is a much more inclusive approach. I think it is important that we do still continue to offer languages. I would say that I would urge Members to support this. I take on Deputy Curtis’s point that, yes, we may be already doing this but I think this also reinforces the feeling of the Assembly and that we are moving with the times in the sense that things are not how they were when I was at school 20 years ago.

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

This is going to be a challenge. It has been a challenge because every time we talk about languages there is so much criticism and I want to try and offer some way forward here. I will support parts (a) and (b). I understand what Deputy Curtis has said but I would ask him, just at this time, to transport this so that we as an Assembly can start to move forward on languages, so that this debate does not keep coming back with the constant criticism of either the delivery or the level of them. I want to offer again to the chair of the A.P.F. and members of the committee, to Members of this Assembly who are concerned about how we promote languages to come and work with the department. We have somebody who is employed to be the senior language adviser. I will in my Ministerial on Friday commit to set up a working party so that Members can be involved so they can look at ways forward to try and promote languages more. I absolutely agree they should definitely be offered as an option in our schools. I would want to promote them to 11 to 16 schools to our students if they are applicable and the right thing to do, and I will support that. We will support that as much as we possibly can. I ask Members who have that involvement and interest, please do. I would also extend that to say: please come in and see some language classes in the 11 to 16 schools. Please come in and see what is happening. You are welcome, we can arrange that for you. If you do not have a D.B.S. (Disclosure and Barring Service) check, we will get you accompanied, we can work everything else out so you can come in and see what is happening. I want our schools to be transparent. Members in here may politically not agree with me, may politically not like me in this position. That is absolutely fine, that is politics, that is life, but I am very serious about doing this job well, about doing the right things and moving education forward. If we can do that together, that is really constructive, and I would ask that to happen, and also remove the conflict that is starting to move around languages. It does not help us, it does not help young people, and it does not help us as an Education Department to move forward. There is another big olive branch, there is another big opportunity here to come from this debate so it is not wasted, and we can move forward together. I ask Members to support these parts (a) and (b) and come and talk to us and let us get some work done together.

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

Just very briefly to help Deputy Alex Curtis. I think there is a good constitutional reason why it is okay to vote for parts (a) and (b) even if you regard them as things that have already been done by

the department which is that, though the States Assembly is the sovereign policy decision-making body of the Island, it obviously does not opine on every single policy, and government departments will naturally be proactive in developing their own policies on a whole range of issues, not always coming back to the Assembly to get a mandate for it. If you at least have a resolution from the Assembly in the form of an adopted proposition, that then becomes the supreme policy in the Island, which means it is harder in future to tinker with it. If you were to tinker with it, you would then have to come back to the Assembly if you were going to do it, whereas if it were just a government department policy, Ministers as they come and go can tweak it without necessarily having to reference back. I think there is a fair constitutional reason to say it is okay for the Assembly to have resolved on it in that way.

1.2.6 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

I think I agree with the point made by Deputy Mézec just now. I think there is a purpose in voting for (a) and (b) because it is a very small step forward for those who believe that the teaching of languages is a vital part of the instruction which ought to be given to our children. I believe that a majority of Members in this Assembly probably do at heart think that the teaching of a foreign language should be compulsory for key stage 4. I think there was a misunderstanding about the position of the Curriculum Council. The law requires the Minister to consult with the Curriculum Council on any change to the curriculum, so that my objection to the amendment of the Minister was not so much that the Curriculum Council would be consulted, but that it was going to be consulted at such a leisurely pace. That was not a criticism so much of the Curriculum Council, it was a criticism of the Minister and the timescale which he had put in place for that consultation, so I understand the position now of Deputy Tadier. I think that there is a rooted objection within the Minister's department towards doing the things which a majority of Members think ought to be done. The only way in which that will be resolved is when the Assembly gathers together the courage to give a direction to the effect that was sought by the now withdrawn proposition of Deputy Tadier. I am going to support with a heavy heart the remaining paragraphs of the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the proposition as amended? If no other Member wishes to speak, I close the debate and call upon Deputy Tadier to respond.

1.2.7 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will start off by I think addressing the points raised by Deputy Curtis. I wonder if he had known that there was not ultimately going to be a debate on part (d) whether he might have spoken earlier on the amendment. I suppose the salutary lesson there is to always speak if you want to early and speak to what is in front of you because you might not get a chance otherwise. Nonetheless, I do value his question and I will say this, I think it is valuable for the Assembly to give its view on affirming the rights of the children because we have not done that yet in this context about home language provision. It is something that we simply allow the department to do and that we leave to schools to do. We are lucky that at the moment there is a commitment from this Minister. Notwithstanding the quite clear disagreement that I have had with the Minister and vice versa on this particular issue, we must not forget that of course on 99 per cent of things we are completely united in our values and our vision, I think, certainly in our values and in our vision. It is one of the areas, one of the many areas, that he is delivering great work on and I know which previous Ministers have also been delivering great work on. But it is not something we can take for granted because a different Minister, different department, different schools might at some point find that their resources are being stretched. It is really important that I think both parents and children have their human rights affirmed so that if they are in a position where they need support in a school and it is difficult to get that, they can go back to a States decision that has been made and they can say that on 5th February 2025 the States agreed that all students, both primary and secondary, should receive support from

their school to access and develop their home language in accordance with their rights. Which rights? It is the Article 30 of the U.N.C.R.C. (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child). This is not just a technical thing, it is because there are so many fundamental reasons why it is important that children have access to their home languages. I think that the current Education team have been really successful in changing the narrative in the past about the fact that we - not we - but I think some administrations, some Assemblies have been tempted to see multilingual learners, those who do not have English as a first language perhaps from a young age, as a problem, as a challenge. It is certainly a challenge, it is definitely not a problem. I have even heard in the past that they were kind of grouped with S.E.N. (special educational needs) when in fact what we should be looking at those children, the 27 per cent of our pupils at primary school who do not have English as a first language, is that they are gifted and talented, they have a super power. **[Approbation]** Their super power is that they can already speak another language but it is not automatic. Just because they might have a parent at home who speaks Portuguese, Thai, Polish, whatever the language is, does not mean automatically they are going to be fluent in that language. They need support in that language so that when they get to school age they have got the capacity to be able to think and learn, have the building blocks at that age for the lifelong learning that they are going to be doing at a young age. This is why this whole debate really has been about lifelong learning. It is about making sure that we have the right interventions at the right time so that you can continue, whether as a child or as an adult, to be able to learn. I am reminded of something I do not mind bringing in at this point - I did not necessarily want to refer to it - but something that my wife told me about. She is big into human rights, she used to chair the Amnesty Jersey Branch a while back, and she is passionate about education, passionate about children's rights. She told me about the harrowing story that she had learnt about where a young boy who ended up ... basically he was being abused, he lost his life. It is still something topical that from time to time we see in the media about a young boy who was being physically abused at home, ultimately died of his injuries. He could not tell the teachers at school or those around him what was going on because he did not have the language to do it. This is also a matter of life and death for some students and if they cannot vocalise what is happening to them that is an extreme circumstance. But if we do not empower students to be able to learn but also to engage, then we are doing them a great disservice. We do have a language policy already. A language policy exists in the Education Department. Part of the reason that I was slightly perplexed about the reference to the Curriculum Council is the fact that we have already got a language policy adviser and I think we have got a senior adviser, if I am not mistaken, has come in recently who also looks over that. It should be really those who are leading on this area and not necessarily a generalised Curriculum Council. If there was going to be a change to be made about mathematics or science we would not refer it necessarily to the Curriculum Council; you would probably refer it to the lead person in that particular area. We do have a language policy that currently exists which is still in place. It quotes, first of all, that: "Students must be encouraged and supported to value their home languages and continue to develop proficiency in them inside and outside the classroom." It goes on to say that: "A child's first language provides them the roots to learn additional languages and parents should be encouraged to continue to use their home languages and strengthen and support their children's language proficiency as they join new environments." It is strange the parts of this proposition which have been controversial in the sense that the Members initially looking at part (a) and said, "I am not sure I can support part (a) because it is a great aspiration but we cannot possibly expect teachers to teach the thousands of potential languages that they are going to come across in Jersey just because one student happens to speak this obscure language." It is obscure for us, it is obviously not obscure for them. But of course it misses the fact that there is so much new technology that is available. There are so many ways that teachers who are adept in the classroom can bring in this new technology. It is about supporting and putting in those packages, making sure that they are getting the support at home. Also making sure that if they already speak Polish fluently that they can sit a G.C.S.E. in Polish or in Portuguese or in Thai, if it is available, and that they can do that perhaps not at the age of 16 but they might be able to do it at the age of 14. These are all live issues that

conversations need to have. I think that is where I have concerns when things are being left just to schools to do. It seems to me that in some cases there is a free-for-all, if you like, that we allow language policy certainly to be dictated by schools.

[11:30]

This is why I think part (b) is also really important. Interestingly, the Minister for Treasury and Resources when she spoke, I do not think she was speaking as the Minister for Treasury and Resources at that point, said she does not agree with part (b). I will be expecting her to vote against part (b). Because part (b) says that: "The States secondary schools should continue to offer a choice of at least 2 modern languages, other than English, one of which must be French." I have put in there "continue to offer" because I think that is what they do already by default. But there is not a dicta I do not think anywhere that they have to provide 2 languages. We do, strangely enough, and we have not discussed this today and we will not get to discuss it either, is that we have a very prescriptive language policy between the age of 11 and 13, so key stage 2 and 3. The U.K., which I do not think is necessarily a beacon of an exemplar, if you excuse the tautology, in this area, it says you have to do a language between the ages of 7 and 13 but they leave it up to the schools to decide. I think that makes sense in that context because it may well be that French might be the default but if you live in a particular area where there might be a large Arabic population or whatever population, it might well be that your school wants to make the decision about what language it offers. There is much more flexibility in the English system. We have a very rigid system here and I think the political trade-off has been the fact that we are so geographically historically intertwined with France that French must be the language that must be offered. Of course because of that it means that often other languages that could be offered between the ages of 7 and 13 are then excluded because you cannot expect all primary schools and all secondary schools to provide that many languages, especially if they are having to foster and nurture those E.A.L. (English as an additional language) students who are bringing their richness to the classroom. What I would say is that we have got to start looking at the town primary schools like Rouge Bouillon, like Plat Douet, which is not in town. Is it? Plat Douet is over towards St. Saviour, Samarès, all of those urban schools which have the richness, which means that they conduct a lot of their lessons in an increasingly what we call translanguaging way. It means that you switch back and you make references in the classroom so that differentiation occurs. This is something that our teachers in schools at all levels do really well. This is why I was quite relaxed about the request for languages to be extended up to 16, is because teachers are able to differentiate. They are used to dealing with students who are in love with the subject. They are used to dealing with students who do not particularly like the subject, who are indifferent to it. One of the key points here is that the success indicator for learning a language, the key success indicator is not whether you are good at it, it is about whether you are motivated and you could argue that is the same for a lot of subjects. If you have a teacher who is dynamic, who is making the content of their lessons really interesting but key relevant to the students, which is in a multimedia way, that is when they are going to want to succeed. I know from my own experience but I also know, for example, when I was at Hautlieu I loved languages so much that I did a G.C.S.E. in Spanish alongside my A-levels, which meant that I was with slightly younger students. They were all in a class where they had to do a language. They had a choice but they were in the Spanish class not necessarily because they want to do Spanish but because they loved it. But the teacher made those lessons so compelling all of the students in there, they were able to succeed but also to enjoy the lessons. I think that is what we have got to make sure that we encourage and continue that good momentum that we have got in the classroom. The key thing here is that there was a trade-off. I had some Members of the Assembly saying: "I would support this if you had made it French-compulsory." I have got other Members saying: "I cannot support it if you make French compulsory." What is the middle road that we have to achieve in Jersey? We recognise the fact that we are still a French-speaking Assembly when we want to be. French is a really important language geographically, socially, culturally and, hopefully, not just historically. It will increase in that importance and in our relations with the French

Government in particular, not the French Government directly but the regions perhaps. I think it is right that French remains one of those languages that must be offered from 14 to 16. It would be ridiculous, would it not, if we insist that students have to do French up until the age of 13, only to find that a particular school does not offer it for G.C.S.E.? I think that would be a ludicrous position to be in, so that is why we insist that French be one of those languages. It is also not prescriptive. Schools, if they want to, do not have to just offer 2 languages; they can offer 3 or 4 if they have got the capacity and the teaching staff to do it. I think that is why there is the agreement here between the Minister and myself. I think that is the positive part. That is why, to answer in short to Deputy Alex Curtis, why I am keeping parts (a) and (b). I think it is really important that the States have a firm decision that they can refer to and it will be on the record. I do have to make some more general comments in summing up because we have had a wide-ranging debate today, not as wide-ranging as necessarily I would have liked and it certainly has not been as definitive as I would have liked. But to go back to Deputy Ozouf's point, and I do thank him for the energy that he has brought to the debate and certainly the support he has given for my side of the argument. The other day I was walking through town with my dog. I was doing some research for myself because, as you know, I like to keep a hand in with history and I was preparing for a talk I was going to give to some adult students who want to become tour guides. Jimmy and I were walking through Parade Gardens, I have got the photos to prove it; it may already be on social media. I stopped by the Philip Baudains memorial, which is in Parade Gardens. Like a lot of those memorials from the time, there is one to Pierre Le Sueur, they are bilingual. You can see that the main language which most people were speaking, the official language was French. On the back of it in French it says Connétable de Saint Hélier and it is talking about the fact that he is in the electorate who elected him several times for reconnaissance, as they usually say, and they built this bust for him and put it on a plinth. Adolphus Curry incidentally I think did the plinth. I might be wrong, I might be confusing that with the Queen Victoria one but I digress. It said that in French but on the back it said: "Philip Baudains, Mayor of St. Helier." In fact I do not think we translate Connétable these days as Mayor of St. Martin or Mayor of Grouville. But that is what they did and they did not really know how to translate it because that is what we used to call the Connétable back then; you would not use the word "Constable". You would use Connétable, you would use *Deputé*, you would use whatever the title was. Interestingly enough I hope we teach but certainly we know students should be taught about the Norman conquest of England in 1066. What we are going to see in the future, I think, we are going to need to start teaching our students because it is important to teach them about local history. We are going to need to start teaching our pupils in Jersey about the English conquest of Jersey because that is exactly what has happened. This is what has been happening for the last 100 years. This debate will feature in that timeline. This will be one of the references that will appear in the history lessons, potentially, but certainly on the websites and in the archives, to the day which the States of Jersey did not take the decision to require students in Jersey to learn a second language and, as an adjunct, of course to learn the other official language of Jersey, which is French. We have said it has to be offered for G.C.S.E. but students do not have to take it. We have got this mad situation where they have to study French to the age of 13 but they do not have to study it to the age of 15, just when it is getting interesting, just when you have developed the wherewithal intellectually to make those arguments, to get into the real issues. You have learned how to say: "I have got one brother and 2 sisters, I live in a house, I live in a flat, I have got a dog, I have got a cat, *Je suis fils unique* [I am an only child]" whatever it is. But when it gets to the interesting stuff that you want to talk about, like fake news, about the threat of cyber-attacks, about the environment, about opportunities to go and study abroad, about climate change, you cannot do that now. What, but that is getting quite interesting? "No, you have to go and study science." "Why can I not study science and a language and then we can talk about climate change and sociology and geography and history and do it in French?" "No, no, you cannot do that." What about learning my own language, which is English and learning the grammar? Because I certainly did not learn any grammar or syntax or epistemology when it comes to philosophy or any of those ideas until I started learning a second language at a reasonable level. What do the

rest of Europe do? We have this fake news from my colleague, Deputy Scott of St. Brelade, saying: “We would not expect the French to force their students to do a second language.” Of course they do, we do not use the word “force”; it is a normal requirement. I have sent an email to some of the colleagues, is that right across Europe it is not just one language, it is 2 languages and it is usually 2 languages to 18, not one language to 16. We have really lowered the bar in Jersey. We, as an Assembly today, have sent out the message that is okay. I have done my bit, my conscience is clear but in 20 years’ time when those Constables who have voted for the amendment today are having trouble filling their twinning associations because nobody is leaving school with any basic French anymore and the world has moved on and Jersey has become completely Anglicised, do not come complaining to me. I have done what I can for that. I will continue to support the twinings in the interim. When the Assistant Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning says: “We are already struggling to recruit language teachers.” Yes, go figure. I put that in my proposition very clearly; in the proposition there is a paragraph, which I think somebody might have highlighted: “The lack of school-based language learning has a knock-on effect. Fewer language learners in schools result in fewer language students at university, which ultimately leads to a shortage of qualified teachers to teach the next generation.” It becomes a downward spire, a race to the bottom. We cannot find any French teachers. Why do you think that is? Because they are not doing French anymore. It used to be 100 students doing French in one school, now it is 14 and that is at G.C.S.E., not at A-level. There used to be students doing A-level German, now you cannot find any that are doing it for G.C.S.E. This is the kind of Island that we have become. If the Minister thought culture for Jersey identity, is she comfortable with that? At some point I would be really interested in hearing her view. This is not just about national anthems. This is not just about whether you have Liberation Day as your national day. It is about whether you have anything to have a national day about. It is about whether you have anything that you are passionate to sing about in the first place. Increasingly, I do not think we do. I think what we will find is that if you are a monolingual Jersey person who speaks English your national anthem, mate, is God Save the King, which is a perfectly good anthem but you do not get anything else. If you want some of your own culture you can have your Portuguese national anthem, your Polish one, your Thai national anthem, your Romanian one; the list goes on. But you are separate from us. We need that Jersey identity and I am afraid we are losing this. That is the decision we have made today. I am a democrat. We are voting on parts (a) and (b). Parts (a) and (b) in themselves are very good and it is going to be business as usual now for the Education Department. By all means I may go and talk to them but I already know what they are going to say. They already know what I think. We have had the debate. We have the debate in public in this place and we are the policymakers. Okay, today we have made some decisions, not as many decisions as I would have liked. I will leave it there and I thank Members for the debate. I think it has been useful and call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. Deputy, do you wish to take the parts separately?

Deputy M. Tadier:

All together.

The Bailiff:

All together. All right. The vote will be on all of the parts of the proposition. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been adopted:

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy S.M. Ahier		

Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
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 R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				

Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

2. Draft Children and Young People (Independent Advocates) (Jersey) Regulations 202- (P.87/2024)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Children and Young People (Independent Advocates) (Jersey) Regulations, P.87, lodged by the Minister for Children and Families. The main respondent will be the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Children and Young People (Independent Advocates) (Jersey) Regulations 202-. The States make these regulations under Articles 44 and 46 of the Children and Young People (Jersey) Law 2022.

2.1 Connétable R.P. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child states that: “When adults are making decisions that affect children, children have the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them and have these views given due weight, in accordance with their age and maturity.”

[11:45]

This is not always an easy thing to achieve for certain groups of young people, which is why I am bringing these regulations to establish independent advocacy services which will empower our most vulnerable children and ensure their voices are heard when decisions are made that will affect their lives. Members will know that the Children and Young People (Jersey) Law, which this Assembly adopted in 2022, set out a legal framework designed to promote the well-being and safeguarding and welfare of children and young people. An important part of this law is the introduction of the statutory role of independent advocates, which is defined in these regulations and in the Code of Practice which accompany them. The law allows this Assembly to create regulations requiring me, as Minister, to introduce an independent advocacy service. This service will give eligible children and young people access to a trusted individual to speak on their behalf, effectively and impartially, if they need it. The advocacy service brought forward under these regulations will be truly independent from the Government or Children’s Services. It will help young people navigate complex systems like child protection, education and healthcare, ensuring that we can make informed choices regarding important decisions affecting their lives. Six key principles informed our approach to independent advocacy. These can be summarised as follows. Voice: every child and young person

has the fundamental right to have their voice heard on issues that affect them. Independence: advocates must act solely in the best interests of young people, free from outside influence, ensuring their voice remains central to all decisions. Accessibility and inclusivity: a child's background circumstances or need should not affect their ability to access independent advocacy services. Confidentiality: advocates must uphold confidentiality, building trust and ensuring that children feel safe and secure in sharing their concerns. A right-based approach: advocacy must align with the principle of children's rights, ensuring that the best interests of young people are at the forefront of every decision. Professionalism and training: advocates must be properly trained and equipped with the skills necessary to provide effective and objective support to children and young people. I am fully committed to bringing forward these regulations and ensuring an independent advocacy service is established and made a statutory right for the most vulnerable children and young people. A strong independent advocacy service is an essential part of safeguarding the rights of our children, which we have committed to do through the ratification of U.N.C.R.C. I see these regulations as a further positive step forward in building a more and just inclusive society for future generations. I propose the principles.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the principles?

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

The Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel would like thank both the current and previous Ministers for Children and officers for briefings and for working well with Scrutiny on this matter. We are supportive of the introduction of a statutory independent advocacy service framework. We also recognise the good work already done by advocacy services who have contributed to the panel's understanding of this matter. There are several concerns we have raised, which have been adequately addressed by the Minister, which can be seen in the comments paper which we published. There are still a couple of concerns, which I will ask the Minister to respond to in his closing speech, which are, firstly, for clarity around the point that advocacy providers should not deliver other services to a qualifying individual. We are unclear how this would impact advocacy providers who may offer other services like skills and training. Secondly, how does the Minister intend to ensure independence from the Government of the commissioned services? We would appreciate answers to these points but, however, the C.E.H.A. (Children, Education and Home Affairs) Panel is supportive of the draft regulations.

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

I welcome this regulation but I just have a few questions for the Minister, if he could respond to. Would the Minister be able to explain why the definition of independent advocacy makes any reference to justice and addressing or even recognising that there is an imbalance of power? There is an inherent imbalance of power. All the responsibilities of these advocates to make sure that the vulnerable children and young people not only feel that they have been listened to but also to show them that when they have also spoken about the issues that they are facing, that they can see some changes. That is the responsibility of the advocate to also show that their voices have been listened to and there are changes happening, otherwise this could create an illusion of listening without having a framework to ensure that things do change and that the young vulnerable children and young people see that, that that is worthwhile to speak. Because often it is not about just accessing the services but also keeping that going and ensuring that there is continued support through the advocates and the youth and children see that it is working. I think that is really important. Also, the Minister said in a briefing last week that he felt the budget proposed was sufficient but I just have some concerns in this regard. Because just ask the Minister how many independent advocates should this budget support? Does he feel this is enough to cover the current amount of children and young people eligible for this service, so not for those that are currently accessing the services? But obviously I

am assuming that there is a desire and a need to ensure that as many children and young people who are eligible for this service also access that. Part of this would be about building that confidence of our children and young people to be able to access this service. But does the budget cover to support that many independent advocates to be able to support that many children and young people if they take up these services? Lastly, of course the Code of Practice talks about skills and the importance and the need for independent advocates to have a range of skills. But could the Minister say is there enough skill on the Island for this desire to have enough independent advocates to support the amount of vulnerable children and young people that could be eligible for this service? If they all decide tomorrow that this is the service that they absolutely should access, do we have skill on the Island to take up this professional advocate? What are the resources the Minister is putting in place to expand that pool of professionals and try to access that from within the Island and to organise and if there is a way to provide on-the-job vocational training to upskill those who are already currently working in this sector, rather than specifically need to go back to an education establishment to get their skills?

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

I am sure the Minister will respond fully to those questions that have been asked. But perhaps in support of that I can answer Deputy Curtis and Deputy Jeune's points, and I am sure the Minister will flesh them out. In relation to skills and training, of course an independent advocate by their very nature is independent; the advice they give is completely independent. But of course there might be crossover in which ways they can help young people develop in their lives, and of course skills and training are very important features in young people's lives. But those advocates are independent, so they could signpost to organisations that could support with skills and training without undertaking that support themselves. In relation to the independence, of course it is really important and the Code of Practice highlights how an independent advocate should operate. The whole point of having it on a statutory footing, because let us remember this service already exists and all we are doing is formalising the service. The budget is exactly the same. But what we are doing is making sure it is enshrined in law, is pegged against the Code of Practice and the benefits of having that Code of Practice is that if the independent advocate falls outside of that code we can take action to make sure that either the contract is withdrawn from that organisation or improvements are made to ensure that they are adhering to the Code of Practice. There was a question asked about justice and of course while an independent advocate is in supporting people impartially, young people, they are not an advocate in the legal sense. But when it comes to justice they are not there to administer or support the justice process but they are certainly there to challenge injustice in young people's lives and to support them through any process where they might need help, and that could include the court process. But of course they are not advocates in the traditional sense of the court setting but they can help with the broader aspects of an individual needing to go through the court process. The number of advocates, we are envisaging something like 3 to 4 advocates would be able to cover the current workload. At the moment it is being covered by an organisation that provides that support. As I say, the budget is £342,000; that will remain the same. But I just speak now in support of the Minister and I am sure he will flesh out those answers more. But I hope that fully answers the points that have been raised thus far.

The Bailiff:

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

2.1.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Independent advocacy is not just about helping children in need, it is about giving the tools and support they need to shape their futures with confidence. We must remain steadfast in our commitment to ensuring their voices are heard. Deputy Ferey has already covered some of the questions that have been asked. Perhaps if I look at the Code of Practice it may be useful for me to

say what an independent advocate is and what it is not. Independent advocacy is about speaking up for and standing alongside individuals and in doing so not being influenced by external organisations, service providers or personal interest, providing non-judgmental support and respecting the views of the individual for whom they are advocating, regardless of their own opinions or beliefs. Finding out what makes an individual feel good and valued, understanding the individual's situation, offering independent support to assist in telling other people what they want or introducing them to others who may be able to help. Representing individuals in meetings, hearings or other formal settings. Helping an individual to know what choices they have and what the consequence of these choices might be. Enabling a person to remain in control of their life but taking up issues on their behalf, if that is their wish. Independent advocacy is not making decisions for someone, telling or advising someone what they should do, solving someone's problems for them, mediation, counselling, befriending or mentoring or providing therapy or a relationship that disempowers people. It is not about providing legal advice, interpreting the law or representing individuals in a court of law. Of course you will be well aware that there are other services that provide legal aid to young people. As regards cost, I am satisfied that the current budget that we have asked for for this year will cover what is required, plus some contingency. We will be going out to tender. Of course in next year's budget request we will factor in any increase that may be necessary as a result of that tendering process.

[12:00]

Qualifications: we do have qualified people on-Island, however, it is not necessary that the advocate or the advocacy services would be provided by people on Island. One would hope that they would be. We currently use Barnardo's and Jersey Cares. Of course some of our children are in the U.K. and, therefore, would use people from Barnardo's U.K. services. I am satisfied we have the qualifications and that people can undertake training on-Island. Highlands I think operate the course and people can work towards a qualification in independent advocacy. I am just checking that I have covered the questions that were asked. With that, I maintain the principles.

The Bailiff:

Do you call for the appel?

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

Can I ask if the Minister will give way?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes.

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy.

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

Okay. I did ask, which I do not think has been replied to, about clarity around the point that advocacy providers should not deliver other services to a qualifying individual, which I think is in the Code of Practice, which could, potentially, be difficult for those providers who do offer the other services.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I think we must maintain the independence of the advocacy and in providing other services that could impact on them. There will be a contract with those who provide advocacy services and, therefore, I think there could be a conflict if they are offering other services to the children as well. But that would be covered in the contract and the tendering process.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. The appel is called for, I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on the principles of P.87 and I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The principles have been adopted:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
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 M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

Deputy Curtis, I assume the panel does not want to call this in.

Deputy C.D. Curtis (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

No.

The Bailiff:

Very well. How do you wish to deal with the matter in Second Reading?

2.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:

En bloc, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is it seconded for Second Reading? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on Second Reading? If no Member wishes to speak, those in favour of adopting in Second Reading, kindly show. Those against? The Articles are adopted in Second Reading. How do you move in Third Reading?

2.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:

En bloc, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is it seconded for Third Reading? **[Seconded]**

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

I apologise for not being in the Assembly for the Articles. I was briefed on it by the excellent presentation that the Minister gave and I just would finally, in the Third Reading, the Minister will know the question, that he will refer the word “with” not “to” in future. Maybe he could say that in summing up.

The Bailiff:

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

2.3.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:

I think that Deputy Ozouf makes a very good point. It is extremely important that we do not speak to children and that we work with them. It is important in that respect that the independent advocates do not give regard to their own views when putting forward the views of children. It is absolutely vital that if children are to have confidence in this service that they are able to see that their views have been put forward. As we said earlier, that they can see the results of those views having been put forward. That is why it is important that the dialogue continues with the independent advocate, that they do not just put the views forward but that continues. That would continue even after they have perhaps left the service for at least a further 60 days, and I think in that time if there were any matters they would see that there have been results. I would like to thank absolutely everybody who has been involved in working on this legislation and the Members of the previous Government who were involved. I also thank the advocacy providers, which include My Voice, Jersey Cares and Barnardo's, whose contributions were invaluable in developing the Code of Practice. My thanks to the Scrutiny Panel for their support and helpful comments in the paper published last week and to all the officers who have worked hard to bring this to this point. With that, I maintain the regulations in the Third Reading.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for, I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on the adoption of the Draft Children and Young People (Independent Advocates) (Jersey) Regulations in Third Reading. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. It has been adopted in Third Reading:

POUR: 43		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

3. Draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.89/2024)

The Bailiff:

We come now to the final item of Public Business, the Draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations, P.89, lodged by the same Minister and with the same responding committee. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these regulations under Article 82A of the Children (Jersey) Law 2002 and Article 82(6) of the Marriage and Civil Status (Jersey) Law 2001.

3.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):

Perhaps I must remind myself not to bring 2 pieces of children's legislation to the Assembly on the same day in future. On 19th March 2024 this Assembly voted in favour of the Children and Civil Status (Amendments) (Jersey) Law which will improve the rights of all children to have their parents recognised in law. It ensures that all parents have proper rights and responsibilities for their children. If approved by Members I am planning to bring this legislation into force later this year via an Appointed Day Act and I would hope that that will be, at the latest, in the autumn and perhaps towards the late summer. When implemented this would provide new routes for same-sex parents and parents using fertility treatments to be recognised in the same manner as all other parents. The law will implement a number of longstanding policy intentions; to enable same-sex couples and opposite couples using donor sperm to be jointly registered on their child's birth certificate, to enable same-sex couples to re-register their children's birth, to add the second parent's name to the birth certificate, allowing the courts in Jersey to make parental orders for Jersey-born children. This will enable couples who use surrogacy on-Island to become legal parents without having to adopt their own child; allowing the court in Jersey to make recognition orders for Jersey-born children to retrospectively recognise parental orders already granted by courts in England or Wales. This will provide these families with legal certainty around their parental status; treating civil partners in the same way as married couples when registering the birth of their child; removing the customary law assumption that the husband of the birth mother is automatically the father of the child. Married opposite sex couples will now register the birth of their child together with the father's consent, in the same manner as unmarried couples. In order to fully implement this legislation, extensive consequential amendments via regulations are required to recognise these new parents through Jersey law. I would, therefore, like to propose the Draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations, which are another big step forward to making vital changes in preparation for bringing the new law into force. These consequential amendments are wide-ranging. In short, wherever the concept of parenthood intersects with the law, amendments have been required for the new routes to parenthood, in the same manner as all other parents. Extensive searches of the statute book have been conducted and has resulted in 180 amendments, both minor and extensive, across 42 separate pieces of legislation. Wherever the law contains provision relating to parents, these would be extended as far as possible to parents via the new routes established in the Children and Civil Status Law. However, the fundamental intentions of each law would not be altered. In 2014 the U.K.'s ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child was extended to Jersey. The Children and Civil Status Law is an important stage in the journey towards progressively realising improving children's rights. These consequential amendments are an integral stage in implementing the Children and Civil Status Law and the significant improvement in rights that would be confirmed by that law. In particular, Article 7 of the U.N.C.R.C. states that: "Every child has the right to be registered at birth, to have a name and nationality and as far as possible to know and be cared for by their parent." This is currently infringed upon as one parent in a same-sex couple and couples using certain fertility treatments cannot acquire legal parent status for their child via registration on a birth certificate. It is, therefore, not possible for both parents to automatically share full responsibility for making important decisions concerning the upbringing of that child. These parents currently need to go through additional legal processes to gain the rights in relation to their own children and that cannot be correct. The situation can be complicated and upsetting for families who have welcomed a new baby into their families, sometimes after lengthy fertility processes. I am aware that this legislation is complex and it has taken some time and a considerable amount of work to achieve. I thank all those involved. I would like to recognise the continuous advocacy work of the individuals and organisations championing improved

rights for families. I understand that families have been waiting keenly for the implementation of the Children and Civil Status Law, which will provide them with the legal parental status for their own children. States Members and their constituents will be keen to hear about the progress made towards implementing the Children and Civil Status Law. Officers are assisting key agencies and stakeholders in preparation for the law coming into force. A communication plan has been written. New processes are being developed for administering the new routes to parenthood. New court rules have been written. The Office of the Superintendent Registrar will have new registers and new certificates. Websites and information will need to be updated. Pending Members' approval, I am truly hopeful that we can have the law in force this year. As a next step in this project, policy and law drafting work is being conducted at pace to develop primary legislation with the intention of abolishing the status of illegitimacy. This means that children will no longer be labelled based on their parents' marital status. The concept is outdated, discriminatory, and has little relevance for the conferral of substantive rights in the modern world. Legitimacy status has fallen out of step with family life and the principles contained in the Children and Civil Status Law. I therefore feel it necessary to abolish the concept. I hope to bring this legislation before the Assembly in the next few months. We will also be working closely with the Social Security team to improve clarity and develop some process for Jersey parents who use overseas surrogates and whose children will be subject to overseas parental orders. In particular, some more work is required in regard of these parents' entitlement to parental leave and parental benefits under Jersey law. I do not anticipate that this work will cause any significant delays beyond summer or autumn 2025, and that this will ensure that the package of legislation confers greater rights to all children. I plan to ask the Assembly to bring these laws into force together by an Appointed Day Act later, as I previously said, hopefully in the summer, but by the latest in the autumn of 2025. I propose the principles.

[12:15]

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]**

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

Again, I would like to say the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel would like to thank both the current and previous Ministers for Children and officers for briefings and for working well with Scrutiny on this matter. The panel published a review of the draft Children and Civil Status (Amendments) (Jersey) Law last year, when the law was approved by the States Assembly. Now we have the draft regulations and the panel is supportive and looks forward to the Appointed Day Act. We appreciate this has been a huge body of work for officers, making approximately 180 amendments. There is some legislation which is not included in the amendments and these are the laws around legitimacy. This concept, when used to describe a person, is abhorrent and in our 2024 review we made a recommendation in relation to the status of legitimacy that the Government should undertake a review to consider the relevance of the laws around this. My understanding is that the Government is now working separately to remove references to legitimacy in Jersey law, as the Minister has just referred to. I understand the intention is for this work to be revised by Scrutiny before the Appointed Day Act is lodged for the enactment of the amendment law. So I ask the Minister to confirm this, but above all the panel is supportive of the draft regulations and looks forward to them coming into effect.

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

I agree with the comments of the Scrutiny chair around legitimacy, and that was something that I wanted to raise myself. I have a couple of things that I would like the Minister to respond to when he sums up and just to clarify on the Appointed Day Act, and it does relate to the legitimacy issue. So, could the Minister clarify the initial target was for a summer debate on the Appointed Day Act, so I believe that the Minister said that may now be the autumn. Is the reason for that the legitimacy

work? Further to that question, I would like to understand a bit more around the legitimacy work that is being undertaken. I want to echo the comments of Deputy Curtis because I completely agree that concept is absolutely abhorrent and when I have had conversations with people about this, many Islanders are not even aware that concept of children being legitimate or illegitimate even exists anymore in our legislation, and in many other jurisdictions it has been abolished. As far back as 5 or 6 years ago, this was something I was advocating for and was told all along that it was not possible to do at the same time as this legislation without significantly delaying it. I know there have been difficult decisions taken by previous Ministers, including Deputy Gardiner and myself, and I was told that it was not possible to do that work and to revise the laws on legitimacy without delaying the main law. So what I would like to understand from the Minister is at what point did he give the steer to officers to do this work, and how have they been able to do it a lot quicker than I was led to understand? For which I am grateful because it is extremely important. Just a bit more information around that process and how that happened. I am not necessarily disagreeing with that decision, but I would like to understand in more detail what has changed and exactly how long it is going to set back the Appointed Day Act. Another point I would like to raise, which I have raised in previous debates, and I am not certain if this has been picked up by either the Minister for Children and Families or the Minister for Health and Social Services, but one of the provisions within the law, which has been approved, is the need to use a fertility clinic to access the rights, which of course the rights are not yet in force because we have to approve these consequential amendments and then the next and final step will be the Appointed Day Act. But if and when the Assembly approves that Appointed Day Act, couples, who I am sure will be delighted to have these rights, same-sex couples will still have some barriers to accessing those rights, and one of those barriers is financial. So, if you have a couple, 2 women, who want to have a child together and they want to access these parental rights, they have to use the A.R.U. (Assisted Reproductive Unit). They have to go through an official clinic setting to achieve those rights. They cannot just do it informally with a friend. I have been contacted on this because some couples do not have the financial means to go through the steps required to access the free I.V.F. (in vitro fertilisation), and I am aware that there have been massive improvements in that area for which I am grateful, but for same-sex couples, they have to access the A.R.U. before they can access I.V.F. and there is a cost associated with that. I am told that cost is around £1,000. It is not going to be the end, I am afraid, once we have these amendments approved and the Appointed Day Act. There is still some work to be done on ensuring that there is true equality for same-sex couples. So I would like perhaps the Minister for Health and Social Services to comment on it during the debate. I would like to see the Assistant Minister for Health and Social Services perhaps consult the Women's Health Group on this. I would like to see what they say about it and what could be done, because I do not think there should be a cost for couples accessing these rights. So those were the questions that I had and the issues I wanted to raise; very minor, some of them, but important nevertheless. In a general sense, these consequential amendments, I have heard them being referred to as simply a formality, and it often is when we have debated the principles of something in some primary legislation and we get these consequential amendments. But I wanted to challenge that today and draw Members' attention to the significance of these consequential amendments today, which do go hand in hand with the main piece of legislation that we have already approved. Because the areas of law that we will be amending today are so broad and so wide-ranging, and they encompass things like the criminal child abduction laws, data protection law, gambling law, fatal accidents law, marriage laws, mental health laws, nursing home law. I could go on. There have been further areas added since I was overseeing this work, which shows what an absolutely thorough job the officers have done. It is one of the biggest legislation projects ever undertaken in Jersey and to my community, to the L.G.B.T.Q.+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, and more) community, which I am part of, and I know there are other Members who are part of that community, to my community, the approval of these consequential amendments today is hugely significant because it signifies our society taking another step away from the hurt, the discrimination, and the trauma of the past where L.G.B.T.Q.+ Islanders were denied the chance to

live full lives, they were denied the chance to marry, they were denied the chance to have children and sometimes they were denied their freedom because of who they loved. So I cannot underestimate how grateful the community is for this legislation. I will thank again all the Ministers and officers who have worked on this and all who have campaigned for progress. To my colleagues, to Members of the current Assembly, I hope that we can vote for this unanimously and see it as a collective achievement of our Assembly that we can all be really proud of. I am going to end by giving voice to some members of our community that I have been in contact with. The first quote I would like to make is from St. Helier parishioners and they mentioned to me that they recently had a daughter and they say: “We are unquestionably both her parents. My wife came to every appointment, every class, painted the nursery and prepared for her arrival in the same way as a heterosexual couple would do. She supported me through labour and was the first person to hold our daughter and cut the cord when she arrived. She feeds her, changes her, cuddles her when she is sad. As it stands under Jersey Law, she has no legal recognition as her mother. On a very basic level, our daughter cannot have my wife’s surname as we had hoped she could. When we registered her at the G.P. (general practitioner) and for nursery, I had to specify that my wife was allowed to be contacted regarding our daughter and that she can take her to any appointments. When we go on holiday, a worst-case scenario could be that something incapacitated me. My wife would not be permitted by authorities to look after our daughter or return with her to Jersey. As it stands, if the unthinkable happens to me, the default position would be that my own parents would have more rights to care for our daughter than my wife would. The inequity has made us consider leaving Jersey for the U.K. so that, should we have any more children, we will not experience the same issues. As an Island with a falling birth rate and an ageing population, Jersey should be doing everything it can to make sure younger working people like us feel welcome and want to stay here. Our daughter has a right to parity with her peers in terms of her birth registration reflecting both her parents.” A final quote that I would like to read is from 2 St. Saviour parishioners: “The passing of this law and the consequential amendments are so immensely important for families like my own and for the children of same-sex families in the future. From my own personal circumstances, myself and my wife to be have our son, who is just under 3 years old and he does not yet have a correct birth certificate with us both named as his parents. The passing of the consequential amendments will allow the law to come into force, which will correct this situation and allow us to re-register his birth retrospectively. So we will then both be his parents from a legal standpoint and both acquire parental status. There are no words to truly explain how these changes will positively affect our family. To put it simply, in the eyes of the law, we will be accepted as a family unit and our son will have a legal document acknowledging both his parents.” I will end there on the words of some same-sex parents in our community and urge Members to vote for these consequential amendments. **[Approbation]**

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

I am pleased to follow my colleague from St. Saviour because this really is, after a difficult debate maybe early on about the past and the future, this is really a vote about equality for families and for Jersey’s future and I strongly support these regulations. They do, as the Minister and the speaker before me have said, ensure that all children, regardless of their family structure, will have the same rights, protections and legal recognition. It is not just about fairness, it is about the reality of Jersey today in all of those manorial districts or Parishes or whatever they are. Families today take many forms. When I brought the Marriage and Civil Status Law to the States in 2002, I could not have imagined that we would be amending it and all these other regulations that we should do. I could not have imagined that people like me could be fathers, in the plural, but they could and they should, and that this is about making that easy. Families today take many forms. Same-sex couples, surrogacy, assisted reproduction. They are part of our life and we must have laws to reflect that, which is why I am rising to speak briefly. The reason why it is particularly important is because our birth rate is falling, our population is ageing, and we need to ensure that we have got families who wish to raise children and how that those families are supported. We are recognising those new routes to

parenthood. Members may have watched the television over the period of New Year and Christmas. There was a heart-wrenching drama about a single-sex couple, a male gay couple's journey through adoption and highlighting the challenges and joys that they experienced. If Members have not seen it, I would commend it to them, "Lost Boys and Fairies" was the subject. We must remove unnecessary legal hurdles for loving parents who want to bring up children in our Island. No parent should have to adopt their own child, and these changes of course bringing us into line with modern jurisdictions and they respect the international commitments of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, and I commend the Minister for bringing forward that and thank them on behalf of all of those people that I know that never realised that they could be parents, but that dream can come to them and can come true in a completely non-discriminatory way.

[12:30]

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

Just again to field some of those questions before the Minister speaks, particularly on legitimacy. So lots of work has taken place over the second half of last year on the subject of legitimacy. There is still some work to be done to determine the parameters of the saving provisions where the status of legitimacy would still be relevant. An example of this is officers are investigating customary law, honours, titles, and manorial rights, and due to the complexity and historic nature of these areas, the abolition would not be retrospectively applied to prevent any impact in the succession of a person who died before the commencement of the draft legislation. So there is some complexity to this piece of work obviously, as I am sure Members will understand. But we also do have some good options to draw on from the U.K. and how it has been applied in the U.K. and disentangled. So I am sure the Minister will speak further on that in his summing up, but that is my understanding of the situation.

3.1.5 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:

I have one comment to which I think I do know the answer, but from my days in legal practice, if I recall it, the question of the marital status or parents is relevant to the domicile of a child in the sense that, in general terms, a child born to parents who are married will take the domicile of his father or her father, and when unmarried, that of his/her mother. I think I am right in believing that the extent of these provisions does not extend to the taxation provisions, and I do emphasise the taxation aspect. But perhaps the Minister in his summing up could kindly confirm that.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the principles? No other Member wishes to speak on the principles. Then I close the debate and call upon the Minister to respond.

3.1.6 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Firstly, I would like to thank everybody who has spoken. There have been some excellent speeches, in particular Deputy Doublet; I would like to thank her for her speech. Firstly, I will cover the matter of any delay with the Appointed Day Act into possibly the autumn. It is not necessarily due to the fact that we have now worked in tandem on the legitimacy law. Towards the summer of 2024, we realised that we were making very good progress on the legitimacy law and other areas, and therefore the decision was taken, perhaps shortly after that, that we would bring, if we were able to, the Legitimacy Act and the Appointed Day Act to the Assembly at the same time. The delay is more relevant to the fact that we found another 17 bits of legislation that required amending, so it went up from around 25 to 42, and that has been the main area which has caused some delay. Nevertheless, any delay will be relatively short and it will be the autumn rather than the summer. If we can get it in before the summer break, then certainly we will do so. I will certainly have to speak with the Minister for Health and Social Services about the additional costs to some couples or the £1,000 that Deputy Doublet mentioned with regard to provisions for fertility in fertility clinics. There should not be financial barriers and so hopefully we can have some discussions with the Minister for Health and

Social Services in that respect. Taxation: I believe that the Deputy of St. Mary is probably correct that this does not cover the taxation area, but I am sure the officers, if I am wrong on that, will correct me and we will look at that. So this law, or the draft Children and Civil Status (Consequential Amendments) Regulations further progresses towards realisation of the rights of children to have their parents recognised in law. I probably just cannot understand what a relief and joy that will bring to couples. I remember the birth of my own children and the fact that they can be recognised as parents, be named on the birth certificate, have all the same rights, will bring tremendous joy to them, having been denied that in the past. The work has been complex and has taken time to develop, as I have just said, and it continued developing during 2024. Again, I recognise the continuous advocacy work of the individuals and organisations, the officers that have been involved, the Law Drafting Department, and these consequential amendments are another big step towards making vital changes and bringing joy to those parents. So, with that, I maintain the principles.

The Bailiff:

Do you call for the appel?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on the principles for P.89. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The principles have been adopted,

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
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 I.J. Gorst				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

I take it the Committee does not wish to bring this in, Deputy? Very well, do you wish to move the matter in second reading?

3.2 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Do you wish to take them *en bloc*?

The Connétable of St. Peter:*En bloc.***The Bailiff:**

En bloc. Is it seconded for Second Reading? **[Seconded]** Does there any Member wish to speak in Second Reading? No Member wishes to speak in Second Reading. Then I close the debate. Those in favour of adopting in Second Reading kindly show. The appel is called for. Again, I invite Members who may have rushed out in the last few minutes to rush back in and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. The vote is on Second Reading for P.89. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I asked the Greffier to close the voting. The Articles have been adopted in Second Reading:

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
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 I.J. Gorst				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

Do you propose in Third Reading?

3.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are they seconded for Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak in Third Reading? Those in favour of adopting in Third Reading kindly show. The appel is called for. The vote is on Third Reading and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their vote, then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The legislation is adopted in a Third Reading:

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				

Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
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 I.J. Gorst				
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 H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				

Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

Very well, that concludes Public Business and I call upon the chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose business of the future arrangements.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

4. Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

The arrangements of public business, for the first time ever we only have one, well, since I have been chair of P.P.C., we only have one item on the agenda for 25th February, which is the P.88, States of Jersey Development Company: Pre-Sales Provisions for Residential Developments and Pre-Let(s) Provisions for Commercial Developments. P.78, which we were going to discuss at this meeting, has been moved to 22nd April. I make the arrangement of business.

The Bailiff:

Do Members approve the arrangements for future business? Those arrangements are approved. That concludes the business of the Assembly and the Assembly stands adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on 25th February.

ADJOURNMENT

[12:40]