

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

THURSDAY, 30th APRIL 2015

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER	3
1. The Bailiff:.....	3
PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption	3
2. Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): tenth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(10)) - paragraphs (2) and (3) - resumption	3
2.1 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:.....	3
2.1.1 Deputy P.D. McLinton of St. Saviour:.....	4
2.1.2 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:.....	4
2.2 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): eleventh amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(11)) - paragraphs (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d)	8
2.2.1 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence:	8
2.3 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): third amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(3)) .8	8
2.3.1 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:.....	8
2.3.2 Senator I.J. Gorst:.....	9
2.4 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fourth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(4))9	9
2.4.1 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:.....	9
2.4.2 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Peter:.....	12
2.4.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:.....	12
2.4.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier:.....	13
2.4.5 Senator Z.A. Cameron:.....	14
2.4.6 Senator A.K.F. Green:.....	14
2.4.7 Deputy S.J. Pinel of St. Clement:.....	15
2.4.8 Deputy J.A. Martin of St Helier:.....	15
2.4.9 Deputy S.M. Brée of St. Clement:.....	16
2.4.10 Senator I.J. Gorst:	17
2.4.11 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:.....	19
2.4.12 Connétable C.H. Taylor of St. John:.....	20
2.4.13 Deputy R.G. Bryans of St. Helier:.....	20
2.4.14 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:.....	21
2.4.15 Senator P.F. Routier:.....	21
2.4.16 Deputy J.A. Hilton of St. Helier:.....	24
2.4.17 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:.....	24
2.4.18 Connétable J.M. Refault of St. Peter:.....	25
2.4.19 Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:.....	25
2.4.20 Deputy M.J. Norton of St. Brelade:.....	26

2.4.21 Deputy A.D. Lewis of St. Helier:	26
2.4.22 Deputy G.P. Southern	27
2.5 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)).	31
2.5.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	31
2.6 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)) - amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)Amd.)	33
2.6.1 Senator I.J. Gorst:.....	34
2.6.2 Deputy M.R. Higgins:.....	35
2.6.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	36
2.6.4 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:.....	37
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	38
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT	39
2.6.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:.....	39
2.6.6 Deputy J.A. Martin:.....	41
2.6.7 Senator I.J. Gorst:.....	41
2.7 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)) - as amended	43
2.7.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:.....	43
2.7.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	43
2.8 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015) - as amended	44
2.8.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:.....	44
2.8.2 Senator L.J. Farnham:.....	46
2.8.3 Senator Z.A. Cameron:.....	48
2.8.4 Senator A.K.F. Green:.....	51
2.8.5 The Deputy of Trinity:.....	52
2.8.6 Deputy M.R. Higgins:.....	54
2.8.7 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:.....	55
2.8.8 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	55
2.8.9 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:.....	56
2.8.10 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:.....	61
2.8.11 The Connétable of St. John:.....	65
2.8.12 Senator I.J. Gorst:.....	65
3. Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal: appointment of members (P.30/2015)...	69
3.1 Deputy S.J. Pinel (The Minister for Social Security):.....	69
4. Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal: appointment of members (P.31/2015)...	70
4.1 Deputy S.J. Pinel (The Minister for Social Security):.....	70
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS	71
5. The Connétable of St. Clement (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee):.....	71
ADJOURNMENT	71

[9:32]

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

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

1. The Bailiff:

Members will be aware that today marks the last day in office for Michael Wilkins as Viscount, one of the officers of this Assembly. He was appointed to that office in 1981 and although his job perhaps does not require his presence in this Assembly as often today as in centuries past when Jurats, Rectors and Deputies did not behave as well as they do now, he has been a faithful servant of the Assembly since then. Members will be accustomed to seeing him carry the seal of King Edward I upon its cushion on all ceremonial occasions, an exercise which is harder than it looks, but the Viscount assures me that it tones up his forearms for tennis, which he enjoys at the weekend. As Viscount, Michael Wilkins has been particularly active in the field of insolvency and, indeed, the co-author of a notable textbook, and he is expert in that area. He was also appointed Judicial Greffier in 1997. He has been a superb servant of this Assembly and of this Island, as indeed was recognised by an award of the M.B.E. (Member of the Order of the British Empire) in the Queen's Birthday Honours of 2011. On behalf of all Members, I thank him for his service and I wish him well for his retirement. **[Approbation]** It is also the last day for the Vice-Dean as Dean substitute in this Assembly as the Dean will be returning after his sabbatical for the next meeting. I would like to take the opportunity of thanking him very much for his assistance. **[Approbation]**

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption

2. Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): tenth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(10)) - paragraphs (2) and (3) - resumption

The Bailiff:

We now resume debate on amendments 10(2) and 10(3) to the Strategic Plan. Does any Member wish to speak? Deputy Maçon.

2.1 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:

I think what struck me yesterday is out of many of the speeches given certainly one of the most enthusiastic ones that was given was by Deputy Labey. It struck me, thinking about the Strategic Plan, thinking about this document is about vision, this document is about aspiration and things to achieve, and when we look at the Strategic Plan a lot of it is not major policy change. A lot of it is business as usual. A lot of it is, well, we have to do this anyway. Some of it is picking up on stuff we should have already done in the last term: reference public sector reform, et cetera. We should be 3 years down the line on that. So we are looking at the document and we want something aspirational and something to give vision. It is a bit lacklustre. So what struck me with Deputy Labey's amendment is here we have some vision, something about what the Island could do and achieve and what it could be, which I thought was very inspirational. What I want to touch on is looking at what Deputy Labey's amendment tries to achieve. It fits in with a lot of established States policy, whether that is the sustainable transport policies, whether that is the health policies of exercise and public promotion, it fits in with that as well. It fits in with our tourism policies which are trying to encourage people to the Island. While driving back, as I was given the courtesy of a lift home by the Deputy of Grouville very kindly yesterday, we drove through the Havre des Pas area and it is in need of a lot of love and care and attention. It is in need of that. Looking at the whole aspect of the fourth strategic priority in this Strategic Plan, which is St. Helier, of course ... although as I pointed out in the draft version, it is the central urban area, but never mind, we will carry on. Looking at how funds will be spent on that area, already we are looking at ... well, Deputy Vallois is twitching and it is the point that Deputy Martin raised of where is the money

going to come from for this priority, which is absolutely a fair point to raise. Looking at those particular areas, we do need to do what we can in order to improve the living areas in those parts of the town. Then we started to get into this argument of my masterplan is better than your masterplan because my masterplan encompasses this much but yours only looks at this much. Of course, going back to certain masterplans such as the North of Town Masterplan, there are elements which were not mentioned about it yesterday, which is within that masterplan buildings, were supposed to be bought and knocked down in order to provide better pathways through the north of town. That document was 2010. We are 2015; that has not happened. Also, there was supposed to be chunks of areas which were then supposed to be bought and turned into green spaces. Well, that has not happened. The money for that probably is not going to come forward. So when we start talking about “let us have this huge masterplan in order to cover the whole of the central urban area in order to achieve what we want to”, inevitably it is going to be a phased approach which is going to have to happen. So, although the criticism from the Council of Ministers has been this only looks at one particular part and we want to look at the whole thing, well, we are going to have to do a phased approach anyway. So here we have an element where we can start, which is achievable, and, therefore, I think that the Assembly should try and love the central urban area and support Deputy Labey this morning.

2.1.1 Deputy P.D. McLinton of St. Saviour:

There is a book called *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. I know that the Chief Minister is familiar with this book. Some people chuckled, which I half expected, but I know one of the habits of highly effective people is to begin with the end in mind. Now, you could argue that the Strategic Plan, this section of it, begins with the end in mind, the end being a nice end. We are going somewhere nice. It is like maybe a metaphor of somebody setting off on a journey. Where are you going? Somewhere nice. Do you know where? No, I am going to start and end up somewhere nice. I do not doubt that the somewhere nice will be a very pleasant thing indeed because there is a fine team of people who will be putting together an excellent vision of St. Helier in the future. However, I rather fear that the dumping ground that is the Havre des Pas area, the districts of Deputies Labey et al, will yet again be left somewhere on the back burner. I rather fear for them because, after all, they are our neighbours, Deputy Maçon and myself, and so I am speaking partly for the people in our district as well. So I would like to see some commitment to this poor, dumped-upon area. My father grew up there. I have spent a lot of time down in that area. The McLintons basically started off at Havre des Pas and moved off to Georgetown, so there is a synergy between the 2.

[9:45]

Now, if the Minister in his summing up could give a commitment that this will happen in Havre des Pas, then I would be happy to reject the amendment simply because I would know that there is a commitment to it on record, that poor old Havre des Pas will be looked after in the Strategic Plan. If, however, as I suspect, it will not be committed to, then I will certainly be supporting this amendment because I think the poor, put-upon people of the area of Havre des Pas certainly need a bright and breezy area in which to live, work and enjoy.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Then I call on Deputy Labey to reply.

2.1.2 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:

Can I propose raising the défaut on Senator Cameron?

The Bailiff:

Well, she is here ...

Deputy R. Labey:

She is already ... okay. [Laughter] I did not want to lose her vote.

The Bailiff:

No, quite.

Deputy R. Labey:

But I do want to get finished before Senator Maclean arrives back in the Chamber. [Laughter]

The Bailiff:

You may have lost her, Deputy, but she was here earlier. [Laughter]

Deputy R. Labey:

I thank the speakers this morning and yesterday and, to the last speaker, you are going to have to vote with me now because the Minister does not get a chance to reply and give you an assurance. I would like to thank the Minister for Planning and Environment for his very reasonable treatment of me yesterday and especially for opening up La Collette, so important. As I said yesterday, that area has been dead and if you kill an area you kill the amenities around it; they will die. So, that is welcome news. I also welcome the Minister for Planning and Environment being part of this high-level overview - I am going to avoid the "M" word completely this morning - because he is a man of action and I know he wants to get going. He is an action man in the best sense of the word, as is the Minister for Transport and Technical Services. He is a man of action. He is an action man. They both are, as am I, and this is an action plan. However eloquently but lengthily Senator Ozouf splits hairs, this is an action plan. Senator Ozouf is right to highlight the furore that the Constable of St. Brelade copped when the St. Aubin improvement plans started, but they are not carping now at that. It is excellent. The horizontal services are up to scratch and brilliant and the traffic calming works, it seems to me, extremely well and in an inoffensive way. I should apologise to the Constable of St. Mary for calling the new cobbles a roundabout. They are not a roundabout. They are, in fact, a square.

Deputy R. Labey:

What they do is tell motorists on approach that this is not a road, this is not just a thoroughfare, it is a square and there may be people on that square and it is sensible to slow down. That is sophisticated traffic calming which looks good and is appropriate and I applaud it. I think the Constable of St. Mary and the Deputy will find that the furore there drops down. Also, the furore is not coming from people who live on that road and that is what that traffic calming is all about, for the people who live on that road. That is what I want for Green Street and it is urgent. The chicanes are carnage. I am not asking for granite for Green Street or for the promenade, I am just asking for concrete, but a better concrete with literary quotations imprinted on it, a literary walk. I am indebted to the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture for last night sending me a quote from T.E. Lawrence. It is the quote about men who dream at night, wake up and find it is vanity; men who dream in the day, open their eyes, are dangerous men because they act on their dreams and they make things possible. I know why the Minister sent it to me and I thank him and it lifted my spirits. I want that quotation on our literary walk pertaining to people in the area. It was interesting, in the summer I was ... actually, I think I was doing my leafleting for the election and I saw one of the blue coaches arrive on the end of Havre des Pas as it goes up to South Hill. The coach pulled over, put the hazard lights on and waited there for about 3 or 4 minutes and then it indicated and drove off. I said to a local who was there: "What is that all about?" and he said: "Oh, well, they stop at the house where T.E. Lawrence, Lawrence of Arabia, lived for a while and they take their pictures from the coach and then off they go." I want the coach to be able to park

somewhere in Havre des Pas, for those people to get off, do my literary walk, walk to the most southerly place in the British Isles - forgetting the Minkies - have their selfie there, do the loop, come back, and use the amenities in Havre des Pas. People are investing in those amenities. There are some very good restaurants and pubs and those landlords have invested a lot of money in upkeeping them. Then you walk from one of those places along Havre des Pas and it is shabby and it is dreary. The most telling contribution probably of the day yesterday was that from Deputy Andrew Lewis because I did exactly what he did. After his speech, I went on to Google and I googled Havre des Pas. It is terrifying that one of the things that pops up is TripAdvisor, very, very, very critical. I do not really want to repeat it because I do not want it to go on Hansard, but it talks of it being a poor location, to be avoided, it talks of walking into town from there in streets that are not lit properly, and the parking issue. As any hotelier or restaurateur or guest house owner will tell you, those TripAdvisor comments are commercial death. They are very, very destructive and the tourism Minister should be jumping up and down about this. Of course, he cannot. The Minister for Economic Development should be jumping up and down about this because it is highly detrimental. It is highly damaging. But, of course, he cannot because he, I think, is bound by collective responsibility, which I think is a shame. It is quite depressing as a Back-Bencher putting these things forward because now you are meeting the wall of collective responsibility. You have no chance to convert Ministers by the debate and I think the debates are poorer. Are they not bound? Are you releasing them? Is the Chief Minister releasing them?

The Bailiff:

Through the Chair.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I do not know if the Deputy is giving way to me but I thank him very much. That is very kind. The Minister for Economic Development is free to speak about tourism matters and he frequently does. He can make statements that are in line with government policy, which is rejuvenating the whole of St. Helier, and that is exactly the reason that Ministers have put this priority in their plan. I tried to speak before the Deputy stood just to give the commitment, certainly, that Deputy McLinton wanted and that the Minister for Planning and Environment gave yesterday about action together with T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) in ...

The Bailiff:

I think, Chief Minister, this is too late for a speech.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

The Deputy kindly gave way.

Deputy R. Labey:

I think you are taking advantage. I think the Minister is taking advantage of me giving way.

The Bailiff:

He is taking advantage of you, Deputy.

Deputy R. Labey:

He is. [Laughter] So let us strike a blow against that. I appeal to Members, appeal to the Connétables, I appeal to the Back-Benchers, I appeal to the Assistant Ministers, come on, let us strike a blow against this. I am not trying to steal a march here. I am trying to blaze a trail for a local area. The reason why I put this in and why it is Havre des Pas is not because I want to get in there first, because it is more special, because it is more important, it is because we are a little bit further down the line with this than most other areas because we have a well-established Havre des

Pas improvement group. I should inform you that much of what is in my report has already been presented by T.T.S. to the Havre des Pas improvement group. That happened last October. That carrot has been dangled and I just do not want that carrot to be gobbled up by the behemoth that could be this all-encompassing massive review of the whole area. It is about putting 3 little words into this document: Havre des Pas. Now, I know my style is forceful. People have commented on it and I know perhaps I am over-loud and people are disdainful of it. I will try to conform in future and I will try to know where to draw the line in future, but please do not confuse my style and theatricality with any insincerity. I have to face the residents of Havre des Pas every month in that group meeting, along with Deputy Martin, along with Deputy Wickenden, along with Constable Crowcroft, and that meeting is full of sincerity and passion and disappointment and frustration and hope. I want to give these people some hope and some action. It is a small concession. Let us have a look at those cycle paths over the pier heads. Let us do the study. Let us see if it is feasible. Let us see how much it will cost. Let us smarten up the area. Let us try and defeat that awful comment on TripAdvisor, which is so dangerous but so revealing. That is an ordinary person just giving their view and it is painful to read. Let us stop the rot. Let us have some action. I move and maintain the amendment and ask for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. The amendments you wish us to take together?

Deputy R. Labey:

I think we should take them separately.

The Bailiff:

Separately, very well. Then the vote is on amendment number 10, paragraph (2), and I invite Members to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 20		CONTRE: 23		ABSTAIN: 2
Senator Z.A. Cameron		Senator P.F. Routier		Senator P.F.C. Ozouf
Connétable of St. Helier		Senator I.J. Gorst		Connétable of St. Mary
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Senator L.J. Farnham		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Senator A.K.F. Green		
Connétable of Trinity		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy of Grouville		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)		Connétable of St. Martin		
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		Deputy of Trinity		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H)		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
Deputy A.D. Lewis (H)		Deputy E.J. Noel (L)		
Deputy of St. Ouen		Deputy of St. John		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)		
Deputy R. Labey (H)		Deputy of St. Martin		
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		Deputy R.G. Bryans (H)		
Deputy T.A. McDonald (S)		Deputy of St. Peter		
Deputy P.D. McLinton (S)		Deputy S.M. Bree (C)		
		Deputy M.J. Norton (B)		
		Deputy of St. Mary		

The Bailiff:

Very well. Deputy, according to the running plan, the loss of that amendment means that paragraph 10(3) falls away.

2.2 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): eleventh amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(11)) - paragraphs (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d)

The Bailiff:

Very well, we now come to amendment 11, paragraphs (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d). I am going to ask the Greffier to read the amendments together.

The Greffier of the States:

After the words “in the attached Appendix” insert the words - “except that” - (3)(b) on page 15, in the first paragraph, after the words “costs than elsewhere” insert the words “; a pressing need to place Jersey on the path of fiscal balance”; after the words “coping financially” insert the words: “It is, therefore, critical that we have sound and sustainable public finances.”; and in the second paragraph, before the words “4 priorities” insert the word “other”; 3(c), on page 16, for the words: “The Council’s 4 priorities” substitute the words: “The Council’s 5 priorities”; 3(d), delete paragraphs 18 and 19, service delivery and funding, and renumber pages and priorities as required.

The Bailiff:

Lodged by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. Oh, there you are, yes. You have moved. Deputy Le Fondré, it seems to be convenient to take all 3 together if that is ...? Very well.

2.2.1 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence:

Yes, thank you. As I said, my understanding is that the Council of Ministers are obviously accepting these because they are consequential amendments, having inserted the main amendment earlier I think yesterday. It might even have been Tuesday. So, for example, now instead of having 4 priorities we make reference to “other” 4 priorities and we are obviously just tweaking the words accordingly as a result of the changes that have already been put in place. On the basis that they are not controversial or anything along those lines, I shall stop there and move the amendment.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak? All Members in favour of adopting the 3 amendments kindly show? Those against? The amendments are adopted.

2.3 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): third amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(3))

The Bailiff:

We now come to amendment number 3 lodged by the Connétable of Grouville. I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

After the words: “In the attached Appendix” insert the words - “, except that in the chart numbered 5.1 on page 18 of the draft Plan, in the column headed ‘Key Areas of Focus 2015-2018’ after the words ‘Deliver e-government’ insert the words ‘to a level and timescale that will be set out in the Corporate Delivery Plan’.”

2.3.1 Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville:

The Council of Ministers have accepted this, in fact welcomed this amendment. I hope there is nobody in the room that does not want to set targets and timescale, so I think I need speak no further and I propose the amendment.

The Bailiff:

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

[10:00]

2.3.2 Senator I.J. Gorst:

Just to say we do indeed welcome the Constable's amendment as it will focus the programme and hopefully bring delivery forward, so we thank him for his pertinent amendment.

The Bailiff:

Do you wish to reply? All Members in favour of adopting the amendment kindly show? Those against? The amendment is adopted.

2.4 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fourth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(4))

The Bailiff:

We now come to amendment number 4 lodged by Deputy Southern and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

After the words "in the attached Appendix" insert the words "-", except that in the chart on page 18 of the draft Plan, after row 5.1 there should be inserted an additional row as follows. Desired outcome. 5.2 Commitment to the first 1,001 Days agenda made real. Key areas of focus. Extend statutory maternity leave to 26 weeks paid out of social security contributions; expand capacity for free nursery places from 20 to 30 hours per week; increase the number of health visitors to meet the U.K. (United Kingdom) recommended level for average caseload of preschool children."

2.4.1 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:

Two days ago I would have said that this was a fairly routine amendment and that it was in serious danger of going through on the nod. However, the tenor of the debate we have had so far has been otherwise. The Council of Ministers have dug their heels in time and time again and argued in some cases over wording of 6 words, sentences of 6 words, and said: "That is not good enough." Time and time again the Council of Ministers has argued against very straightforward and feasible and practical and useful propositions. I believe that my amendment could be described thus. Let us focus once again on the process, remembering that this is the overall strategic planning and that gets put into action in the Medium-Term Financial Plan and that is when the money gets attached to it. This is, today, deciding priorities. It is not the action. The action takes place later. We will see those plans in June/July and we will vote on them in September. However, what one can be sure of, given the squeeze that we have on financing, is that if it does not get on the priority list in some concrete way you will not be seeing it in the Medium-Term Financial Plan and, once again, it will be up to this House to bring amendments to say: "Hang on, the priorities you have are not right. Put this back in." What we have here is classic invest to save. If you put the effort in in the early years, you reap the rewards 10, 20, 30, lifetimes later with better education outcomes, better health outcomes, better social outcomes, fewer people in prison, fewer drugs, et cetera. You cannot necessarily measure it in any particular way, but you can say that you have improved outcomes time and time again. For investment now, you reap fivefold, tenfold, whatever, that sort of answer in the long run. That is exactly what this ministerial government is saying that they have embarked on, in particular with public services. Invest to save in the long term, that is what we are told. So it

fits in entirely with what ought to be Council of Ministers strategic planning. Let us have a look then at the comments issued by the Council of Ministers and note that we have 4 statements absolutely totally positive about 1,001 Days. Under 2.4: “Support children and families during critical preschool years.” Further on: “Support children and families from conception through the critical preschool years outlined in the 1,001 Days initiative and beyond.” That is an amendment that has been accepted and looks fairly concrete. “Reduce demand on services by investing in early interventions.” Here is the use of the “invest” word. Yes, it will cost money but it will save money in the short term. The money is not issued today. The money is issued and debated and authorised come September. Then we have: “The Council of Ministers firmly believes in this agenda. The States now have a firm commitment to the first 1,001 Days agenda and the pending establishment of an early years’ task force is an important development.” Indeed, apparently the Ministers have responded to the report that I make use of, the E.C.D. (Early Childhood Development) report by UBS, and have put out a news release on 27th April which says: “As part of a restructuring, the task force will examine the services available to support children during the critical early years, identify any gaps and find solutions for those gaps.” Well, that is very laudable, laudable indeed. So why, despite repeated statements of support for children, do the Ministers end up both in the opening line and in the last line saying: “The Council of Ministers strongly recommends this amendment be rejected”? The Council of Ministers strongly recommends that this amendment be rejected, top and tail. Not only ordinary rejection, which is normal, but strongly recommends rejection. Not even: “We like bits of it and you might have the right idea, but overall we do not want to vote for it.” Strongly recommends; this is something that is somehow completely wrong according to the Ministers. Well, I invite the Ministers to prove how completely wrong it is because I do not believe it is. It is very much in the spirit of support for early years, 1,001 Days initiatives. So let us have a look at what the UBS report says. Perhaps I could do no better than start with the introduction: “The UBS Optimus Foundation commissioned this report to examine opportunities for enhancing early child development in Jersey both through raising the population average achievement and through reducing inequalities.” Here comes that word again, inequalities, equalities. They have been against it all 3 days on this debate. Every time anybody mentions equality, fairness, they came out against it. “In particular, this report aims to describe the landscape of early years childhood in Jersey, describe the services available to enhance E.C.D., identify gaps in those services, and make recommendations for enhancing E.C.D.” What is the task force entitled to do, tasked to do? Identify any gaps and find solutions for those gaps. The report has already been done. While the task force has things to do, it is about prioritising. It is about designing systems, about how best to apply. But in terms of identifying the gaps and finding solutions, that has been done. I will just go briefly through what they say. What are the gaps? Several gaps in knowledge and services were found, the lack of data on preschool children. There is little communication between G.P.s (general practitioners) and health visitors, insufficient support for C.A.M.H.S. (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service), some families are more at risk than others, et cetera. There is a list of at least 10 issues that could be taken on. I have extracted 3 issues from this report and said: “Let us start here.” The recommendations: “1. Improve the current service provision. Health visitor numbers should be increased.” That is in my proposition. “Improve access to high-quality services,” access to Bridge and Samarès, et cetera. “Increase the quality of childcare and education services, public health campaign on early literacy, improve local E.C.D. capacity through improving intelligence, and evaluate the system as to how well it is working and how to make improvements.” So, nothing there that this Council of Ministers should really be objecting to, I do not believe. Let us just examine then what I am proposing. I am proposing that commitment expressed by the Council of Ministers to the first 1,001 Days agenda is made real, and I am trying to get something that says: “Do something.” Do not give me a report on it, do not discuss it, do not sit around discussing it, do something, commit now to putting this in your Medium-Term Financial Plan so that something gets done. In the 2 months between now and the Medium-Term Financial

Plan work out how best to deliver it. I think in the key areas of focus this means extending statutory maternity leave to 26 weeks. Could I have some water, please? **[Interruption]** Apologies, that is not just an ordinary frog in my throat. We do not have them in Jersey, not very many of them. It is one of the toads from my back pond. Right, extend the statutory maternity leave to 26 weeks paid out of social security contributions. This is the starting point for the 1,001 Days. It is about maternity leave. In the report, it already says the following, and this is why I focused on it, apart from my own concern, the fact we do not have proper, I believe, statutory maternity leave and the issues are still there: "Some employers currently provide paid leave of up to 6 months. The general pattern at present among most working families appears to be of taking around 4 months [it is fairly low in Jersey] paid for from savings." Why is it that low? Because people cannot afford to. We understand that breastfeeding is initiated by most mothers but continuation beyond 6 weeks is relatively uncommon, reportedly due to early return to work. Now, again, early return to work and they are 6 weeks breastfeeding. Now, there is evidence from around the world that this is a key bonding issue, the very core of 1,001 Days initiatives, bonding in the family between mother and child, particularly through breastfeeding, but certainly having the time off to establish that bond in the very earliest days is absolutely vital. Miss out on this, I believe, and you have to start playing catch-up almost straight away. Yet we have made some moves and we do not have that element of 6 months, which is fairly universally recommended, nor do we have the issue of how we are going to afford that done and dusted. We have 2 weeks' paid leave and a Minister for Social Security who has already committed to review this, I believe, in the coming year, to consult and to come back with proposals. So, there is very little advance in my proposition from what is intended. In the 3 to 4 years of this plan this is perfectly feasible. Even within the Minister for Social Security's own remit, she has it pencilled in, we can do the work, so this is perfectly practical and can be done.

[10:15]

Expand the capacity for free nursery places from 20 to 30 hours per week. In our low-wage culture with high rents and high costs, expand the system we already have, build on it from 20 hours a week to 30 hours a week I am suggesting is the way forward. Why am I? Because, as it says in the report - the work has already been done, it is sitting there - the costs of childcare are high: "Full-time care for children aged nought to 3 years generally costs £5 to £8 an hour or £855 to £1,368 per month." That is a heavy load, whether provided in centres or by a registered family child carer. "Lone parents and parents with low income, therefore, struggle to afford centre-based childcare and often seek less formal arrangements with care provided by family or friends. Some parents are forced to place their children in illegal childcare settings with much lower costs, sometimes paying as little as £1 an hour or payment made in kind." We have heard evidence that these arrangements are often unsatisfactory and sometimes border on illegality. Okay, so I am saying let us make a move to improve access and free access to childcare, quality childcare that takes place in proper conditions where the language skills are being built up, where the social skills are being built up, and not in unsatisfactory, perhaps illegal settings where language developments and interaction are not taking place. Then my third initiative: increase the number of health visitors to meet the U.K. recommended level for average caseload for preschool children, and here it is very straightforward. There are 14.8 whole-time equivalent health visitors on Jersey, including 4 new posts, so the average caseload of preschool children is at least 330, which is above the nationally recommended figure in the U.K. of 250. That is my third branch of what I think we should start doing straight away, and it is very clearly laid out in the report that this is one of the recommendations, very clear. So, what do I have in my proposition that sets the priorities, that sets the framework going forward to the Medium-Term Financial Plan, which we can decide to spend money on or not as we come to September? I have 3 doing words, to use the old-fashioned primary school expression, which my wife says is not accurate but nonetheless they are to me. They are verbs, they are doing words, and

that is what I like to hear. The doing words are extend statutory maternity leave - already planned in some form or other, I say get on with it - expand capacity, expand, and then, finally, increase the number of health visitors. Those are my 3 action words. I think it is perfectly safe to put those 3 actions into the Strategic Plan as priorities so that they can be translated into the Medium-Term Financial Plan and over the next 3 years perhaps we have the opportunity of making everyone in this room's commitment to the 1,001 Days initiative ... this is the way to improve our society from birth onwards, from pre-birth onwards, from conception. Put it into action so that the support we would all give ... and each Minister has. I have heard them all say it on the hustings, totally support 1,001 Days. This is the way to put that into action. Make it real. As I say, make the first 1,001 Days agenda real. That is what this does and I maintain the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Is it seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak? Yes, Deputy of St. Peter.

2.4.2 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Peter:

The Council of Ministers is, as the Deputy rightly points out, very committed to the 1,001 Days strategy. It is part of the Chief Minister's election manifesto and the 1,001 Days is a cross-party manifesto. It is an approach and I am very pleased to see that the Reform Party are also signing up to this cross-party approach. Like our Strategic Plan, it sets out a way of thinking. It is not prescriptive and while well intentioned, this amendment, I believe, is too prescriptive. We are already doing a lot, a great deal, in this area and making significant improvements in services for parents and young children. Take sustained home visiting, for example, community midwives who are operating now from G.P. surgeries, the Samarès children and family centre, which offers non-stigmatised access to universal services for all families with pathway support for vulnerable families, family care co-ordinator focusing on families with young children with complex needs. They are all good initiatives. We need to ensure that we address the 1,001 Days in a holistic way. We require a strategic approach as opposed to an initiative-led approach. In January this year, the Chief Minister announced setting up the dedicated task force. We are making the early years agenda real. It is in the Strategic Plan and we have seen already the acceptance of Deputy Doublet's excellent amendments, which reinforce our belief in the 1,001 Days strategy. Earlier this week we announced the appointment of the director of the early years' task force. This is a key role and the director will take her post next week and begin the work, which will work across departments and it will also take into account the very helpful UBS early years report which the Deputy has referred to. The first work of the task force director will be to analyse the need that we see in the Island, taking into account the UBS report. It will then move on to identify the gaps we have in service and bring forward the right solutions for Jersey families. What do we need and what do we currently do that we do not need? It is very much an invest to save initiative and it will do so in consultation with families. There will be no second guessing of their needs or the solutions, unlike this proposition. In addition to the task force, other essential building blocks are being put into place. Our early help initiative, for example, will be launched in the coming weeks. This provides all professionals, teachers, social workers, staff in charities, nurses or others, an easy to use tool for helping to identify and assess the needs of families. It is a tool which helps to ensure that families who are under stress or who need help are quickly and efficiently referred to the services they need. It will help to ensure those families are not passed from pillar to post continually having to repeat their story. This proposition is not backed by evidence. We simply do not know if the proposals it includes are those that will deliver the right change for families. We must let the task force do its work first. As the Deputy stated in an earlier speech, this is a Strategic Plan, an opportunity to set the compass. As the Deputy said himself, this is not an action plan. I urge Members to reject this amendment.

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

This amendment is the one that I have spent most time looking at and thinking about, apart from my own, of course. I really want to thank Deputy Southern for bringing this because these issues are so, so important. I think for too long the States Assembly has had too much of a short-sighted approach and - I hate to use these words - silo mentality. As I said on Tuesday, the 1,001 Days initiative, the fact that it has been accepted by the Council of Ministers, gives me so much optimism. Looking at these 3 points that Deputy Southern has picked out here, I do agree with all of them, but I also agree with the things that the Council of Ministers have pointed out in their comments. For example, the paragraph at the end of page 2 on the comments: "No consideration is given as to whether better alternatives may exist." So, for me, the statutory maternity leave, that is so important. If I was prioritising these things, that is what I would put first. But I am not sure I would put the other 2 things first. There are other things that can be done from the 1,001 Days commitment that do not really cost much, if anything, like giving training to childcare settings in attachment so they can focus on the attachment needs of babies, to encourage more reading among families. There are other things that we can do at this time when we do not have as much funds as we might like to give to these things, that we could maybe do first because we do have to balance out the need for these things which are really important and the money that we have. I have to trust the Ministers on this somewhat, I do, because they have made steps. There is an early years' task force that is in place. The lead person has been appointed. There is movement on it. There is. The Minister for Social Security is looking into the maternity arrangements. So I think we do have to trust the Ministers and watch and wait and see what happens. I was not sure which way I was going to vote on this because, as I said, there are things from the Ministers and there are things from Deputy Southern that I agree with. I will be supporting it simply because I believe that the 26 weeks' minimum statutory maternity leave is so, so important and I cannot stress that enough. That is so important that we get that in as soon as possible because if we continue to let ... it is damage that is being done to babies, to young Islanders. If we let that continue, then we are just storing up problems for the future. So, I would urge Members to indicate their support for the babies, infants, children, young people of our Island and vote for this amendment and say: "We are thinking about you and we do care about you and we want to do something about it." Once again, I want to thank Deputy Southern for this. Just one last comment: I think something has maybe gone wrong in that Deputy Southern should be on the Council of Ministers because I could not support his amendment yesterday because there were more things on the Council of Ministers' section that I agreed with, but there are so many things on there that should have been in there. I maybe want to see more openness from the Ministers and listening to Deputy Southern and other Back-Benchers because there is a lot of good there.

2.4.4 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier:

Hear, hear to those last comments in that last speech. I could not possibly endorse them anymore. She was absolutely right there. I stood on an election manifesto which said very clearly that I, alongside my Reform Jersey colleagues, would support 26 weeks' paid statutory maternity leave, so to not support something that aims to get a solid commitment on that would be a complete betrayal of the people who voted for me and the people who voted for the other members of my party. In politics, I think there is often a very simple choice between 2 things. You can say you are in favour of something or you can be in favour of something, and unlike the previous speaker I do not have faith in the Council of Ministers, especially after the past few days where I see them having purported to be in support of something and then having not just voted against something to give some concrete steps towards action on those points but have actually urged other Members to vote against them as well. So, frankly, in politics I care absolutely nothing for platitudes. I want action and I want tangible outcomes and that is what the purpose of this amendment is. Frankly, this argument that we should not accept this because it is pre-empting the task force I just think is utterly absurd. Is this task force really going to come out and say: "Do you know what we do not

need is more maternity leave”, when we only have 2 weeks’ paid maternity leave in the first place? Are they really going to come out and say 2 weeks is sufficient? Of course they are not. As Deputy Southern said, the overwhelming evidence is that babies need at least 6 months with their mother to bond with them properly. How you can disagree with the medicine and the science behind it is just unbelievable.

[10:30]

That will inevitably be something we have to work towards. We are already years and years behind the rest of Europe on maternity leave. It is going to be something we have to move forward to, so what on earth is wrong with supporting something that says, okay, we are specifically committed to that? It just does not make sense. Is the task force really going to say: “Do you know what we do not need more of is more easy access to nursery places for children”? Are they really going to suggest that? Of course they are not. Nursery care in Jersey is extortionately expensive. I know this because a close relative of mine has recently had a baby and she is really struggling with it. She is doing a great job because she is tough and she is hard working, but it is not easy. To make it easier for those families, especially when you consider that most of the families that will struggle are going to be the poorer families, the families that will find it naturally harder to give the best start to their children in life because of everything else that is connected to that, that extra help would specifically help children from poorer backgrounds who face the most challenges anyway. So I cannot foresee a task force saying that we should not do that. This, as far as I am concerned, is such a clear choice between platitudes or delivering action. That is the difference here. It does not matter how many photographs you get taken for the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* in front of a 1,001 Days manifesto if you do not end up with anything out of it. It does not matter how many speeches at how many conferences you give, what matters is outcomes and this is what this is about. For goodness sake, we cannot just say we are in support of something and not be willing to put our money where our mouth is. That is the worst of politics and it is what has led so many Islanders to being disillusioned with it. It is politicians standing up and saying one thing and not delivering on it. That is what this amendment does. It is aimed so we can reach these outcomes, so I urge Members to support it.

2.4.5 Senator Z.A. Cameron:

This is an area very close to my heart and I would like to congratulate Deputy Southern in encapsulating some of the key areas necessary for success of the 1,001 Days manifesto. With regard to maternity leave, which I would prefer included parental leave, Jersey of all places should be aware of the dangers of institutional care at too young an age. High quality nursery care from 2 to 3 years helps ensure social development and lessens the gap between children that is already apparent by age 5. With regard to health visitors, this is absolutely necessary to ensure that the children’s development is properly screened and we pick up those signs of those that are not necessarily receiving the attention that they deserve at a young age and to help enhance that and help parents to put that in place if that is necessary. So I will be supporting this amendment.

2.4.6 Senator A.K.F. Green:

Like my colleague, the Minister for Home Affairs, I am a little concerned that we are putting the outcomes before we have done the work in terms of everything that needs to be done. We are absolutely committed to 1,001 Days. That is not lip service or platitudes or anything else. It is an absolute commitment. The task force has been put together. A chief officer has been appointed to run this, but those things that Deputy Southern has pointed out may well be the ones that form part of the work that we will need to do. I think it is quite likely that some of that will be there, but there may be other things that will have a greater impact, a greater benefit. What we are doing here is putting the outcomes before the work has been done. What I like to do is to look at the work. I

keep getting told by my colleagues in Scrutiny that the work you should do should be evidence based. Well, we need to get that evidence, look at what has the greatest outcome, look at what has the greatest benefit, absolutely committed to 1,001 Days as my colleagues are, but let us do it properly and let us make sure that we get the greatest benefit to ensure that our young people have the best start in life.

2.4.7 Deputy S.J. Pinel of St. Clement:

With reference to the first part of the proposition, we have debated the maternity leave period a number of times recently. Members will recall - and as mentioned by Deputy Southern in his opening remarks - that I have committed to review the family friendly rights one year after the law comes into force, i.e. September 2016. This will include consultation by the Employment Forum on a second stage of rights in which the periods of leave might be extended. A 26-week maternity leave entitlement may be our next goal. However, 26 weeks maternity benefit brings a cost to the States. When we debated Deputy Southern's proposal for 26 weeks maternity benefit last year, it was made very clear to the Assembly that the Social Security Fund would not be able to tolerate the £1.5 million additional cost. This proposed amendment would bring an even greater cost to the States if the fund needs to cover the cost of statutory maternity pay rather than provide maternity benefit. These proposals come at a time when we already need to make significant changes to our existing contributions and benefits so that the Social Security Fund is sustainable over the next few decades. I also wish to reiterate that the Council of Ministers is fully signed up to the 1,001 Days manifesto and the early years' task force.

2.4.8 Deputy J.A. Martin of St Helier:

Yes, and it is one of those amendments where you look at it and you think: yes. I am committed to the 1,001 Days and I feel Deputy Southern's frustration because this is not the first commitment. I have been here long enough and I have been in Health and I have been the Assistant Minister with responsibility for children, looked-after children. We have had different reports and we have been promised the earth. Yes, I do not disagree that the longer you can take off work and spend with your child has to be right. The second one - and I think these all will be voted on together - expand capacity for the nursery places, now it is 3 years 3 months for the child to get in. I think that is too late. But are we targeting the right people? Because if anyone was in this House and remembers Senator Shenton's amendment, he wanted to look at who could afford and who was in need. Maybe rightly, maybe wrongly, we gave it across the board. Now, we gave it to people who could afford to pay and straight from there they went to very expensive paying schools from nursery. Now, were they taking the places of the children who really needed it? We have struggled with this. I really struggle to vote against Deputy Southern, but on the premise first we do no harm to our children is what we should be doing, with the extra health visitors we took on we are working with families we know, and we should know them right from early on. I will not go as far as conception, but this is what the 1,001 Days says, early on, before the baby is born, working with these families that we have known for years. This in a different context comes down to money because I do not want any other money diverted from the children, the teenagers, the families that are already known to health visitors, social workers, C.A.M.H.S., who have left our care, who we have let down for many years. So what we have a dilemma with is improving those services - because we have already let those children down, we have done it for many years - and frontloading because nobody in this House disagrees that the earlier ... excellent presentation from Senator Cameron. I had already seen that with the Deputy of St. Peter and Deputy Bryans when we were taken to Northampton with Brighter Futures. I do not think anyone can disagree. Their saying is not 1,001 Days; the presentation we saw was 2 is too late because if you do not bond, you do not stimulate the child. It is amazing to see a well cared for child and what they can pick up in those first few weeks, months and then years, that first 2 years. The science again was shown in

Senator Cameron's presentation. The size of the brain of a child that is stimulated to a child who is ignored or basically pushed from pillar to post in size is physical damage, basically. So I absolutely have real, real sympathy and feel Deputy Southern's frustration, but I want to know that we are targeting. I want to see the M.T.F.P. (Medium-Term Financial Plan). I want to see where we are targeting the money. I tried to have it statutory and I know we do a good job for our care leavers, but it is still 18 and it is only due to some very committed staff who have got to know these children over years that it does carry on and there is a budget, but it is not statutory. So I am looking, making sure you are not cutting here, because we have helped them through. The children are not children anymore. They are 19, 20, 21. Again, we cut off. We need to look at the whole. My focus is we are focusing too much on the 1,001 Days, which is excellent but, as I said, we have already done the damage to some children, or damage has been done, not by us, maybe over different years. People have to go to work. We have just heard from the Minister for Social Security, who brought in family values a year ago. We are 30 years behind the U.K. in loads of these things, so how much damage have we done to our families, our children, in those years? But they are still here and we still need to budget and deal with them. So I really do not know. I will listen. I do not know if anyone else is going to speak. Very disappointing that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture is not here because I would have liked to have heard some facts and figures on part 2, expand capacity. Is there absolute demand because I have asked questions before and some people say: "No, there is capacity." It might not be in the actual nursery that the mother wants. It might not be convenient but there is capacity. I need to know this. But the Minister for Education is not here. In fact there are not a lot of Ministers here, but that is their priority. Just a shot across the bow, and I totally agree with Deputy Doublet, Deputy Southern has always been ignored. He does look at things, he does his research and he just does not seem to get a fair hearing. I do not even know, was he called in, was he asked, was he given facts and figures. When he brought his amendment yesterday, it was reject, reject, reject. We have all said we like bits of it. I like bits of this. I need more information. The Council of Ministers do not answer me these in the comments about the capacity for ... the Minister for Education is coming back. I am sorry, and I hope he can answer my question, because this 20 to 30 weeks from 3 years and 3 months, that is when they are accepted, because I know I have a close relative on the year they were born could not access it until they were 4. Again it is little things like this that the task force should be looking at. Look forward to seeing more of what they are doing. But I will listen to a few more speakers. I am torn because I need to know that we are not taking away money from one part of our society that needs our help because of things we have not done over the years or have not done as good as we could, and have not accepted the ... maybe not known. Maybe not known that we need to get in much earlier. Who knew this 40 years ago, 30 years ago, 20 years ago? But we are behind. So we are sending mums back to work very early. We have no paternity leave at all. Dad's get no look in. So there are lots and lots and lots. I hope we do have a good debate on this because I am worried. At the moment I am not sure so I need a bit more of hopefully some statistics and I will await to hear and see whether I can support. But I think it may be the Medium-Term Financial Plan to see where this money is coming from and where it is going from before I can support something that I need much more information on. Thank you.

2.4.9 Deputy S.M. Brée of St. Clement:

I had not intended speaking on this particular amendment but I think it is quite important that we put things into context of what exactly we are debating here today. We are debating a Strategic Plan. That Strategic Plan is a vision for the future.

[10:45]

A vision that has been presented to us by the Council of Ministers but on which we have a say to what it contains and what it intends to achieve. But to achieve any vision requires investment. It

then becomes a question of where do we want to spend money. What areas do we feel are important to the people of the Island? A lot has been spoken about economic development and how important that is. How we should stimulate business. But really what we are talking about here is a vision for the future. I think we do need to start making commitments to the public in where we are going to spend, which after all is their money. What we do not need is expensive report after report after report and nothing gets done. I fully agree with the comments the Council of Ministers are saying, that yes, we do need to look at this holistically. We do need to look at this as an overall area. But I think what we need to show the public of the Island, now today, is real commitment. Real commitment to the 1,001 Days objectives rather than talking about it, rather than employing somebody to write a report on it perhaps what we need to do is to lay down a number of areas that we believe are important. I think that is what this amendment provides for. It is not saying to the exclusion of everything else. It is not saying we cannot spend money on other areas that become apparent. What it is saying is that this Assembly believes there are a certain number of priorities and it is naming a number of them. I feel that if we do not support this amendment then we are delaying any investment in the future of this Island through its children. That is what we are talking about here. We need to have a much longer view of the world than just the next 3 years. If we can achieve that today, and perhaps only that today, then I think we have shown that we have a commitment to the public and the future of the Island. I would strongly urge Members to support it for that reason. Thank you.

2.4.10 Senator I.J. Gorst:

I take heart from the debate that we are having on this particular issue today. These areas, I personally can find them quite difficult, and I think that perhaps for some of us we have to look beyond the personal experience of the issues that we are considering. Because we are not only talking about vulnerable families and vulnerable children in our community, and they are extremely important and I want to come back to them, but we are also talking about the way we organise ourselves as a community. The priority that we put to some of the fundamental issues that give hope for the future, and a number of speakers have spoken about attachment and bonding and the importance ultimately, although we are not verbalising it in this way, the importance of family. When I use that word I do not use it in the traditional way. Family now can mean and encompass, for me, a myriad of relationships. But that attachment, that way we respect and build families in our community, for me it is absolutely fundamentally important about having a better future than we have had in the past. It goes beyond the cost of services right to the core, I believe, of what it means to think of our children and our grandchildren and what it means to give them a future. I take heart from Deputy Southern wanting today to give some actions to that priority that the Council of Ministers have set in the Strategic Plan. I understand the areas that he has focused on, and he is asking us today to say that 26 weeks is absolutely the right number of weeks for maternity leave. The truth is, I believe, that we are going to need to consider, as the task force will do, and come forward with action plans; and I just want to pick up on that point as well, because a task force is about action, not about writing more reports. We have had lots of reports in the past and Ministers are committed. The reason we have set up a task force is not that they write more reports. But it is exactly that. That they come forward with actions that we will need to deliver on. I have some questions about the action that we will need to deliver on with regard to maternity leave because I do not think it is simply maternity leave. I think it is also paternity leave. I think it is also adoption leave. It is about trying to deal with some of those and putting in place the very best framework that we can to make sure that families are strong for the future. The Deputy also says that the answer is in his amendment by using the Social Security Fund and using contributions. That may be the answer but there is no, rightly, because it is an amendment to the Strategic Plan, but none of us know what the effect on the Social Security Fund will be, as the Minister has just said to us. None of us know what the effect on the contribution rate will be and none of us know

what the effect on businesses will be to allowing that leave. The reason I raise those points is because they should rightly be part of any consultation for change. They should be rightly made clear and transparent that that is what it is going to cost but if we are going to choose that these are the reasons why we think it is very important, and the financial cost is far outweighed by the benefit to our community. We then come on to the second point, expanding the capacity for free nursery places, and I think Deputy Martin made some very pertinent points about that. Is it the right approach to allocate funds in that manner so that they are free for all? We need to consider whether that money can be used in better interventions because those Members that have had the opportunity to read, and if they have not I ask them to do so and to consider the UBS report that was undertaken by a professor from Scotland. The review in the media seemed to completely miss the point. But one of the things that they rightly raised and Ministers sat with that professor, and Ministers and officers were completely open about where we thought the problems were, so that that could be dealt with. One of the points raised was that we do not have the data and the data to help us make informed interventions. That, while it might seem an administrative piece of work, is absolutely crucial to make sure that the interventions that we then deliver are going to be delivering in the way that we want, that are going to be measurable, and that we are going to be able to see that the outcomes are working. Because one thing that we are not good at with government policy and governments around the world are not good at, you start a programme and just let it carry on. You do not measure the outcomes to see if it is delivering the policy priority that one wished for. We have to step away from that, particularly in this area. As some of the Members have said, there has already been an increase in the number of health visitors, but the challenge is: are they in the right area? Are they delivering in the right way? This Strategic Plan has caused a lot of consternation in the media. First of all people started out saying it was pie in the sky, it was just a woolly document. Then today we have heard, and no doubt we will hear it again, that it is just business as usual and it is just carrying on doing things that we cannot avoid. Then we discuss the resource implication and everybody cried: "Oh dear, we have got a black hole." The truth of the matter is that there are many areas in health, in social provision, and in there we talk about children's services, we need to get right to the heart of delivering on the 1,001 Days agenda and the other work that the task force will be doing, working with vulnerable families so that they are kept out of interaction with the ... largely the police and the - I am trying to think of a word to describe those sorts of interventions - interventions of last resort where issues and problems have arisen to interventions of first support, so that we never get down to that line. That is going to cost money. The Minister for Health and Social Services and the former Minister for Health and Social Services and the Senator sitting in front of me now knows that we need to spend more money on health and social services. We need to spend more money on children's services. We need to spend money on mental health services. We need to ensure that we are spending the right amount of money on those with disabilities. Some people will find that difficult. They say: "Well, how on earth can you be proposing to spend more money in these areas when you are putting back and reprioritising some of your existing services?" We are doing it because we believe it is the right thing to do. We see the issues that this debate is touching upon and many, many other issues as well, and many other interventions that we need to be providing in our health and social services system. There will be, even when we have invested the extra £47 million in health and social services, there will still have to be choices, there will still have to be compromises. I suppose what Ministers are saying with regard to Deputy Southern's amendment is that: does this Assembly know today whether this is the right choice and this is the right compromise when weighed against all those other issues, Members in this Assembly will be contacted day-in, day-out, week-in, week-out, about some of the services that we provide in these areas. We are going to need to make some hard choices, and we are going to need to spend more money. That will of course come in the M.T.F.P. I agree with Deputy Brée, this is not about a 3-year plan. This is about improving our services for the next generation.

[11:00]

We are going to have to balance out, putting money in early intervention to prevent problems in the medium and longer term, with the need for improvement in current services. The M.T.F.P. is going to help us to be able to do that. Of course, my comments have focused mostly on health and social services, but those services are delivered hand in hand with the Education, Sport and Culture Department and we know that we are going to need to spend money in the Education, Sport and Culture Department as well, to help them. Sometimes education is - I will not use the term "left holding the baby" - but the problems have not been dealt with prior to them coming into the education system, and so we have got individuals going into that system whereby there should have been much earlier intervention and support and teachers, and the Education, Sport and Culture Department are not equipped to deal with such intense and often difficult problems. So we have to work together across the spectrum. There are some reasons why people come into politics, and I look in front of me and I know that Senator Cameron stood because she wants us to start to make improvements and changes around the interventions and the services that we provide. She is right to have wanted to do that. But I believe there are many Members right across this Assembly this morning who have come into politics to deal with these issues. To make sure we are having appropriate early intervention and we are stopping problems before they develop. You can never do that completely so you will always need the later provision of services and it is the only reason that Ministers are saying we cannot accept this amendment as it stands today because of that weighing up between where are we going to put those resources. Are we absolutely certain that that is the right thing to do and it is costed today or are there other areas that we think interventions will be better provided in? It is only through the work of the task force, together with the further work that we know UBS are going to do as well, together with looking at other academic studies around the world and experience, that we are going to be able to come forward with a package of actions that we are going to have to ask for funding for in the M.T.F.P. It is sort of with a heavy heart that I ask Members to do that, to wait for that action plan to be delivered. But I do, and I do it simply because I believe that that will be the best for delivering the outcomes that we want into the future. Sometimes that is difficult. But I do ask that Members do. That they engage with the task force and that they support their work and that they engage with their experience that they see day-in and day-out from their constituency work about issues that do need to be addressed. Thank you.

2.4.11 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:

I think it is fair to say that everyone in this House is passionate and feels that the most support that we can give to our families is paramount. This amendment is well intentioned but I think we need to take it all in context. In some cases it is before conception, sometimes by the time someone does get pregnant it can be a little bit too late. We need to make them sure that their families are ready to cope with having a family. As I said, the amendment is good in principle but deciding the outcome before the evidence to support it is the wrong way round. The UBS did a really good piece of work and as the Chief Minister said, I hope all Members will take the opportunity to read it. But one of the recommendations too, is the lack of data that we, as a States department, had and the lack of evidence. It is vital to understand the problems and issues and to make sure that the services that we will put in will change, will directly benefit the families. This is a commitment that has been given and action ... a lot has been said here about lack of action. Action has been started and the Minister for Home Affairs has already mentioned that, and she is a woman of action and she will definitely pursue it and get it really going. Deputy Brée mentions that he is supporting this amendment because we should have a look longer than 3 years. But I would say to Deputy Brée, this is one of the reasons why we should not support this amendment. This is definitely longer than 3 years and to ensure that we need to put all the issues all together and making sure that what we come out with is right and fit for our children, not for today, not for tomorrow, but for the next generations and making sure that we have the money in the Medium-Term Financial Plan to

go alongside it. It will be tight. There will be a lot of issues when the Medium-Term Financial Plan comes to this Assembly. We have a chance to get it right, not for us, for the States, but for our families for the next generation. I will leave it there, thank you.

2.4.12 Connétable C.H. Taylor of St. John:

When you read the 3 key areas of focus: extend statutory maternity leave to 26 weeks, an excellent idea, should be supported; expand capacity for free nursery places from 20 to 30 hours a week, again excellent; and increase the number of health visitors, again brilliant. But I am reminded of an event that took place while on holiday in Scotland, and I will be brief. We were driving as a family in the Land Rover. I was driving, my wife was in the front seat and we saw a stag. My son in the back whipped up his camera and took a photograph just at the moment that the only tree in 50,000 acres went past. He handed the camera forward to my wife and said: "There you are, Mum, I got him." It was not a picture of a stag but a perfect picture of a tree. My wife said: "You photographed a tree" and as quick as a flash he quoted Yoda from *Star Wars*: "Look beyond what you see." [Laughter] From a 16 year-old that was quite a remark. This is what we have to do here. How is a small business going to survive if they allow 26 weeks maternity leave? That is too big a burden on a small business on this Island. Where is the money going to come from for increasing 50 per cent extra time in free nursery spaces? Where is the money going to come and where are the health visitors themselves going to be sourced from? Is that further immigration to provide a higher level of visitors? This is an exceedingly good idea and this is the gold standard. But at the moment we do not have the resources for it and so it is with a very heavy heart that I ask people to think before they vote and to vote against this proposition.

2.4.13 Deputy R.G. Bryans of St. Helier:

I will be brief but I was challenged by Deputy Martin to respond to the situation she was describing with regard to the nursery situation. I just want to give some feeling of positivity about where we find ourselves. We were approached by Professor Wilson of UBS when he came along and said; "Was it possible, could you write this particular report?" and we greeted him with open arms and gave him complete *carte blanche* to gain access to whatever he needed to do because we think it was absolutely right that we had an independent point of view. What I do want to amplify is that we are on the case, the Deputy of Trinity has just said that Deputy Moore is an action orientated individual. I would consider Senator Green to be the same, and equally myself. But we need to reflect not just the fact that we sit here as either Senators or Ministers dealing with this but that we have, in my particular case, a large department behind me. That large department was visited last week by the Governor. He himself, one of the reasons I wanted him to do that was to observe independently of how the department was working. I hope he is going to forgive me because he wrote me a letter just the other day, and I am just going to quote it because I want you to feel that there is some confidence, we are not just saying these things or putting them into the strategic review. But we can verify what is being done behind us. He says in this that all of the areas that we were briefed on, development and evaluation, I.T. (information technology), trackers, human resources, finance, professional ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair).

Sorry, to stop you, Deputy, but Standing Order 104 says that the Lieutenant Governor's views should not be used to influence the States.

Deputy R.G. Bryans

Sorry, Sir, okay.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair).

I think His Excellency may find it inappropriate.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

Okay, fine, thank you. Basically what the letter says is that he has confidence in what we are doing. [Laughter]

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair).

Let us move on.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

Okay. The department itself is very firmly focused on achieving all of the aims of the strategic review. Deputy Martin is quite right, when I went along with her to NorPIP I was amazed; I think we were all educated at that point in time. I did not know some of the stuff that was delivered to us. In fact one of the considerations that I have discussed with Deputy Moore is the consideration of creating a Jersey P.I.P. (Parent Infant Partnership) so that we have something equally to support what we have intended to. But we have got a task force. We are focused on 1,001 Days and we are beginning that process. I stand here and unfortunately I cannot quote the letter but it gives me great confidence that the department that I stand in front of has the intellectual acumen and the vivacity and the professionalism and the acute passion to make see this happen. Thank you very much.

2.4.14 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

I came here this morning and I had already made my mind up how I was going to vote on this but I have listened to the debate and I have been swayed. I looked yesterday at reports on the profits that are made by companies that this Assembly has set up to pay excessive bonuses to employees and directors that we have already paid handsomely to do their job and I see that we can actually afford to pay almost all of this 26 weeks from the bonuses that we have paid to these people. [Approbation] I think that this Assembly needs to think very carefully and send a message to the Council of Ministers that, fine, it is okay to hide behind reports and quangos and all the rest of it, but we need to have a much higher emphasis on the social conscience. Although I do not agree necessarily with all of these items here, I will be voting for this proposition because I think we need to send a message to the Council of Ministers that we need to look very carefully at how we dispose of public funds and public assets. Thank you.

2.4.15 Senator P.F. Routier:

I think today we have heard, I have to say, a very thoughtful and passionate speech from the Chief Minister regarding his commitment, and I know the commitment of the Council of Ministers to ensure that the children of our Island are supported in an appropriate way, and the families as well.

[11:15]

What I would like to emphasise to Members is that the Council of Ministers has put this 1,001 Days initiative as a high priority. It is something which we want to happen and it will happen. We know that we have a duty to our Island to ensure that our children have the best upbringing we can possibly give them. It is something that I am committed to and the Council of Ministers have already appointed an officer to lead the task force - not a report writer, the task force - to make things happen. I believe we are going to be getting on with things right now. The person who has been appointed, I have met her and she is so keen to be getting on and making sure that all the departments, the Education, Sport and Culture Department, the Home Affairs Department, the Health and Social Services Department, are all pulling in the same direction to ensure that the children of our Island are supported and the families of our Island are supported. I urge Members to give the backing to the Council of Ministers to get on and do the job because that is what we intend to do and the amendment which is being proposed by Deputy Southern does point in the right sort of direction but it is not completed. What needs to happen is to ensure that we give the

Council of Ministers the oomph and please ... I know it sounds difficult to reject Deputy Southern's amendment but it is something which I would suggest to Members would be the wrong thing to do to support his amendment. Please reject it, but in the understanding that the Council of Ministers, as a whole, really want this 1,001 Days initiative to progress.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I was stirred into action by hearing the remarks of the Constable of Trinity. I think it was him. He does not often contribute in debates but when he stands up and speaks, like his predecessors, his words matter. I was almost shocked and disappointed to hear the Constable, to whom I have the greatest of respect for the work that Trinity do in all sorts of different areas, saying that a message needed to be sent to the Council of Ministers on their social conscience. I was one of ... I think that is what ... you were looking to me quizzically.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair).

You are free to interpret the Constable's words as you see fit. **[Laughter]**

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

If I got it wrong, then I think that is what I heard. I was one of the Members of this Assembly of which I was joined either coincidentally or at the same time that put in our election manifestos, the commitment to 1,001 Days. I congratulated Deputy Doublet on her earlier amendments about the 1,001 Days. I am not, as Members know, a father and never will be, but I understand fundamentally the importance of the 1,001 Days in terms of getting it right. There is no doubt, having spoken and listened to the people of Brighter Futures, the P.I.P. group, the people in the U.K., the leadership, for example, the U.K. M.P. (Member of Parliament) Andrea Leadsom, the cross-party parliamentary group, sadly the manifestos of the U.K. parties have not fully adopted the commitment to the 1,001 Days that was being sought and that is a shame. There is obviously more work to be done. This Council of Ministers has put 1,001 Days into the Strategic Plan. That has not happened in the United Kingdom and I am not aware of it happening anywhere else. So if there is some miscommunication or if there is some lack of awareness of the absolute commitment to deliver on not just these bits of 1,001 Days but all of them, then I am sorry that the Connétable and any Member of this Assembly would doubt the absolutely steely resolve and the determination to do so. Also, to say that ... we will come to the main debate, but there is almost a hysterical situation in Jersey, an underpinning, and perhaps almost in response to this amendment and others, that somehow we are in trouble, that we are not going to be able to put the resources and the amendments that Deputy Southern is proposing cannot be afforded. I am disappointed. I am depressed but optimistic that we can solve the messaging that somehow we have arrived at a situation that we are in some sort of serious difficulty that cannot be resolved. I know with a meeting between Islands of the Crown Dependencies yesterday where other Crown Dependency representatives were almost gleeful that there was the news of a deficit in Jersey. My questions to those representatives were: had they done forward projections of what they will need to spend on putting social justice and their social conscience at the heart of their government plan? I do not think there is any other Assembly that has done that. I do not think any other of our Crown Dependency have. So dealing with the amendments, and again almost this is one, and it is not a copout, but it is almost an issue whereby I am almost wanting to abstain because I cannot quite bring myself to vote against but I cannot vote in favour. I cannot vote in favour of a piecemeal approach to 1,001 Days and also because of course it is a commitment to do something that has no financial implications to it. I would agree with statutory maternity leave but the words that I am being asked to sign up to by Deputy Southern is extended statutory maternity leave, 26 paid weeks, paid out of social security contributions. Is that correct? Is 1,001 Days and the fundamental reasons why that agenda is put forward, is that a blanket approach that gives, for example, people

on higher and very high incomes, the ability to have 26 weeks paid maternity leave? Yes there are some challenging decisions to be made on resources but do I want to sign up today to every single mother to get 26 paid weeks of maternity leave? Given the choice, I do not know how much the figure is, I give way to the Minister for Social Security if there is a financial implication. I do not know whether we know it. We do not know it?

Deputy S.J. Pinel:

It is about £1.5 million.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

So we are signing up to £1.5 million, I am grateful for the Minister for Social Security, which is a universal, across the board, to all income mothers for statutory social security paid leave. I am sorry, but I know, as all Members of this Assembly, mothers of different means. I know mothers who find it difficult to live within their means for all sorts of different reasons. I also know mothers who are professional, highly paid mothers, who wonder why they get a cheque from Social Security when they have a child. If we are going to find the resources to deliver what we really need to do, which is to identify those mothers and parents and families who have the difficulty within the first 1,001 Days, then I am afraid that there is going to be a need for prioritisation because we cannot do it all. Government cannot spend everything and Government is not the solution to every body's problem, and universal benefits, such as signing up to £1.5 million is, if I may say, not the right decision, I suspect. But I do not know. I am not going to vote in favour of Deputy Southern's automatic, universal 26 weeks of maternity leave, irrespective of means because I believe in targeted help and I want to equip the task force, which is being ably led by the Minister for Home Affairs, who I know is a friend of mine but I know that she fundamentally understands the difficulties. It is the hard to reach mothers, the hard to reach families, those families who perhaps do not realise that there is a problem and an importance of 1,001 Days. If I am going to spend £1.5 million I have to say to the Connétable and other Members, I want that to be absolutely targeted to those that really need it. Whose life choices and life chances of the children we are talking about will be transformed as a result of that intervention. I do not want to give money and public money to those that do not need it. Whose life chances are going to happen anyway. I agree with part (3). I think part (3) may be in Deputy Southern's issue. That may well be an issue but again I am not signing up to something ... I want to have that debate when we have the Medium-Term Financial Plan and I also do not know what the financial implication is for free nursery places from 20 to 30. It is the same thing. I do not want a universal benefit. What is the cost of that? I want it targeted. I want it targeted to the people that really need it. That perhaps do not know they need it. So I will summarise. I am really sad, I am really sad that the Assembly feels that the Council of Ministers needs a message about a social conscience because a social conscience is at the heart of this plan because it is about spending more money. I know that there were articles in the paper yesterday about the size of government and what the role is, and we will come to the main debate. There are those members of the Tea Party of Jersey that would think that there is no redistribution, that there is no government role in helping those that need it. I do not sign up to that. I sign up to a social justice and a social conscience Assembly and Government that is going to work to get the resources and reprioritise those resources to those people who need it. A universal benefit system is a benefit system which, I am afraid, I do not think the Connétable or his parishioners will sign up to the costs of a universal benefit system such as we may have seen in Scandinavia and others, which has a tax implication which is dramatically more than we have in Jersey. We are a low tax jurisdiction but we are a caring jurisdiction that needs to target the government money that we raise. I urge Members to vote against this amendment, if necessary abstain, but do not sign up to universal, costly benefits. If the Constable needs a commitment of the

message of a social commitment then I look forward to other Ministers in the main debate standing up to say: “Yes, we have listened” and I am sorry that that message has not gotten across.

2.4.16 Deputy J.A. Hilton of St. Helier:

That was a very interesting speech to listen to. I would like to start by saying firstly that I support what the Constable of Trinity said, and it was really refreshing for me to listen to what he had to say. What I would like to say to Senator Ozouf is if he is really concerned about a universal benefit going out to pregnant mothers, regardless of their income and everything else, and I believe if you pay into something because the amendment is talking about it coming out of a social security fund, if you pay into it I think you are entitled to receive out of it. I have not got a problem with that but if he is really concerned about that additional £1.5 million to extend a 26-week maternity benefit to all mothers in Jersey, then I suggest we do seriously look at raising income tax levels for people who earn 6 figures plus in this Island to pay for it. One of the things that strikes me listening to everybody speak this morning is that I feel the crux of the problem in my mind is a housing problem. Jersey has the highest number of working women in Europe and we have to work.

[11:30]

Women have to work to help balance the family budget and to enable people to afford decent accommodation. While ever that situation remains and while ever demand exceeds supply we are never going to get out of this situation. I cannot recall whether we have built any affordable housing for instance, recently. I cannot recall that we built any at all. Senator Ozouf spoke yesterday about the planning applications that were approved in the north of St. Helier and not one single unit of affordable accommodation or social housing was included in that plan. I do not quite understand why that happened. It is shocking when you think about how many units were approved yesterday. So until we address the housing issue in this Island we are going to have difficulties around children and some of the problems that go with overcrowding, while we encourage people to come into the Island who are low-skilled workers, who can only access lodging house accommodation, so there are issues of overcrowding. We have got this dual system of housing available to the people who live in Jersey. We are going to continue to have these problems I believe. So until this Assembly really gets to grips with the housing problem and starts building more homes for the people who are already here, I do not see how we are going to solve the issues in the long term. But I am going to support Deputy Southern. I think he is absolutely right to bring this to the Assembly today for debate. Senator Routier did say that he felt that Deputy Southern was going in the right direction. If he believes he is going in the right direction why does he not support him today? In the Deputy’s amendment he has not put timelines here about extending statutory maternity benefit, and expanding capacity of nursery, so I do not understand why the Council of Ministers, who believe he is going in the right direction, cannot support him today. I really do not. One final point: Senator Ozouf mentioned about none of these ... that the 1,001 Days is not something laid down in statutory capacity in the U.K., but that may be because if you look at those 3 things that Deputy Southern is proposing that we adopt today, they already do in the U.K. so we are years behind the U.K. when it comes to looking after pregnant mothers, children, in my opinion. We are years behind and it is about time we did something about it.

2.4.17 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I did not realise I was that close in the queue. I cannot sit on the fence. I cannot prevaricate. I cannot support this, is the short answer. I would love to. But that is a platitude. I really would love to. But I keep looking at what we were told last Tuesday, we will have more of it I am sure in the debate that follows all the amendments. How can I sign up to another £1.5 million here, another whatever it is, even if it is an unknown timetable, when we are talking about already

anticipated at least £100 million growth in expenditure next year, which at the moment we cannot afford. That is the nub of it because, yes, my children are 10 and 7 so I can still remember the whole issues around maternity leave and the whole issues around the stresses and strains when your wife gives birth. But the upshot of it is if we cannot afford I do not think we can add to it at this stage. When our finances are back in balance, yes, I am happy to sign up to anything along those lines if we can afford it. At this stage I do not think we can and I think that is really ... we know these next 3 years and going beyond are going to be awful. We have got some really horrible decisions to make. If we just add some stuff in. I am sorry, we do. I look at the expression down there at one of the former Ministers, who is shaking his head, and pulling an expression and we have got £125 million coming along. Sorry, is that not what the Resources Statement says if we do nothing? That means that the Rainy Day Fund in 8 years' time if we do nothing is gone, give or take. That is what we are facing. Not fun. Now we have got propositions coming up: we want a digital clock, £1,800. We have got web-streaming coming through, £30,000. That is somebody's job, is it not? Scrutiny have just agreed to reduce their budget by £100,000. That is fine. I do not want to see £30,000 of that going on video cameras. Those are the kind of priorities we are going to have to stop making. That is the easy decision. The difficult decisions are what we are coming from and signing up to. This now, I am sorry, is another £1 million, another £1.5 million added to the problem. Actually from the point of view of the betterment, if you like, of our Island, if our finances are in a mess and if we have to start then looking at some form of charge, it does not matter who it goes to, ultimately it filters down all the way to the bottom, that is where the ultimate problem will lie. That does not make the things better for anyone. That is where I stand. I hope that is clear. I will not be supporting it. Thank you. Not because I do not think it is well-intentioned, not because I do not think it is a good idea, but fundamentally I do not think we can afford it.

2.4.18 Connétable J.M. Refault of St. Peter:

A bit of a difficult act to follow, Deputy Le Fondré there, with his impassioned speech but certainly it does concern me that I do not think any Member in this Chamber wants to vote against this principle. It is a principle we all would want to buy into. The problem with it, of course, is the funding of it. It is the funding of it that bothers me. Not because of the money itself, it is because of the number of staff that we have in Health who are at the moment worrying about who is going to be put down because we cannot afford to ... we have to get rid of some staff to reduce our costs. The pathologists which we had to work quite draconianly on a couple of years ago to reduce the costs of that department and these people are sitting there today, people working, delivering the services we want to go out to the public. The child care officers. All of these people are sitting there saying they are just going to spend £1.5 million and yet we are going to have to face not a pay cut, but a zero pay award again this year, and some of us may not have a job at the end of this period of time because we have to make pay cuts. If I am a single policy person I will vote for this, but I am not. I have to think about the broader impact of propositions like this and the amount of money. I sent an email last night to one of the officers in Treasury to ask him if they had been keeping a running total of what all these amendments would cost. He said: "I have not managed to work it all out yet. I will get back to you?" Whether he will do before the end of the debate I really do not know. But much like Deputy Le Fondré was saying, we are just adding more to the cost bill. Now in a way I agree with Senator Ozouf. We do not have a shortage of money. We have an over expenditure of money. What we are doing is adding to that over expenditure of money and that is the problem and we need to curtail and spend our money appropriately, where it needs to be spent, rather than having some of the items that Deputy Le Fondré spoke about, the nice to have ones.

2.4.19 Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:

I was not going to speak on this one but I will after the last 2 or 3 speeches. This is a Strategic Plan and we are putting forward what our aims are going forward. I think what Deputy Southern is putting forward is a very laudable aim. Whether it can be achieved in the next 4 years and in this particular Strategic Plan is another thing. The same goes for a lot of the things that the Council of Ministers put forward. They have set out their aims but until we see the Medium-Term Financial Plan and we get into the debate on the detail, many of the things that we have discussed in this Chamber over the last 2 days may disappear from it because until we have the full facts then we will decide what the priorities are. I do not see anything wrong with Deputy Southern's proposition. It is something I think we should achieve; whether it will be achieved this time is irrelevant. It is an aim. It is a thing that this States should be trying to achieve and when we come to the detail that is when we decide whether it goes into the plan at that time or not. I think it is scaremongering on the part of the Council of Ministers. I blame, as well people know from the speeches I have made in this Chamber, the Council of Ministers for many of the ... in fact the deficit. I am sorry, Senator Ozouf is shaking his head, but personally I hold him largely responsible for it and I think it needs to be told. I think the public are getting a bit wise on that finally. But the point I would like to make is that this is an aim; it is one that we should be aspiring to; I commend Deputy Southern for putting it in there. I would ask Members to support it and then when we look at all the other priorities and we look at the money that we have got, then we will decide on the order of priorities. Do not be put off by the statements of the Council of Ministers today because many of the things they say they are going to do they will not be able to deliver anyway. Then we decide priorities.

2.4.20 Deputy M.J. Norton of St. Brelade:

I was not going to speak, like many today, but one after another ... As was said by the previous speaker, laudable; yes, a laudable amendment. The aims are right. It is along the right path. But then so is 1,001 Days - more so. At the end of the day this comes down to trust. It comes down to trust on the task force. It comes down to trust of the 1,001 Days. It comes down to some trust sometimes in the Council of Ministers. For my part I feel that the 1,001 Days is already going down this road. We have heard already of the passion that some have towards the 1,001 Days and I too have that passion for it. I think that it is going in the right direction and I feel that we must let it do its work. We must let it do its proper research. We must let it find the correct findings so we target the right people. Deputy Southern said in some parts of the speech the words "perhaps" and "maybe". What we need is absolute definitive and that will come from the task force, and that will come from the new director, and that will come from 1,001 Days. In fact I feel - with the amount of Council of Ministers who have on record said that this is going to happen - that is where we must go. That is why, while it is a laudable amendment, it is not one that I can support.

2.4.21 Deputy A.D. Lewis of St. Helier:

As many have said already, this is a laudable amendment. I would just like to go through the 3 elements of the amendment and just highlight them because they are all different in the way that they could be funded. Now, Deputy Hilton made a very good speech about the need for women in the workforce. We have, as she said, a very, very high proportion of women in the workforce and I think our economy and our society is better for it. But there is a downside to that in that it does affect the family unit, whether that be the woman working or the man working. There are plenty of househusbands around as well. When it comes to maternity care, of course it is very, very important that we provide something. If we do not, where is the economic growth going to come from if part of your power house is working women? So what we are in danger of here is not having the linkages between the economy, the welfare and the children in our society that was linked up during that Government and we all thought, and we would all like to think, that ministerial government is all about that. The silos, we hope, have gone or are going and we need to

look right across the spectrum so that there is joined-up thinking. I do not see enough joined-up thinking here. I really appreciated Deputy Le Fondré's passionate speech about what we face in the near future or not quite so near future but certainly over the next 8 years, but this is an aspirational plan which should be in our plan. It should be aspirational. The Deputy has not set in there any timescales, so why can we not put it in the plan? It is aspirational and it is absolutely something that we should be aspiring to. Like I say, without that economic growth, we cannot pay for all the other things that we need. Without the people in the workforce, we cannot supply the economic growth. Without the housing, we cannot house those people that are going to be requiring housing because of the economic growth. So it is all linked. I do not have a major problem with what Deputy Southern is suggesting, particularly when it comes to the Social Security Fund. It is an insurance fund. It is not a tax and we are in danger here of starting to view it more and more as a tax. It is not. It is a fund to ensure social mobility and the wellbeing of our society. That is what it is there for. It is not a tax and it should be used for social benefit, of which this is one. So I do not have an issue with that at all. The Constable of St. John quite eloquently said: "What about small businesses?" Well, that is the idea of the fund. Small businesses perhaps should not be as affected as large businesses. There are a lot of different ways of doing it, but it is aspirational. Let us try and do it so that we can still get the economic growth; we can still get new businesses being created that are not in fear of employing people that might have a baby. I do not want that sort of discrimination going on. We have got a discrimination law coming in. That should not happen, but it will happen if you have not got adequate maternity leave. People will discriminate against taking on people they think might start a family, and that is wrong.

[11:45]

As far as free nursery places are concerned, yes, it is a needy requirement for those that want to get into work and stay in work and pay that mortgage or pay that rent. Health visitors: I understand - and perhaps the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture could correct me - that we have an increasing number of children in our society. We have a little bit of a mini baby boom. Is that the right word? There are certainly more children coming through the primary school system. So surely there is a natural requirement for more healthcare visitors anyway, regardless of the fact that we do not seem to be meeting national or international standards in the number of trained personnel in that area. Surely that is something we should be aspiring to fix or at least fixing as a priority in our healthcare system. I do not know. There are lots of other priorities in our healthcare system. Perhaps the Minister for Health and Social Services can correct me there. I am completely torn on this, as I am sure other Members are as well, particularly after Deputy Le Fondré's passionate speech, which made absolute sense. But I heard others, particularly the Constable of Trinity as well. So I am going to listen to what anyone else has got to say, but it is a difficult one. I would encourage Members to think very hard. This is aspirational. There are no timelines in there to do it. I think it should be in the plan. In fact, I know it should be in the plan. The numbers worry everybody but there are priorities, and surely health and education is our priority. It is stated by the Council of Ministers: "Health and education should be protected." It is our priority and these are what they are related to: health and education. Thank you.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

If no other Member wishes to speak, I will call on Deputy Southern to reply.

2.4.22 Deputy G.P. Southern

Fractious day. The question is where do I start? I thank all Members for contributing, either positively or differently, to my amendment, genuinely. It has been a refreshing and a very good debate, one that I think we were overdue to have, but I start again with the basic process that we are going through. This is about priorities. It is about vision. This document contains not one single

spend; not one single figure in terms of how much it is going to cost. Whether it is the departments, when we are talking about what we are debating today, the running order, and whether it is the Council of Ministers, or amendments, there has been no costing. So I regret that the previous Minister for Treasury and Resources chose to focus on bringing the money into the argument. It could be that he felt the Council of Ministers was losing the moral argument and so he wanted to use another weapon, but it is a shame that he did so, I think, because this debate is not about the spend and how much it costs and it cannot be. It is about the Strategic Plan. It is about the next - at least as we are told - 3 or 4 years. In response to his words - start there - I recognise that the new Director of Education has pointed out that vulnerable children come from all income levels. When we talk about maternity leave what we are talking about is lack of time with children. As the previous speaker said, with the cost of housing in the Island, most women have to work all the hours that are sent and what goes wrong is the lack of time with their children. Rich babies need their mothers too and maternity leave is about the health and welfare of mother and baby. That is the critical thing. Now, what I found quite shocking was that the previous Minister for Treasury and Resources started to dismantle, in front of our eyes, the contributory benefit system. This House has decided that maternity leave is so important that we make it a contributory benefit, not a means-tested benefit. How would we? How dare we? Rich mothers cannot have it? Rich babies cannot have it for their health and wellbeing? He started to dismantle our benefit system in front of our eyes. Now, if that is a signal of the way to come then I dread to hear what we are going to hear in terms of welfare benefits come September. I hope not, that that thinking stops where it started and goes no further, because that would be a serious and major change to our system. Having said what the costs are and introduced it, I am glad to hear 2 contributors, the Constable of Trinity and my fellow Deputy from St. Helier, saying that it is necessary. They think it is so important as the priority that we ought to look at re-organising how we gather the money to make sure we can pay for it. But the debate for that is had when we have got the Medium Term Financial Plan in front of us and we decide where the priorities are and we have to make that decision, this particular preventative action, against that one. Where is the balance? Now, those will be extremely hard decisions this time around, but we are not making them today. I happen to know the chief officer who is leading the action group. She is a thoroughly competent, intelligent, young woman with tremendous drive that I remember when I taught her at Hautlieu in the sixth form. **[Laughter]** She has a very scientific mind and we do appreciate each other when we meet, but the point is she has been tasked with developing what 1,001 Days will mean. Part of that, we are told, is to find the gaps and to find remedies, and she has got a tremendous steer there. I come back to the mechanism. Nothing will happen if it does not appear in the Medium Term Financial Plan and we prioritise it. So she has got basically May, June ... we should see the Medium-Term Financial Plan by July and we will be debating it, maybe, end of June, if you are an optimist, and we may be debating it by September. So that is 2 months. Now, if I were to go through the end of the entire list of where the gaps are and what needs to be done then it would take me some time. I will not do that but, nonetheless, to say that, yes, there are a dozen initiatives that might go into 1,001 Days. Now, I have picked 3 of them because it was not my job to do that job. The report was very clear. These are some areas. What did I think were priorities? Here I bowed to the argument. I could be slightly wrong, but let us look at it. For example, with hindsight, I would go to my second one: "Expand capacity for free nursery places from 20 to 30 hours a week." Possibly I should have taken the last line out: "from 20 to 30;" expand the capacity and make sure you get the right grouping in there for the right amount of time. Expand the capacity and make sure you get more people in, not necessarily more hours. Then we come down to Deputy Martin's accusation of yesterday or the day before - how much I enjoyed it - that the Council of Ministers have been lazy in this particular debate and they have because, if that were the case and if that was a problem, why did they not come to it and amend it? They did not. They could have done and said: "That is too specific. Let us open it out a bit." They could have done that at any stage and that traditionally is

the way we do things. If you do not like what you read in a proposition or amendment, you amend it. That is what we are supposed to be here for and yet this Council of Ministers, instead of saying: "Oh, I am not sure you got it right", as they did with the previous one, but you could not vote for that because there was too much in it, now I have narrowed it down to 3 and you cannot vote it because it is too specific. If they wanted to, they could have amended it. That is the way we do things. I think perhaps I will turn to Deputy Norton whose words in particular struck home. He said - sorry, it is a cliché - it comes down to trust. No, it does not. Like in many areas in life, it comes down to the money and the money will be decided on the Medium-Term Financial Plan. Then he went on to: "And I am passionate for 1,001 Days." Well, I have got news for him. All the passion in the world is going to do nothing. What I want and what this amendment seeks to do is go for action. I want to see concrete items on that Medium-Term Financial Plan as priorities so that we can discuss the balance between which ones we do compared to other ones we do, because I believe that government is about doing and not just sitting on your bottom talking. I may be wrong. Maybe it is not. I will tell you what my amendment does not do. It does not stop any of the dozen other targets being targeted. It does not say that actions are not already being taken and it does not say: "They are the wrong actions. Let us stop them." It does not do that. It does not criticise anybody for the efforts that are already in place, with people running around trying to make sure that the system works. It does not stop any change in structure to say: "This is a better way to do it and that is a better way to do it." It mentions 3 things, without a timescale, that surely we can get on within the next 4 years. But, having moved on and mentioned the cost involved - and, as I say, that is not relevant to this debate but let us just examine them - I have done my research, as Members will be aware I often do. It helps, I find. Eighty-six per cent of mothers who gave birth in 2012 claimed maternity allowance. That is 944 out of 1,100 births. The absence may be either that these mothers may have been relatively wealthy and did not feel the need to claim or they might have had contributions missing so they could not claim. If all the claims were for the full 18 weeks, which they may not necessarily have been, then the total 2012 cost would have been £3.1 million. That is how much we spend now, in the order of £3.1 million. The actual expenditure was recorded at £2.4 million. That is the gap between who is entitled and who did not claim. Extending the period that the allowance can be claimed to a full 26 weeks ... and this 26 weeks universally has support for breast feeding, for example, as the way to bond. I will repeat myself. That is the brick that goes right in the bottom without which all the other things you are doing, by the time you get to primary school, by the time you get your health visitors involved, is running to catch up. That is essential, that bonding. If that were claimed for the full 26 weeks, the total cost, depending on how many claimed, would be between £3.5 million and £4.5 million. So we are talking about, tops, £1.1 million extra that might be involved if you decide in a few months that this is a priority and deserves to be a priority and we go for it, as you get that vote.

[12:00]

So, summing up, I would like to thank Deputy Doublet for her contribution but, as I suggested yesterday, my experience is that, unless you put those doing words in, things tend not to happen. We get some more meetings. We get things that do not happen. I too have my Yoda quote, which I thought might amuse me. Yoda says: "Do or do not do, there is no try." That is what I am proposing. That is why I have amended this plan. It is not about trying to get somewhere. It is about doing. Doing words: let us act. We know what 1,001 Days is. We know how much support it has got. We know that it works. Let us act to make it more than a vision. Let us make this investment, as Deputy Brée says, and let us show, today, real commitment; his words. Yes, I cannot let that one go. Senator Gorst, whether he meant to or not, said, just in case the financial cost of this particular move vastly outweighs the benefits, he does not want to act today. Hang on. We make that decision as to cost benefit when we examine the Medium-Term Financial Plan, not today and, at a cost of £1.1 million, I do not know what other people think but that is unlikely to

massively outweigh the benefit we know about. This is the cost we are talking about. He also says: "Is this the right compromise?" Again, I will come back to him and say: "No," because if we need to make compromises around this amendment then we make it on the Medium-Term Financial Plan. We will have the material. The task of devising exactly what 1,001 Days is in the next 2 months, is a major one anyway; but let us get on. Let us give a steer is what I am saying. Yes, then we had the argument about the small businesses. "How can we go to this" from the Constable of St. John, to which I can only respond by saying the president of the Chamber of Commerce, a small businessman himself who runs a very tight ship, has 9 months' maternity leave for his staff and does not have a problem with that. He says it can be managed and that is quite a small company. He has that because he respects the skills and the talents of his staff and he wishes to hold on to them and that is one of the things that proper maternity leave, if we were to adopt it, would do for workers. Senator Routier said: "Give the Council of Ministers the oomph to get on with it," and that is exactly why I have lodged it. This is about oomph. It is about: "Come on, get on with it; get working." Senator Ozouf I have dealt with. **[Laughter]** Although I have to support Deputy Le Fondré who said: "The ex-Minister is looking at me very strange." Yes, he was indeed. He has been during this entire debate. He has been gurning at lots of things happening around the place. I only hope the wind does not change because he certainly would regret some of the looks on his face if they stuck. Deputy Le Fondré again launched out on the money: "We cannot afford this, we cannot afford this." Save those qualms until we are faced with real decisions about that money as a priority and then vote with our heart for once, I would suggest. That, I think, is most of what I had to say except to wrap up with the final contributor, Deputy Lewis, to say thank you for your support. I am glad you share the vision that this is one of the things we have to deal with. I support the proposition and call for the appel.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The appel is called for, so I invite Members from the precincts to return to their seats. The vote is for or against the amendment of Deputy Southern and the Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 16	CONTRE: 28	ABSTAIN: 0
Senator Z.A. Cameron	Senator P.F. Routier	
Connétable of St. Helier	Senator P.F.C. Ozouf	
Connétable of St. Saviour	Senator I.J. Gorst	
Connétable of Trinity	Senator L.J. Farnham	
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)	Senator A.K.F. Green	
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)	Connétable of St. Clement	
Deputy of Grouville	Connétable of St. Peter	
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)	Connétable of St. Lawrence	
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)	Connétable of St. Mary	
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)	Connétable of St. Ouen	
Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H)	Connétable of St. Brelade	
Deputy A.D. Lewis (H)	Connétable of St. Martin	
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)	Connétable of Grouville	
Deputy R. Labey (H)	Connétable of St. John	
Deputy S.M. Bree (C)	Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)	
Deputy T.A. McDonald (S)	Deputy of Trinity	
	Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)	
	Deputy E.J. Noel (L)	
	Deputy of St. John	
	Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)	
	Deputy of St. Martin	

		Deputy R.G. Bryans (H)		
		Deputy of St. Peter		
		Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)		
		Deputy M.J. Norton (B)		
		Deputy of St. Mary		
		Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)		
		Deputy P.D. McLinton (S)		

Deputy G.P. Southern

Could I just inform Members that a similar amendment will be lodged for the M.T.F.P. with the backing of the new action group?

2.5 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, we come to the final amendment, the fifth amendment in the name of Deputy Mézec, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “in the attached Appendix” insert the words - “, except that in the chart on page 19 of the draft Plan, in the column headed ‘Taxation’ (a) in the second bullet point, for the words ‘should be low, broad and simple; substitute the words ‘should be fair’; (b) in the fifth bullet point delete the words ‘, where possible,’.”

2.5.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I was wondering, before I start, if I could just ask - there is an amendment to this from the Council of Ministers; they are proposing changing 2 things - when it comes to that vote, can they be voted on separately or must they both be voted on together?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

No, I think the 2 amendments from the Council stand separately. They could be taken separately. Yes, I think so. They are expressed separately on the amendment paper, yes.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Okay, excellent. Thank you, Sir. That is helpful. Taxation, as far as I am concerned, is a fundamental issue of morality and a country’s taxation system, I think, should be built around the values of what the people of that country wish. It is about how much money a Government feels that it has the right to take from its citizens to provide what level of public services. If we look at countries the Scandinavia, for example, which have very high tax rates, they also provide a large amount of public services and benefits and they also happen to be regarded as some of the happiest countries in the world. When you contrast that to other places, of which Jersey is one, where taxes are low and, at the same time - and I say this despite the fact that I know it will give Senator Ozouf an opportunity to stand and speak for 20 minutes about how wrong I am because he is obviously very frustrated at being right when the whole world is wrong and how unfair the media are for letting the public know how bad our financial position is, the temerity of these people - we have a £125 million forecast black hole and there is no way of getting around it. We have been told so far that, in trying to address this forecast shortfall, there is going to be £60 million of cuts to wages and jobs in the public sector and the rest of it is going to be made up by things like health charges for sick people, a toilet tax and cuts to benefits. So when, in the strategic priorities document, we see a reference to taxation - there is actually a chart that shows what criteria they believe there should be

for taxation - the word "fairness" did not feature in it at all. So that is why I have lodged this amendment. I think that taxation should be a fundamental issue of fairness and my view is, when looking at what needs to be done to address this shortfall looking forward, that if taxes are to be altered, to be introduced, to be raised, to be lowered, then fairness should be the guiding criterion before any other because an unfair tax, I think, would be morally unconscionable and would only cause more disillusionment among the public than there currently already is. I think the current chart, unamended, which says: "Taxes should be low, broad and simple" frankly is too arbitrary and simply does not make sense. We say taxes should be simple. Well, okay, I do not think many people would disagree. Complicated taxes simply provide more opportunities for loopholes to be found so the tax does not get paid in the first place, so simple makes sense. But should taxes be broad? Well, maybe some taxes should and maybe taxes being broad helps avoid bureaucracy, but I think broadness in certain taxes is very unfair. Take G.S.T. (Goods and Services Tax), for example. That is a broad tax but we tax people's food, something that disproportionately affects the poorest people in our society. So how can it be right on that occasion that that particular tax is broad, especially when in other examples, like V.A.T. (Value-Added Tax) in the U.K. it is much narrower and there are exemptions? So I think it is fair to say in certain taxes there should be exemptions if they are being done to create fairness and to protect the most vulnerable. It also says taxes should be low. Well, okay, we all want taxes to be low. Nobody wants taxes to be higher than what they should be. We do not want to extort more money out of people than is necessary, but the problem we have here is we have got this shortfall. Defining that taxes should be low inevitably means that we will just introduce more taxes to get around it. We have got the toilet tax coming up. We have got the health charge. The Senator will obviously stand up and say: "No, these are not taxes" but, let us be honest, they are taxes. That is the purpose of them. It is to take money from people's pockets and give it to the Government. That is what a tax is at the end of the day. So saying: "Taxes should be low," is simply going to lead to more new taxes being introduced, which creates more bureaucracy. It creates more regulations and I think will not serve its purpose as effectively as, instead, saying: "Well, some taxes could be done higher." Some taxes are designed specifically to have a punitive effect. For example, tobacco duty; part of its purpose is not just to raise revenue. It is also to try and discourage people from smoking because it is good for their health to not smoke. It saves money in the health bill at the end of the day. So taxes serve a purpose more than just raising money, and so to say they should be low simply does not make sense. We are having this debate now right after having a debate of which maternity leave was a fundamental part. The criticism was made that 26 weeks statutory paid maternity leave would cost a lot of money. It would cost £1.5 million, I think the figure was put for it. Well, there is a very easy way we could afford that and that is by raising the cap on social security for high earners. Currently, people earning hundreds of thousands of pounds will pay a lower percentage of social security than the rest of us. How can we possibly say that is fair and at the same time we are not going to fund people having maternity leave after having a child? That makes no sense as far as I am concerned. It is completely unfair. We saw the headline in the *J.E.P.* yesterday, which, of course, the Council of Ministers will not be happy about because it is the media doing what they are meant to do and telling the public what is going on. The Council of Ministers would obviously want to avoid that at any opportunity they can possibly have. That proposed reversal of the reduction in marginal relief will affect 80 per cent of households in the Island. Well, here is another radical idea, an idea that I have found has had a lot of support from most of the Conservatives I have been speaking to recently; people on the centre right of the political spectrum who are now beginning to say it is not good for the economy to constantly tax people at the bottom and tax people in the middle because those are the people who spend their money in the local economy. If we suggested raising taxes on the highest earners in our society it is not going to have the detrimental doomsday impact that we are constantly told by the people on the right of politics: that these people will simply leave. Every high earner I am speaking to recently has said: "Do you

know what? I could afford a few more percentages on my tax rate and if that meant somebody elsewhere did not have to go through extra hardship I would put up with it and I would be fine with it.” I think most of these people would be okay with that, so long as the Government is not deliberately seeking to be extortionate in the way it goes about doing it.

[12:15]

So there are options and what the Council of Ministers have proposed in the strategic priorities document is far too arbitrary. It does not give the flexibility we need. My prediction is that in a couple of years’ time into this term of office, once the Government has begun its actions to try to address this forecast shortfall, I think they are going to end up in shock and realise that when forecasts are revaluated they will not be what they expect them to be from taking all of that money out of people’s pockets via a toilet tax and health charges and by sacking all these public sector workers who, by the way, will then go on benefits. So that will not reduce your benefits bill. They will not be paying tax either. I think they are in for a shock and they will realise that the policy was wrong in the first place and to have committed to not looking at taxation, which is what I am saying we should be doing, is arbitrary and it means they will not have the flexibility to change course if they need to and on some occasions that will mean raising taxes as the least great evil in this. Of course there are reductions that can be made in public spending in this area or that area. Of course there are certain charges that maybe should be focused on before another charge is looked at. But to say that all taxes should be low, I cannot see how that can possibly make sense and I think the tide is turning on that and things will get worse before they get better if the Council of Ministers does not acknowledge that point. The second part of my amendment is to say, instead of saying: “Taxation should support economic development and, where possible, social policy”, no, it should always be supporting social policy at the same time. What is the point in economic development if we do not all benefit from it. If only a few people at the top are benefiting from economic development you create a more unequal society, a more unfair society, and the evidence at the moment is showing that you do damage to your economy in the process by having wealth concentrated in so few people when we want it to be spread around more fairly because people will have greater disposable incomes which they spend in the local economy. So to say that it is all about economic development and not about social policy, I think, loses sight of what the whole point of human life is about. It is about having a good life. It is about the next generation having better chances in life than the one before it, and if economic development is not supporting that then it is pointless and, in fact, the only thing it does is, bit by bit, destroy the planet. So to say “where possible” I think is completely illogical. It should always be supporting social policy at the same time and not just social policy but also environmental policy, which is why I accept the second part of the Council of Minister’s amendment to this who want to say that it is not just economic development; it is also social policy and environmental. That is absolutely right. I support that and I will not be seeking to argue against that. So that is essentially what I am saying with this amendment. Fairness should be the guiding criterion here. An unfair tax is something that we inevitably end up with if we set these arbitrary guidelines here that say all taxes should be broad; all taxes should be low. No, there are occasions where taxes should not be broad, where they should be specific and where there should be exemptions and there are occasions where taxes should not be low; they should be high because of the wider economic considerations that need to be made. So, on that note, I propose the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

2.6 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)) - amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)Amd.)

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

There is an amendment in the name of the Council of Ministers. I think I have understood, Deputy, from your speech but, just for clarity, you personally do not accept the first part but you would be happy to accept the second part?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

That is true, Sir, yes.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Sorry, Sir, could I just ask for clarity; so not (a) but (b)?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

But (b). Very well, I ask the Greffier to read both parts of the amendment to the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Paragraph (a), for the words “should be fair” substitute the words “should be low, broad, simple and fair”. Paragraph (b), after the words “where possible” insert the words “and the word “development”; and after the word “economic” insert the word “, environmental”.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Chief Minister, we can vote on them separately but I imagine, for convenience, you are proposing both together?

2.6.1 Senator I.J. Gorst:

Indeed I will, Sir, and I am grateful for the Deputy to confirm he is happy to accept amendment (b), so I will not necessarily speak about that and I will just speak about (a). The Council of Ministers do believe - and it has been the basis of our tax policy for many years - that taxes should be low, they should be broad, they should be simple and fair, and that is why we have amended. We believe that the implication that taxes should be fair is, and was, included in the Strategic Plan with the words: “Everyone should make an appropriate contribution to the cost of providing services while those on the lowest income are protected.” Therefore, we can accept what the Deputy is suggesting about fairness because we believe it is already inherent in the Strategic Plan. What we cannot accept and why we propose the amendment is that the Deputy, by including fair, took out the principles of low, broad and simple. We believe that they should all sit together: low, broad, simple and fair. Therefore, we ask that Members of the Assembly accept the amendment. There are a number of reasons, which I think the Deputy himself accepted, around the need to have a simple system and he did not seem to speak against that but supported that element of our amendment or what is already included in the Strategic Plan, because the benefits of a simple system are that it reduces compliance costs for all taxpayers. It reduces unintentional tax evasion and it reduces administrative costs for the government, but there are other reasons as well. Simplicity is important when we are selling Jersey to international businesses, particularly when you have a low or a zero rate of tax and where other companies or other competitive jurisdictions are offering the same, so I think the Deputy accepts that simple is appropriate. The Council of Ministers also believe that they should be broad and it is fair to say that a tax system that relies too heavily on one particular sector or type of taxpayer or tax-based revenues will be at risk and I find it strange that the Deputy does not accept that principle when, on a number of occasions, he and his colleagues have rightly called for - and this is what the property tax review is looking at - trying to extract tax from other areas and other businesses. That is why the principle, I believe, of broad is

important. We also believe that they should be low and I reject the arguments that the Deputy has made about increasing tax. The rates that we have, the 20 per cent rate, has served this community, its people and the Island well for many years and the proposal that we should meddle with that or we should consider increasing it, the Council of Ministers do not accept. In fact, we would go further and say that we believe that the plan that we are proposing, this Strategic Plan, which is about investing in health, about investing in education, about ensuring that we have got a strong economy into the future, can be delivered while keeping taxes low. Our model does work and it can continue ... I see one or 2 people frowning. No doubt we are going to have an interesting debate on this issue. Our model does work and it can continue to work. A speaker in the previous debate said: "If we do nothing by 2019 we will have a funding shortfall or a funding gap of £125 million." I was a little surprised by that statement because it is not altogether accurate, because if we do nothing then the funding shortfall is not £125 million. The only reason we are considering a funding shortfall is because we are proposing to do things. We are proposing to spend money on health. We are proposing to spend money on education. We are proposing to continue investment in our infrastructure and go beyond that and try to account for it in the proper way with depreciation for the very first time. So it is not that we have this issue if we do nothing. That is why the debate we have just had about 1,001 Days and investing in social provision was so important, because that is the basis of this plan. We want to grow the economy and invest in economy growth because we want to deliver social provision and we believe that by offsetting some of that growth in health with H.R.s (human resources) that is being worked on, by making sure that some of the services that we currently provide recover costs better than the way that they currently do, by making our system more efficient and by driving out costs, which I was pleased to hear the Deputy in his opening remarks accepted was necessary - that there were areas of the public service where costs could be reduced - that is why this plan works. I was pleased to hear perhaps for one of the first times, the Deputy espousing government policy. Long may that continue. We believe that continuing to have low tax is good for all Islanders because it is good for the Jersey community. We accept that you cannot keep increasing tax because it affects ... and I use this word with some difficulty because it is a very wide target but you continue, if you raise taxes, to affect those on middle incomes, and that is something that we must be careful about. I hope that Members will accept the Council of Ministers' amendment because we accept that rather than it just being implicit in those opening comments that I made, including "fair" in the basis, together with "low, broad, simple and fair", is the right approach and we have tried to meet the Deputy halfway, understanding his concerns, by making implicit the word "fair". I ask that Members will accept this amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

2.6.2 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I am going to just speak briefly on the amendment. The Chief Minister has told us he believes that taxes should be low, broad, simple and fair. Well, first of all, our existing taxes do not meet the criteria that he has laid down. If I give one example: G.S.T. is supposed to be a very simple tax, the same as import duty and imports are supposed to be straightforward. I have brought goods into this Island on occasion and I have had conflicting letters from the Customs Department telling me I have got to pay duty. I have asked where the regulations are and so on and queried them. I found out they actually follow the U.K. which are definitely not simple and in fact they have been following the wrong rules. So, in other words, I and others in this Island have been charged money wrongly for goods that have been brought in. That is just one example of where they are not simple. Are they broad? No. There are other taxes that we could bring in, and no doubt will be brought in at some point in time. The truth of the matter is no one likes paying taxes. Erasmus said

there are only a few things that are certain in life; one is death and the other is taxes. So we know we have got to pay them but we have to make them as fair and equitable as possible.

[12:30]

Now, low. I in the past have been accused, as have others who question our tax policy, of being a high tax, high spend person. Far from it; I happen to believe that we should have fair taxes where everybody pays their way but we need to understand the basis of the taxes we have. One of my biggest criticisms of the Council of Ministers, and I have mentioned it many times, is the fact they do not and they are not prepared to look at the tax system as a whole. They have a particular mind-set, they know best, got to be low and: "We cannot look at this and we cannot look at that and we are going to do it this particular way." I do not accept that. One of the things that I want and I hope that other Members will support, because I will bringing a proposition on it if it does not come forward out of this, is that we have an independent review of the tax system. Not independent by calling in people who the Council of Ministers employ who basically are linked to the finance industry because they are part of it in the wider sense, but a body such as the Institute of Fiscal Studies. This body is hated by the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats and all the other political parties because they are truly independent and they say what they think. During the U.K. election we are seeing all the promises under the sun by the political parties and we know darn well they cannot deliver them, they are not going to deliver, and it is just false. It is so dishonest it is unbelievable, and unfortunately I do not want to see the same dishonesty in our politics. So what I would like to see is a complete review of our entire tax system, warts and all, by the I.F.S. (Institute of Fiscal Studies). The reason would be, I may not agree with the findings, they may be totally contrary to what I believe, but because it is an independent body and if they had a wide remit and were able to look across the board at all the taxes, there may be ones that the Council of Ministers' support which they may criticise, there may be taxes that I would like to see or the extent of it, and they may come out against that. I am prepared to accept it if it is a body like that. I think we have a system whereby the tax system, because it does not ... okay, I will put my cards on the table. I have always believed in a progressive tax system. I happen to believe that those who can afford to pay more should pay more and, as I have said before, it is not a case of fleecing people. I encourage entrepreneurship and if people have made their money, great. As long as they have made it in the right way; it has been done honestly, then I fully support what they have done. But I think if you have £10 million, £20 million or as we have seen in the *Times Rich List* when it says £0.5 billion or whatever the figures are, I am sure you can afford to pay a little bit more. The truth of the matter is the vast majority of people in this Island are paying their fair share. These people can afford to pay a bit more. It is not a question of taking, I do not know, 10 per cent, 20 per cent of their income or anything like that. All we are asking them to do is pay a little bit more and maybe we can have some of the nice things we want, such as additional maternity leave or we can fund more apprentices or more training for people or whatever it may be that we want to see in this Island. So, rather than just sort of ramble on, I am going to oppose the Council of Ministers. It is too restrictive, "low, broad, simple". I want a fair system but I want a system of tax that is based on objective study and reporting. I want to know what the facts are. So I challenge the Council of Ministers: if you want us to come to a consensus on tax and believe we are all going in the right way, invite the Institute of Fiscal Studies in, let them do it. Do not try and restrict them by the terms of reference. Give them free rein to look at our tax system, what is right, what is wrong, what we could do, what we cannot do. Let us get all the cards on the table, let all the Members have all the information and then let us decide what our tax system should be. So, I shall oppose the Council of Ministers' thing because it is too restrictive but I challenge them to bring in the I.F.S.

2.6.3 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am genuinely grateful to the Council of Ministers for part (b) of this amendment. As I said before, I completely support it; that is fine. But the reason I am against the first part of it is very simply because it is an oxymoron to say that taxes must be low, broad, simple and fair when some of those criteria are incompatible with each other. The Chief Minister said he was surprised I would be against broad taxes, given statements myself and my party have said on other occasions in terms of companies paying their fair share, some of the companies who currently are not, so we want to make that broader. Of course I support broad taxes in that sense but I am against G.S.T. being broad. What is the defining principle there? It is fairness. That is what matters to me more. A broad tax may be fair; it may also not be fair. To say a tax is broad is not to automatically also say that it is broad. So there are some taxes that I support being broad and some taxes that I do not support being broad. He said that the 20 per cent rate has served the Island well. Well, hallelujah. A £125 million forecast black hole serving us well. Fantastic. He said he was glad that I accept that savings can be made in the public sector. Well, of course savings can be made in the public sector. I am sure there are plenty of areas. I was having dinner with some people last night who pointed out some examples of where there can be savings. No private sector business ever stops looking for efficiencies. Of course the public sector should always be looking for efficiencies, but where we differ is, I think he is living in dreamland if he thinks he can find £60 million worth of savings. I think that is going to cause real harm to our society; it is going to cause harm to our economy, and I am saying instead of arbitrarily saying it is going to be £60 million ... £60 million, by the way, and none of them can tell us the detail on that. They cannot tell us the detail on where the health charge is going to come from; they cannot tell us the detail of where the benefits are going to come from, so they seem to me to just be numbers plucked out of thin air. I am saying that if taxation can play a greater role in it then surely that must be considered, and if you are restricting yourself to taxes being low and broad - I am not so much concerned about the simple but low and broad - you are restricting what you are able to do. Simply, that just does not make sense. Part (a) of this is an oxymoron and for that reason it should be rejected.

2.6.4 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I rarely respond in a debate by saying that I completely agree with Deputy Higgins on asking the I.F.S. to come to Jersey and look at our taxation system. Hurray. I would hope that the I.F.S. would effectively shine the light in some of the areas of political difficulty that previous Ministers for Treasury have had in relation to inexplicable unfairnesses in our taxation system, such as all sorts of unfairnesses that we have because of a united tax return for married or civil partnership couples, which creates distortions; unfairnesses of, for example, senior citizens, irrespective of their means, automatically, just because they retire, getting an extra £600 a year. So I think that, forgive me, but you need to be careful what you pray for sometimes. What I know is that an I.F.S. style analysis of our taxation system has been carried out. A long-term tax policy framework has been already published and was published last year. It was published as an R. in the issue. There are a number of comments about the fact that we cannot deliver our social programme if we continue to have low, broad and simple taxes. Low taxes and low corporation tax, if the Deputy would look at the Office of Budget Responsibility and the I.F.S. numbers on the current forecast for the U.K. economy, would show that per capita and as a share of total income, corporation tax in Jersey raises more money in proportion per capita and as a general amount of taxation in Jersey than the U.K. Low taxation delivers more taxation. Now, that does not fit the ideology of effectively the left and, no disrespect, one is able in politics ... these are the big debates of politics. This is about money, it is about tax and it is about spending, and it is worth having the debate about these fundamental issues. If I may respectfully say, it is perfectly fine for some Members to be on the left or on the right in terms of their redistribution views of the world. I would not put words into Deputy Higgins's mouth but I would suspect that many of the observations that he has had about tax would indicate that he may be on the left side of the debate on taxation, and I have no problem with

debating with different colours of individuals. On the other side, there are perhaps those that believe in a very, very small government. They do not believe, for example, in any form of social welfare provision, free at the point of delivery health systems, a transfer payment for those that cannot afford income support systems, and they would shut it down. I would describe those people as broadly the Tea Party members and those people that want a very, very, very small government indeed. I think always the comfortable ground and the best ground of politics is pretty well in the centre. What we are effectively having and without in any way wishing to divide or segment people's views, we have effectively broadly a 3-option approach. You either have that small government, very low taxes and no spending on social welfare provision; everybody is responsible for their own health insurance; everybody is responsible effectively for themselves, and that there are very few. For example, in the United States it would be those people who voted against the ObamaCare and the United States had no provision for those people with low means. They are proud members of the Tea Party and that is fine. I understand their views; I do not agree with them. I believe that Jersey is unique, and if the wind changes or otherwise I am sorry but I do get frustrated when I hear ourselves talking ourselves into decline, I hear ourselves talking about the inability of being able to solve the challenges that we are setting out. I agree with Deputy Higgins. The parties in the U.K., and dare I say even other small islands, are not looking ahead and telling their communities and their voters the reality of the rising costs of a universal healthcare system that must be integrated with primary and domiciliary care. No party in the U.K. has adopted the Barker provisions by the King's Fund, Dame Kate Barker who is on our F.P.P. (Fiscal Policy Panel), about the reality of the amount of money that is going to need to be spent on health. I believe that we can have it both ways in this Assembly, and as our Island has done so well in the past, I believe that we can have low tax, simple tax that does not have the administrative burden. Simple means not having rules that you can avoid. Simple means a 20 per cent rate that you know that you have to pay if you reach a certain income. If you have a complicated system you end up with huge opportunities for tax avoidance, and many ... all of the problems of the tax avoidance debate in the U.K. is because Chancellor after Chancellor has brought forward nice little sweeteners, nice little incremental changes to give away a little bit of money effectively, which creates a complicated system, which costs a fortune to administer and a fortune in leakage. We should be proud of our record: low, broad and simple. It is much more simple; it is much more economically beneficial, and if it is wrong perhaps the opponents of the amendment could cite another jurisdiction in the world that has 100 per cent of G.D.P. (Gross Domestic Product) in assets not debt, that has a bigger asset base at the end of the financial crisis than at the start. I am sorry that I have to be the one perhaps to remind Members of the facts. There is hysteria at the moment about looking into the future. Most politicians do not, in the rest of the world, look into the future as we have done, we are doing today and our predecessors did yesterday and in previous generations. They did not look forward to a social security provision that would need to collect more because of an ageing society and do things, like former Senator Terry Le Sueur in nudging up social security, that we collect more to deal with an ageing society. We should be proud of our record. I certainly am and I want to continue that centrist approach, which is not Tea Party and it is not of the left, which is socially responsible, low, broad and simple but economically dynamic, which means that there is social mobility, social welfare in a fair and affordable way.

[12:45]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Yes, the adjournment is proposed. Just 2 matters before the adjournment: firstly, to notify Members that the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General, Private Patient Income - Health and Social Services Department, R.51, has been presented. Perhaps also I would look at the

Chairman of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) possibly to give some thought over the lunch adjournment. This debate is not yet concluded on the amendments. There follows the debate on the plan as amended and there are a number of other items of public business listed for this sitting. I am sure those Members with those items lodged possibly liaise with you, Chairman, to assess some possibility of the way forward.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

If I could help the Chairman, I am quite happy to move P.28 and P.33 to the following sitting.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

That will help and others may as well. Very well, the Assembly will ...

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Sir, if I may, my proposition on gas prices is not a matter of urgency and could be moved.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well. Perhaps Members can liaise with the Chairman and he can give us a clear picture this afternoon, but the Assembly now stands adjourned until 2.15 p.m.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:17]

Connétable L. Norman of St. Clement:

Before lunch the President suggested that I might consider how we deal with the remainder of the business down for today. Clearly, as always, Members are in control of their own destiny but I suggest that we try extremely hard to complete the Strategic Plan today, even if that means sitting perhaps a little after 5.30 p.m. if necessary. If that occurs then we should delay the rest of the business until 12th May. If, however, we are able to finish the Strategic Plan before 5.30 p.m., I suggest that we deal with the 2 social security matters, the appointment of members to tribunals, if we are able to finish before 5.30 p.m. That would be my recommendation.

Deputy S.J. Pinel:

May I second that, because the delay in the tribunal appointments could have a serious effect on people who are waiting to appear before the tribunal.

The Bailiff:

Shall we bear that proposal in mind for the purposes of our discussions this afternoon and we can revisit it later on. We are in the middle of debating the amendments to the fifth amendment. Does any Member wish to speak?

2.6.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:

As we drift ever onward in this particular session, we come to the Thursday afternoon session which, if Members will allow me, I will describe as moving from the nearly sublime to the ridiculous, because what we are talking about here ... I was thinking about this in preparation for this debate: "Oh right, a discussion on tax and the nature of tax" and then I thought: "Oh no, a discussion about words and their meaning, okay", and that is where we are. The question is: can a tax be both broad and fair, can it intrinsically be low and fair, and can it be simple and fair? The Ministers in their wisdom have decided that they do not like the word "fair" and, credit where credit is due, they have been consistent throughout these 3 days of debate and argument that they do not like the word "fair", they do not like the word "equitable", they do not like the word "fairness"; they just do not like it. It is not part, it seems, of the Jersey way. So, if we are going to

have it at all, we can only have it in combination with the other words because we could not possibly make our aim one of fairness, even though I think in terms of human rights we have to. We cannot treat people unfairly. "Oh yes, we can", this Council of Ministers said the other day: "If we want an unfair and unlevel playing field for our decisions we can have one." Absolutely wonderful stuff. You could not make it up, could you? So, G.S.T., could it be successfully described as broad and fair? Well, no, because it is regressive and it is known to be so internationally by every economist. G.S.T., V.A.T., regressive tax, proportionately impacts most on the lowest paid and least on the highest paid, and a G.S.T., a V.A.T. without exemptions is even more regressive than the U.K. version. So that seems unfortunate to want to put those 2 together. Again, can we describe our company taxation either as broad or as fair when locally-owned companies, non-finance companies, are taxed at and pay their tax at 20 per cent on their profits, on their overall figures, and those owned by other nationals do not pay a penny? We have got a tax that allows some people to pay tax and allows others to trade in the Island, make lovely profits and pay not one penny tax, and that seems to me grossly unfair. I can understand, since that is the structure we have got, why the Ministers might not want to put "fair" in there at all, but they decided to come a compromise way and say: "Let us put 'fair' in there anyway even though we know and you know that it is not really fair." I have got some writing here which I suspect I have misread, I misread my own writing, because I have just looked at the list of things I was going to say and I thought it said: "What we need is a truth tax." Now, that would be a novel thing, would it not indeed, and I think the Ministers might be heavily charged.

The Bailiff:

I think that is going too far, Deputy. You would like to withdraw that, would you not?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

I withdraw that analogy altogether, Sir, and I will defend their right to defend themselves and to call something low and fair. But it comes back down to: we are stuck with the structure we have. We have got the Ministers, as I have said in opening the debate of this, who have for the past 15, 20 but in fact longer, 30 years, 40 years, 50 years, been reliant on the same model of taxation. It is a model with one rate of tax, 20 per cent. We inherited it, I believe, from the Germans but we are still stuck with it and this Council of Ministers and every other previous, preceding Council of Ministers says: "We are stuck with it. We cannot change it. That is what we need." Yet the evidence is mounting and the evidence is mounting in a big way. We have seen what is going on. The fact is we have, through this policy of low tax, low spend, produced a deficit. We have a shortfall at the moment of £125 million in our tax revenue and the Ministers say: "Not to worry about that. We are actually putting money into the economy. We are going to spend on all these things." Look down that list of things that we are going to spend it on. Is any one of those items a nice to have? It is not. It is essential stuff. It is the stuff that as government we should be doing and yet may not do. Are we committed to paying for the increased demographic, increased number of schoolchildren into our schools in the next few years? We are, but only by running a deficit. What we are going to do, as the Ministers say, is we are going to grow the economy, we are going to grow the productivity of the economy. As I say, do you do that when you extract £60 million worth from wages and salaries in your public sector and lose those jobs one way or another? No, you do not. That £60 million no longer circulates in the economy. That is a kick in the teeth for the economy, unlikely to get growth. We are desperate so we will invent a new tax. It may not be a tax. It may be a charge, a health charge, another £35 million out of the economy, out of people's pockets. We do not even know at this stage whether that health charge will be charged at the point of delivery where you have to pay to get your operation, you have to pay for the ambulance. I do not know but it strikes me as a singularly unfair tax if that is the way we are going to treat our health service. Are we going to take out another £35 million by other savings, including reductions

in the welfare bill? We have heard a hint today of one of the attitudes from the previous Minister for Treasury and Resources that what we should be doing with our contributory system is means testing it so that it only applies to the poor on certain items. Again, all of those doomed, I believe, to fail. So, can we, as Deputy Mézec suggests, let through this compromise position that says our taxes will be low, broad, simple and fair? The answer is no because as we examine what we have got and what this Council of Ministers is prepared to examine, they are not fair. There is only one fair tax, the fairest tax, called income tax and if we were to look at making that more fair then we would have to break the stranglehold, probably, of the 20 means 20, 20 per cent is the tax rate. This Council of Ministers is not prepared to do that, so quite rightly, I think, rejects the word “fair” on its own and says: “No, we can only have it in combination because fairness cannot be the only marker.” I think we should be voting for this amendment and I think we should be rejecting the amendment of the Ministers.

2.6.6 Deputy J.A. Martin:

Just briefly, because I think Deputy Southern had said everything I wanted to say but probably for very, very many different reasons. I look at this and I have been told for the last 2 and a half days - and I am very tired, and I am sure we all are so I really will not keep you long - that we are discussing a high level strategic document, and we have got to Thursday afternoon and we are on the border of discussing semantics and a few words. I absolutely fundamentally believe this is a political statement from our Council of Ministers because they cannot accept the word “fair”. It is a very simple, easy word.

[14:30]

I do not care if it is broad to some; simple to others; low for most, whatever, as long as it is fair. We have a very simple word but I do not want it included because I cannot square that circle. I cannot square all the words before “and fair” because fair means different. It should not mean different but “fair” is fair for everybody. We have wage increases dictated by a percentage of income. Is it fair for someone who gets 1 per cent on £10,000 a year? Is that the same fairness as someone on £50,000 to £100,000 a year? No. So, I will not keep you. We are discussing semantics. It is a principle, it is written in the amendment to the amendment that this is what we have all agreed, this is what the ... of course we want the Council of Ministers to keep our taxes for our people as broad as possible, simple as possible, but above all ... you can probably put in I want them lower actually and I want them more simple, but I want them to be fair. Deputy Mézec has put this in and we are having a political debate here about which political ideology you believe in. Do you believe in the Council of Ministers because they have to have the other 3 in? Obviously, because I am going to vote, not with the Council of Ministers, I must be voting for that. But I really do think they are making so much of the word “fair”, quite simple and easy to understand, and it just seems a bit too late in the day for semantics. I do think Deputy Southern in his speech went into the whys and wherefores of why we could not use the word “fair” because we want to raise taxes. That is not why I am voting for not the amendment, because I absolutely understand what the word “fair” means.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Then I call on the Chief Minister to reply.

2.6.7 Senator I.J. Gorst:

The choice that we have before us this afternoon is to change what is in the existing Strategic Plan and to replace it simply with “fair” or, as the Council of Ministers are proposing, to add the word “fair” to “low, broad, simple and fair”. I think that the Council of Ministers’ amendment is the correct one. We have accepted the arguments of Deputy Mézec that the word “fair” should be explicit. As I said in my opening comments, it already says in the Strategic Plan the principle that

everyone should make an appropriate contribution to the cost of providing services while those at the lowest income are protected, and therefore we are proposing to raise it up to sit alongside “low, broad, simple and fair”. The main argument of those that do not want to accept this proposal is that we should simply have the word “fair” and it is too difficult to make decisions about a tax being broad or tax being low or tax being simple and we should just simply say “fair”. That is the call of those who come and are elected to the Legislature and are elected to Government to make those difficult choices, balancing those elements of any tax system. We all know - and the Council of Ministers believe that our tax system has served us well in the past and it is one of our competitive elements - the way that we manage our public finances, the way that we balance our books, the way that we approach tax. So I would ask that Members do not rip up that history of approach to tax by simply saying it is too difficult to balance those elements so we are just going to have “fair”. Any tax system must balance those elements and we must, I believe, while maintaining what has served our community well, accept and raise up the principle of fairness even though it was written in the Strategic Plan. Therefore, I ask that Members support the amendment that the Council of Ministers is putting forward.

The Bailiff:

We will take the first amendment, paragraph (a), for the words “should be fair” substitute the words “should be low, broad, simple and fair”. **[Aside]** The appel is called for. Members return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 33		CONTRE: 5		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator P.F. Routier		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Senator I.J. Gorst		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Senator A.K.F. Green		Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H)		
Senator Z.A. Cameron		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)		
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of Trinity				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Bryans (H)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy A.D. Lewis (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				

Deputy M.J. Norton (B)				
Deputy T.A. McDonald (S)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy P.D. McLinton (S)				

The Bailiff:

We now come to the second paragraph, which I understand Deputy Mézec has accepted. All Members in favour of adopting that amendment kindly show? Those against? Thank you. The amendment is adopted.

2.7 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015): fifth amendment (P.27/2015 Amd.(5)) - as amended

The Bailiff:

So we now return to the substantive amendment of Deputy Mézec as amended by the amendment the Assembly has just adopted. Does any Member wish to speak?

2.7.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:

Just briefly, I would like to congratulate Deputy Mézec in joining I think what is a fairly elite club of 3 - the Constable of St. Helier, myself and now him - to use the word successfully “oxymoron” in the States. I think there are only 3 of us in this particular Chamber who have used that and certainly the only one to have passed an oxymoron.

The Bailiff:

I was just wondering whether one could actually pass an oxymoron but I suppose one can. Does any other Member wish to speak? Very well, Deputy Mézec, do you wish to reply?

2.7.2 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Yes. I do not know how much there is to say, other than to reiterate the point that of course I consider this to be an oxymoron, not part (b) just part (a). Part (b) I think is good and I am grateful for the Chief Minister, in a gesture of solidarity, for being able to enhance my original amendment. That is great cross-party action and hopefully more of that in the future. Looking forward, I am anticipating that this will be passed and it is going to be very unusual for me to have my name on something that has been passed by this Assembly, so that is going to be quite a nice experience. **[Approbation]** I would not stamp your feet because it will not be something that you will be wanting to do often, let me assure you. I am glad that the word “fairness” is included in this. I think that is important and I look forward to the future where I get to scrutinise the future tax proposals of the Council of Ministers and I can hold this up and say: “Hang on, guys. Did you not say it should be fair?” I look forward to that very much and I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. The vote is on the fifth amendment as amended. I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 39		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator P.F. Routier				
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf				
Senator I.J. Gorst				
Senator L.J. Farnham				
Senator A.K.F. Green				

Senator Z.A. Cameron				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of Trinity				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Bryans (H)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H)				
Deputy A.D. Lewis (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy M.J. Norton (B)				
Deputy T.A. McDonald (S)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy P.D. McLinton (S)				

2.8 Draft Strategic Plan 2015 - 2018 (P.27/2015) - as amended

The Bailiff:

We now return to the Strategic Plan as amended, which is now open to Members to speak. Does any Member wish to speak?

2.8.1 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I have a sense that there is an air of tiredness creeping over the Assembly, so I will get in early so I do not get booted off. Nonetheless, I think there are some things still to say about this Strategic Plan as amended and they are that if you supported one of the amendments, and there are quite a few of them, some of them quite significant, and they have failed, then it is still, I remind Members, open to you to reject the Council of Ministers' Strategic Plan as amended. If you are not satisfied with it, if you do not think it has gone far enough, then it is possible to vote against it. In theory, it is possible to vote it down, to say: "We do not accept it, come back with another version." That is the

long way round and perhaps I do not advise that but nonetheless it is perfectly possible. I just want to reiterate ... not reiterate, just want to state why I cannot bring myself to support this proposition as amended. I quote an independent view of what goes on in the States economy as I do so and this commentator says: "The unexpected shortfall in revenue has brought forth the usual predictable solutions from the States, which has resulted in the equally predictable outcry from left and right." He is talking here about the shortfall in tax revenues. He describes it as unexpected but it was not that unexpected. It has been known about since the 2015 Budget was devised and passed. It was known about that there was a deficit coming up, a shortfall coming up, at the time of the election and yet nobody wanted to talk about it. It was the elephant in the room. That is the reality. So not quite unexpected, but nonetheless certainly far more substantial than many of us were expecting, and as substantial ... definitely a serious shortfall deficit in our economy. So what have we got as a result of this shortfall? We have got the announcement of another freeze in public sector wages and another round of savings; £60 million worth of savings in staffing alone; further savings either in taxes or charges to the extent of £70 million; threatened compulsory redundancies because there will not be places, if your job goes, you can be deployed to because every department will be trying to lay off staff. I have suggested that to save £60 million that means getting rid of around 1,000 positions. It is more than 1,000 positions because we have committed ourselves to essential spending increasing the headcount by 263 anyway. So we have got to get rid of some of those to get back to square one before we start saving the £60 million that we are pledged to do so. All highly predictable. Indeed, so predictable that some people are beginning to believe there are no other weapons in the States armoury for solving what could be a temporary funding gap. It should be a temporary gap because if the Council of Ministers concentrate on what they say is their top priority then economic growth will improve and will go a long way to plugging the hole, if not actually sealing it completely. I have already cast doubt on the ability of the Government to increase the economy, grow the economy through productivity changes and we notice today in the *Jersey in Figures* that our biggest earner or biggest, most productive sector has seen its productivity go down rather than up in recent years. Unfortunately, slashing the public sector will not help to grow the economy and in fact may make matters even worse.

[14:45]

After all, this commentator says, we do not want a lot of redundant public servants looking around for jobs that do not yet exist. In the meantime, attempts will be made to cut spending. When will that not be the case? New technology may help, of course, but only those with their heads in the cloud believe that this will make a substantial difference to the way personal services are delivered in the public. You can go so far with eGov and eCommerce, eThings, but most public services depend on face-to-face public encounters and those bodies cannot be got rid of. He goes on to say: "However, there can be little fat left in the administration following years of C.S.R. (Comprehensive Spending Review) so any substantial savings will definitely mean cutting services." Here is the rub. The Treasurer himself has told Members, has told the Council of Ministers that effectively the economic model is broken. Why? Because the spend on an ageing society is going to keep going up and up and up and up. The Treasurer says that. He says it is inevitable, you cannot escape from it. You have a choice then: reduce services significantly, markedly, or increase taxes. Now, we have seen the start. Perhaps the health tax, £35 million worth, may go some way but it does not go very far. How will it be delivered? At the point of delivery? I hope not and the Treasurer hopes not because he has looked at it and he says: "I hope it is fair." We will see. So any substantial savings will this time definitely mean cutting services, no way out of it. That will result in the Island going backwards, not forwards, just to help solve what should be a temporary problem, and it does not help to continue talking nonsense about transferring large chunks of the public sector to the private sector. We are told we will either cease, reduce or outsource lots of services. May I remind Members that outsourced services still need to be paid for.

There may be marginal savings made but they still need to be paid for; they do not go away. Anyway, no private company would want to take on something that is not going to make a profit. Why would they? “If it is a profitable service, then why should the States want to get rid of it?” this commentator says. Indeed. Unfortunately, States finances will therefore have to suffer, he says, until economic growth returns. Now, he suggests, is that not what at least part of our reserves are for. In doing so, he said: “Why do you not cushion this further recession by spending from the reserves?” It is a Keynesian approach again. We still need some economic stimulus going into the economy; we still need money circulating. Not £60 million out of it alone but put something else in. We have some reserves still. As the previous Minister for Treasury and Resources keeps reminding us, we have got a healthy balance. The question is: why do we not use it. The problem he says may not be temporary of course and we will probably find there is a structural deficit that requires either more taxes or fewer services. This is not my words; this is an independent economic commentator saying: “This is what is going on. Here is my analysis.” So either more taxes or fewer services, that is what we are facing. Indeed he says: “It is a bit of a surprise that the States do not admit this already as it answers the question posed on the front of the paper a week ago or so: “Where did it all go wrong?” It went wrong under the guidance of this Chief Minister. As I remarked earlier, this is the first time the Chief Minister has continued into a second term. He made his bed and now has to lie in it. But he goes further, and it is the argument we heard the other day from Deputy Higgins. It went wrong on the introduction of Zero/Ten tax regime when corporate taxes were slashed to ensure that the finance industry could compete, leaving most of the tax burden to individuals and local companies. Independent analysis of what has gone wrong. Back to Zero/Ten: it is tempting - and I really cannot avoid it - it is very tempting to say: “I told you so.” G.S.T. was introduced to compensate for part of the enormous loss of corporate tax but the calculated gamble was that economic growth would cover the rest. I remember those days. G.S.T. to make this much and the rest will be economic growth, back to economic growth again that we have not seen in the past 15, 20 years. Yet, we are supposed to believe just around the corner we are going to get that growth. Of course we will not, history tells us that. However, the commentator says: “That is when events intervened and growth did not happen.” However, we still expect to have expensive public services. They are. Keeping our people alive, healthy, fit, active, is expensive. But because we have some of the lowest taxes in the world we do not have the revenue to pay for them. That, gentlemen, ladies, is a structural deficit and that is what we have got. That is why I cannot vote for this plan because I can see for all the reasons I have just elucidated that that is not going to work. It is a recipe for impending disaster. I cannot support this Strategic Plan and I will not.

2.8.2 Senator L.J. Farnham:

Firstly and most importantly it is economic growth allied to cost control in the public sector that will deliver the money needed to fund essential public services. The objectives set out in the plan, while focusing on protecting and developing the core sector, financial services, place equal emphasis on increasing the productivity of all sectors of the economy. Indeed it is only by increasing the productivity of sectors such as tourism and agriculture that we will reduce the utilisation of land and labour resources in these sectors. Innovation, enterprise and competition are not restricted to the digital industries and a new challenging enterprise strategy should and will recognise this. Application of digital technologies across all sectors will assist widespread productivity gains. The ability of our existing and future digital sector to provide supply-side support to the demand created by all sectors must be recognised. This is how a digital sector and a digital economy provide a mutually supported way forward towards a digitally enabled society, and I know Senator Ozouf is going to have more to say about this. Productivity in the tourism and retail sectors, which has a brought and paid for infrastructure that bears operational costs regardless of throughput means that visitors can be increased by driving more visitors throughout the year, be

they tourists, leisure, business. This is the end behind the means that the investment in Visit Jersey was created and this will be reflected in the new tourism strategy that is being put together right now by the Tourism Board. This will be greatly enhanced by the move to include sports, culture and heritage within the economic development family. In ways we have not even begun to fully appreciate sport, culture and heritage can make a positive contribution to our economy and especially our visitor economy as enablers of product development while at the same time strengthening their own position in our society. Secondly, productivity in agriculture will be driven by an increasing focus on export and investments, an automation captured in a new rural economy strategy that will be published in late 2015. This strategy will move government support for agriculture away from a subsidy-based system towards a type of system seen in New Zealand, arguably the most successful rural economy in the world, where we will support the clear objectives of increasing productivity through export and automation and the development of the skills needed to flourish in our new rural economy. This will drive higher value, provide better job opportunities for locals and reduce cost of operation. A clear economic goal for what is our most traditional industry. Thirdly, construction: to date an increase in construction activity, profitability and productivity, emphasis has been placed on government providing a pipeline of public sector projects and planning consents for private development. This is not the time to get back into the S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company) debate but it is the time to ask whether we have solved or indeed can solve the problem of affordable housing. In Jersey land values are high and allied to high costs of traditional construction. Development costs are high but this need not be the case. New building techniques that are being used on a small scale in Jersey provide the opportunity to dramatically reduce build costs while providing many more energy efficient homes. Developing the construction sector to deliver large scale developments of this nature would increase affordability, improve productivity and provide a more sustainable solution for the construction sector. Of course, all of this must be done in an environment where the government acts in a co-ordinated manner to support business in all sectors, working with the private sector and using private/public partnerships to deliver services currently being delivered by government. We must minimise the extent to which the public sector directly delivers support to business. Since 2008, the E.D.D. (Economic Development Department) has delivered greater productivity and financial savings by establishing partnerships, while retaining the appropriate political oversight of course in relation to policy, to deliver a far wider range of services. This is manifested in the form of Jersey business, Digital Jersey and now Visit Jersey. We have put in place strong leadership and management boards of the highest quality at these organisations, most recently with the appointment of the new C.E.O. (Chief Executive Officer) of Visit Jersey. In doing so, reducing the E.D.D. headcount by almost a half at a time when the rest of the public sector was growing. I would like this to continue and I am currently considering the creation of an Events Jersey model and Farm Jersey model to further support and underpin our growth and productivity strategies. Inward investment is the sole focus of Locate Jersey. Inward investment brings jobs, tax revenues and with it a diversified fiscal and employment base. Many think inward investment equals unsustainable population growth but it does not. The evidence does not support this contention. In the period from 2012 to 2014 the vast majority of jobs created by inward investment are for entitled workers and not in the financial services sector. Yes, inward investment by definition requires people to move to the Island but the numbers are small and dwarf the number of job opportunities created for local people. Locate Jersey is being refocused and retasked based on a forensic market analysis that will deliver clear country market and/or sector plans. Locate Jersey will move from a reactive awareness reigning strategy to a mode of operation that will proactively seek out high value inward investment businesses that add high value and high productivity business to our economic base. It is this focus that will reduce the population impact of increasing jobs and growth to provide tax revenue for the essential public services.

[15:00]

Now, where do the St. Helier objectives fit in? St. Helier is the engine of the Jersey economy; it is the engine of government tax receipts and the focus of future economic activity. It is right that the capacity to grow the high productivity new economy is provided in St. Helier, but that objective by itself creates a demand for a new strategy for the town. Urban design and planning allied to the provision of new grade A office accommodation now will see St. Helier deliver for the economic future of Jersey. This must happen at a pace and not be hampered by protracted debate. If we do not build they will not come and, more worryingly, they might go. The focus on St. Helier which is enshrined in the Island Plan and will be enshrined in the Strategic Plan will also preserve the countryside for the benefit of sectors such as tourism and agriculture. In fact it will preserve the countryside for all of us. I very much look forward to working closely with Senator Ozouf as he has been given a mandate with various sectors, and I am sure his experience will deliver strong growth with the task with which he has been charged. I am also looking forward to working with Senator Bailhache in developing our trade opportunities overseas. We have a strong team at E.D.D. and I would like to make special mention to my Assistant Ministers, the Constable of St. Brelade and Deputy Norton who have, between them, taken on responsibility for sport, culture, heritage, gambling. I have already mentioned Senator Ozouf, although he is still technically an Assistant Minister for Economic Development I understand his priorities will be operated out of the Chief Minister's Department. But I do not mind that because there is a new era of co-operation developing across the ministerial portfolios and this is absolutely essential to delivering this Strategic Plan. I want to just go back and thank the Assembly for giving me the opportunity to do this when I was appointed Minister. I want to thank the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers as well for the co-operation and the support they have given so far to growing the economy. I will do my very best to make this work. Thank you.

2.8.3 Senator Z.A. Cameron:

The Council of Ministers Strategic Plan quite rightly has a focus on healthcare provision. After all, it is this department that already receives 30 per cent of the budget and employs 50 per cent of public sector staff. Consultancy firms and hospital management advises that we need even more to ensure population health, but is this really the case? Fortunately, most of you will spend only a tiny proportion of your time receiving health care. Many of you who care for children, teenagers, ageing parents will be aware that our health is, in fact, largely determined by the love and care we receive from family and friends, especially early in life. The quality and support and respect we receive at school and in our work place, the quality of food, soil, air, water and greenness of environment. An average human being requires only a small amount of specialist medical care, unless they manage to persuade you otherwise, of course, whether we die at 4, 40 or 90. When required healthcare costs can be contained by prompt and expert assessment and intervention as soon as symptoms arise. I considered putting in an amendment to this plan but to do so would have meant a fundamental rewrite of the whole health policy away from the current N.H.S. (National Health Service) model and towards a more Scandinavian type clinically led model that has created sustainability also in the Anglo-Saxon world in places such as Canterbury in New Zealand, Kaiser Permanente in Tower Hamlets. The proposed changes in the Strategic Plan to Health and Social Services and the building of a new hospital unfortunately mimic changes we have seen typically enacted across the U.K. Concentrating funding on secondary care where only 10 per cent of actual healthcare is delivered has brought community and social services to their knees. Trusts and local authorities are running out of money. G.P.s, social workers and community nurses face burnout, hospital waiting lists have exploded as patients try to access care in the only place that is left available. New hospitals sit like cuckoos gobbling up most available resources, resulting in staff layoffs and further closure of community services. When there is little care available out in the community sick people queue up outside hospitals and once admitted they get stuck there. Jersey already has a low base of community nurses to start with and those we have, unlike the U.K., work

independently from general practitioners. Any child playing football manager or some such game will tell you it is the quality, expertise and training of the players you pick to play on your team that produces the best results, not the quality of the stadium. Health care and education are service industries and here, unlike the motor industry, quality and product safety is based in the relationship established with those who care for you. The changes proposed to Health and Social Services in the Strategic Plan do not, therefore, have my support. During the elections I voiced my concerns about the way Health and Social Services are currently managed. I had hoped that by stepping out of the surgery and into politics I would be able to have some influence on reducing inefficiencies, help redesign services to be more responsive to patient's needs. It sometimes appears that with ministerial government and collective responsibility Jersey politicians have abdicated their power over policy development. Planning the future appears to be the task of an increasing army of civil servants, H.R. (human resources) personnel and managers who bring their propositions to the Minister and the Council of Ministers for rubberstamping. States Members in the Assembly debate the changes, however Ministers are tied to voting with the Chief Minister and since collective responsibility has been introduced the results are largely a foregone conclusion. In Health the civil servants are largely from the N.H.S. so it is little wonder that Jersey is proposing to go through similar changes that have occurred in the U.K. in recent years. With the appointment of the current Chief Executive Officer we have seen the introduction of commissioning and procurement of services and an increase in the employment of outside consultants who advise on future policy direction. The Jersey taxpayer dislikes this form of health expenditure, especially when there is talk of redundancy for local staff and reduction of services. As a director of the primary care body I fought alongside many frontline staff and members of the voluntary and community sector to highlight the dangers involved in this overcomplicated time-consuming process. We argued instead for better collaboration and integration of services rather than the fragmentation and competition brought about by commissioning and tendering. We could see the demoralisation, the bureaucratisation occurring in the N.H.S. and felt Jersey should be taking a different course. As most of you are aware, I have experience of working in many areas across our health system over the last 25 years, having initially returned to Jersey to set up St. Ouen's Village surgery. In recent years my attention has fallen on our care system, both by listening to patients who were cared for in it and as working for the medical adviser for the Children's Service. As a frontline practitioner I became an active campaigner for improved safeguarding in mental health services as the inadequacies of our child protection procedures and the extent and severity of historic abuse became apparent. During this time I have developed a wide network of support from fellow professionals in order to protect myself from working in isolation in this dangerous field. It is all too easy for the system that is working with families' breakdown to break down around them. Indeed it is to be expected that this will happen and increasingly is being mitigated against in high performing areas. I am highly sceptical of the wisdom of handing more money to the management of Health and Social Services while inadequacies in these areas remain unaddressed. Despite politicians repeatedly requesting the adoptions of high standards in safeguarding, Jersey still fails to apply standards that have become routine elsewhere across Europe. I was advised when raising these concerns when working within the system that Jersey does not need to apply the same standards and professional competencies and expertise in safeguarding that practitioners are expected to in the U.K. and by the Royal Colleges. It is comments like these that have given the Jersey way a bad reputation. I would like to point out to Members that the cost of failing to deal adequately with peri-natal mental health and child maltreatment in England has been estimated at costing an extra £25 billion a year. By putting in these processes you are not going to ... it is not going to result in extra expenditure, it produces massive savings. The Scottish Parliament's Finance Committee concluded: "We have heard the evidence stacked from the floor to the sky, it is the right thing to do." In recent years politicians have opted to give health service management power over the registration of local frontline professionals and many of us feel it is no longer safe

to challenge the executive. Staff who whistle-blow regarding patient safety in Jersey are not even afforded the same inadequate protection that exists in the U.K. The danger of silencing professionals in this way and allowing a culture of secrecy and denial are clear to see from the report on Jimmy Savile, Mid Staffs Hospital and Bristol Heart Hospital, to name a few. I decided to become a politician to highlight these issues to fellow States Members and bring their attention to the importance of encouraging a safe, open, transparent learning culture and highlight the dangers that might exist for an executive that failed to do so. Practitioners like myself who raise patient safety concerns usually find their concerns minimised or dismissed and then attract complaints from other practitioners or management within the system regarding their own professional practice and behaviour. Since October 2014 the primary care governance team employed by health management have been given power over the future registration of general practitioners. General practitioners in Jersey are therefore no longer independent practitioners free to advocate on behalf of their patients' best interests. They face an increasing amount of bureaucracy and oversight by Health and Social Services in whose hands decisions about their future registration and professional careers lie. I have first-hand experience of being investigated by this team and have found it so stressful and time-consuming that my husband and I no longer work here as doctors, preferring to work as locums in the N.H.S. I would suggest that this is not the way to retain and encourage participation of conscientious practitioners keen to offer their ideas and enthusiasms. G.P.s, along with staff across health services, have been given the message that it is not safe to challenge hospital management and talk about the reality of their day-to-day experiences if you want to continue to work here. Even staff who do not raise concerns face criticisms. As budgets are set with little understanding of need, staff at times are so busy fire-fighting they find it difficult to keep the people they serve in mind. As another patient coming through the door makes demands on scarce resources, the resentment is sometimes palpable. Budget setting before properly understanding the need is common place, very reminiscent of our care inquiry process. But, unlike the care inquiry team, frontline staff are unable to get management to go back to politicians to allocate more money as the original amounts underestimated or overestimated the size of the problem. G.P.s are blamed for referring too many or not enough cases. Less skilled staff are employed to reassess patients and another tier of bureaucracy is built into the system designed to deny patients and carers timely access to services. Patient safety is compromised, however this can never be admitted as the organisation prefers to scapegoat individuals and find human error rather than admit the methods are wrong. Staff are taught to twist the truth, turn a blind eye and those that find it too distressing to do so, will be accused of being too close to patients, unprofessional, too caring and overzealous. Serious failings like those in our care homes get swept under the carpet as management learns to dissociate itself from acknowledging anything that might threaten its reputation.

[15:15]

In summary, if Jersey really wants to develop sustainable health services fit for the future, it needs to get better at assessing need, start listening and making it safe for Islanders, carers, care leavers, patients and frontline staff to express their concerns and opinions rather than turning to outside consultancy firms. Give public sector staff the freedom to do what is best for Islanders in their care, be free to innovate and improve services with the minimum of bureaucracy in an environment that allows learning from mistakes. Get rid of commissioning and competition, encourage collaboration and friendships; stop being flattered by the great and the good from elsewhere who deign to give us their attention; instead step back and ask whether they really have the best interests of our electorate or their own interests at heart. If we had done this over the last few decades perhaps we would not now be facing such a big bill to find out exactly what did go on in our care homes and the problems that have come to light many years ago. Our problems with recruitment and retention of staff might evaporate. We may well find that instead of needing more money we

actually need to spend a lot less than we currently do in maintaining and improving the health and education of our population. I hope it is not too late to take a short pause and decide which direction future healthcare development can take and ensure a safe learning environment is created, first, that empowers patients, carers and frontline staff to safely play a full and active part. Thank you.

2.8.4 Senator A.K.F. Green:

I cannot say that I am pleased to follow that speech but I am pleased to be given the opportunity to put some of the things right. Approval of the Strategic Plan sets in train a detailed process of resource and action planning. In particular it frames the development of the Medium-Term Financial Plan which we will be debating in September, and the plan focuses on issues that will make the biggest difference to Islanders. Current times are challenging but that does not mean that we can neglect to plan for our future. Nowhere is this more appropriate than in Health. The transformation of the health service, the care services is essential and already underway as Jersey prepares to meet the increased health demands that are going to flow partially or mainly from an ageing society. The pressures are already being felt. People are living longer, and that is something that I want to celebrate not be upset about. But more people have chronic diseases. New medicines and technology are increasing costs but the States had vision. The States had vision in approving P.82/2012 which sets out the way, a new way, of delivering services very much along the lines that Senator Cameron says that we should be doing, and in fact we are doing - I will come into more detail later - set out a new way of delivering services as a redesigned health and social care system, a redesigned system that is not following the N.H.S. Senator Cameron criticised us for commissioning ... one of the things we are doing is redeveloping our services, but let us talk about commissioning to start with. Is it wrong for this Island to commission services in the U.K. which we cannot provide here, to go to centres of excellence but also to expect to get good standards of care and good value for money? We have moved some of our care from London-based hospitals to the Radcliffe in Oxford. Is it wrong that we get good value for money while at the same time providing excellent care for Islanders? I would say that was the right thing to do. We are investing in out-of-community-based services. The Senator is right in many respects; a lot of people only come into hospital when they have an acute situation. Many people want to then be treated at home. That is why we have the rapid response team that is already up and running, set up by the previous Minister. I had call after call after call from people saying how pleased they were to be able to, one, perhaps come into the medical assessment unit and then go home to be treated in their home with services that could only be provided in the past in the hospital - and probably in the main in the U.K. - will still be provided in hospital. Are we wrong to do that? If we did not do these things, if we did not redevelop our health service, if we did not start to develop that virtual hospital that the Senator was talking about in Canterbury, New Zealand, then believe me we will not be coming forward with a hospital of 270-odd beds, we will be coming forward with plans for 500 beds. We are making those changes. I found the Senator's speech somewhat depressing in places where she talked about what was wrong that people had said, and it was anecdotal, I have no evidence of it, that we did not need to have some standards in some areas - I think she was referring to childcare - and then contradicts us for putting in regulations and criticises us for putting in regulations and developing standards, and holding people to account. You cannot have it both ways. We are investing in our out-of-community-based activities, creating that virtual hospital, reviewing and developing our services where G.P.s and Social Security will redefine, with health services, how we deliver them. I want to see my G.P. colleagues delivering more so that we can create a situation where people do not come to hospital until they really have to. But it would be the G.P. that decides whether they send them to hospital, nobody else. Nobody else. The professional decides that. I want a health service that is working together and that is what we are doing now. As well as developing our services we are providing for children and adults with

mental health issues. But these are just ... I could spend the whole of this debate talking about everything that we are doing. This is just some of our initiatives. We are strategically supporting our children and our families through the 1,001 Days. All of these activities help to reduce the demands on our hospital to manageable levels, and it does mean that we end up with a hospital appropriate for the community, a hospital that will be about 270 beds. To do nothing and not to develop in that way is not an option. To do nothing will cost this Island even more. We must very much have the need for continued investment in hospital infrastructure and facilities as we progress towards our future hospital. A future hospital that will, in part, at least be paid for ... and this is why I am sorry that Deputy Southern is not here, he mentioned making use of the Strategic Reserve, he seems to have forgotten that at least a good part of the hospital will be paid for from money generated from the Strategic Reserve in line with the advice from the Fiscal Advisory Panel. All that we are doing at Health and Social Services is focusing on ensuring that our services are safe. Senator Cameron wants it to be safe; we want them to be safe. That they are fit for the future. That our services are financially sustainable and it will keep people out of hospital and in their homes because that is where they tell us that they would like to be treated so much as is possible. But I do not just want to talk about health. I realise that access to high quality and sustainable health, and social care, requires investment; investment that requires economic growth. A driver for the economic growth in today's competitive and fast moving world is productivity. Step changes in productivity require a highly skilled and experienced work force; skilled in the new ways of working and in tune with the skills of the new emerging sectors. That is why improving our education and outcomes for young people figures prominently with our Strategic Plan. We will be aligning Jersey's education system to support the Island's community, the needs of the employer and developing that well-rounded citizen that we were talking about yesterday. Keeping up with the latest technology, those solutions will provide fertile ground for stimulating innovation, enterprise and inward investment. Indeed we owe it to our youngsters and to our population to make available resources necessary for them all to fulfil their full potential, enabling all of our community to take an active part in our evolving economy and in Island life. A workforce with the right skills is going to be a more productive workforce, producing high value goods and services within a sensible cost framework and will give us the competitive edge that keeps businesses here, attracts new sectors and employers to the Island and we grow our own talent, which will help us manage population. If we are to encourage youngsters to come back to the Island or to stay in the Island and develop new businesses, we need to ensure that Jersey remains that great place to live. In this St. Helier plays a key role. To create a high quality urban environment where people want to work, where people want to live, where people want to relax. Regeneration, improved housing, enhanced public spaces will all contribute to making living in town a more attractive proposition to more Islanders. Of course we must not forget the link to that to mental health and general wellbeing. A more modern but not spoilt vibrant town will benefit all of us. In concluding I would like to tie these elements together. The importance of this Strategic Plan is about promoting social inclusion. It is important that everyone in Jersey has the access to good quality education, to jobs, good health care, safe health care, affordable health care and housing. Increased economic growth is key to delivering our planned initiatives in these areas. Without progress in education or health care economic growth will not fully be materialised. Without a skilled workforce or good quality health care, external investments will go elsewhere. The interdependence between the key priorities outlined in the Strategic Plan means more than ever before this Assembly needs to support this co-ordinated approach so we can deliver the best possible future for our Island and for its residents. Thank you.

2.8.5 The Deputy of Trinity:

This plan sets out a vision for delivering a better future for all, putting health, education, economic growth and the regeneration of St. Helier at the centre of what we will do over the next 3 years. I

know the Minister for Health and Social Services has just mentioned a few things but I would just like, before I go on to my portfolio with Housing, to say what over the years this Assembly has achieved regarding health. Not only with the P.82 and the 2 years' of consultation that went with it, out into the community, out with professional bodies, for the public to understand the issues, the big issues behind Health and Social Services. This resulted in the proposition ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I am sorry to stop you, Deputy, but the Assembly has become inquorate. I will have to ask Members in the anterooms to return. There are only 24 Members in the Assembly at present. Very well, you may continue.

The Deputy of Trinity:

Thank you, I will try and pick up my thread again. Not only with P.82/2012 but the House at that time fully endorsed P.82 which had been out for consultation. So I want to put that myth to bed that it was not just a system that was just plucked off the shelf or plucked because it was N.H.S., a lot of background work had been done to achieve that. But, also, this Assembly can be congratulated too on other health issues. I will pick out 2. This Assembly agreed to nurse prescribing. That was a major step forward and I do not think States Members really understood what a difference, to allow nurses to prescribe in their own right - it will make, it does make now and will make in the future - in the hospital as well as the community. But also to pick up the issue about doctor's registration which Senator Cameron mentioned on: this was not plucked off the shelf as something that Jersey should do, this was a result of what their own professional body, the General Medical Council, requested Jersey to do. Let me say, if we had not done it think of the result of that.

[15:30]

That is our G.P.s who ... when G.P.s come into Jersey ... this is not only with general practitioners, this is all doctors in whatever field that they are in, we request that they have to be on the G.M.C. (General Medical Council) list and then the G.M.C. can make sure that they have proper training and proper qualifications, et cetera, as we would expect here in Jersey because we are not a regulatory body. Without this Assembly passing that and appointing a responsible officer, no doctor, whether in hospital or private practice would be able to work. It was that important and that essential. So I congratulate this Assembly for doing that. I think it was about 18 months ago. As across Health and Social Services at the time, safety concerns have always been paramount and I am sure the present Minister now is of the same ilk and in fact he has mentioned it quite a few times. I did have an open door, as the Chief Executive always has an open door. If anybody ... and I encourage anybody who has any safety concerns about anybody go and have them addressed because that is the most important thing. But also with health professionals in whatever field, it is their own professional code that they have to raise those safety concerns. If they did not do and something was found out, they would be struck off their professional registration and that would be the end of their career. The same with care homes. We are regulated and some say we are too much regulated, but when it is the lives of patients I think regulation can never be too hard. Senator Green mentioned about commissioning and I would just endorse what he said. It is better value for patients. At the end of the day it is the patients, if we can get a better outcome for patients and better value for money, surely that can be nothing but a good thing. I shall leave the Health bit there. Regarding my own portfolio in Housing, of course it has an important part to play in supporting this plan and achieving our social, environmental and economic goals because housing does matter. Housing impacts on our health, wellbeing and education and the lives, especially of our children. It encourages social inclusion and economic participation and importantly it contributes towards our attachment to the community around us. That community is so vital in

where we live and how we support each other. So the crucial role that Housing has to play in our Island's future success is embedded in the Strategic Plan, which includes the goal to ensure properly supplied housing, promote affordability, improve housing standards and build strong communities. I am determined to tackle these problems and for Housing to make a full contribution in addressing some of the most important issues facing our Island today. In support of the Strategic Plan I will be bringing forward shortly a housing strategy framework which will set out an ambition and vision for housing across all categories of tenure. It does include and will include increasing housing supply, promoting opportunities for affordable home ownership, improving the standard and quality of rental accommodation, building upon the reforms we have already made in the social housing sector and supporting strong mixed and vibrant neighbourhoods. Clearly housing makes a world of difference to people's lives, and good standard, affordable and secure homes have the potential to make a significant contribution to our social and economic future. Housing will therefore be a key component in meeting our health objectives and tackling inequality. I am particularly conscious of the need to provide housing for our ageing society, for people with special housing requirements and for the most vulnerable and marginalised in our society. We have had a debate about 1,001 Days for children. Where they live and how they relate in their community is important. Equally, the regeneration of St. Helier is making it a more attractive and vibrant place to live and work in, but it depends on us delivering good quality affordable secure homes in the town area that people will aspire to and want to raise a family. We all know the importance of housing. We all share a need to have a roof over our heads. It is a fundamental requirement, to have a home that provides us with security and comfort and which brings stability to so many different areas of our lives. Members can be assured that I am committed to championing affordable, decent and secure homes at the heart of the Strategic Plan and our vision of an Island for all. Thank you.

2.8.6 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I am going to just explain to Members why I shall be voting against the plan. For the benefit of new Members, I would just like to explain that we have just spent 2 days discussing a high-level document with laudable aims. I do not disagree with the aims. We want high-quality education; we want good housing; we want a better St. Helier and we want a vibrant economy where we have economic growth and full employment. No one can criticise those aims. The reason why I am going to go against the document is that when we get down to the Medium-Term Financial Plan and we start debating where the money is coming from and all the details, and things do not go as they should over the next 4 years, you, Members of the States, are going to be told: "It was your plan." I think it is a bit of a fraud in one sense. I happen to believe that the Council of Ministers have been elected, they are the Government, and the Government should be putting forward their plan and they should stand and fail, or stand and fall, on that plan, rather than hide behind the States Assembly, which is what they have done over the 2 previous terms that I have been in this House. Although I agree with the aims, the aims mean nothing until we get to the implementation stage - sorry, Chief Minister, I am making my point - because the Chief Minister will be the first person who will come back to ... or will go to the press and say: "The States decided this. No, we did not decide it, the States decided it" hiding behind the Assembly. I am making it quite clear I agree with those aims. How we go about achieving those aims is where I think we are going to have some fundamental differences, and where those differences will come about is when we get to the medium-term financial planning, because we will know what money is available. We will have to decide on priorities. They, the States, may decide on a series of priorities which I do not agree with, but in the end it will come back, if it fails, and it is your fault. The Chief Minister may not agree with it. I am just making it quite clear for everybody where I stand. I support the aims. I do not agree with some of the semantic changes and I do not agree with some of the little bits and pieces in it and I will not support it, but I believe in those things and I will be fighting for them

when we get to the Medium-Term Financial Plan and offering alternative solutions how to achieve them.

2.8.7 Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:

I only rise to speak really because it does seem extraordinary to me that the Deputy of St. Helier is not going to support the Strategic Plan, which puts for the first time ever St. Helier at the heart of the Council of Ministers' priorities, and particularly now those priorities have been, I hope, amended usefully both by me and by the Environment, Housing, Transport and Technical Services Scrutiny Panel, which is a great mouthful for a Scrutiny Panel every time you say it. I am particularly disappointed because I think those 12 amendments, even though they were not all successful, most of them were, and I think that given the many indications of good faith that we have had from the Council of Ministers, and we have already had early meetings with Ministers, who are as keen, as we who represent St. Helier are, to see significant progress made in improving our environment and the quality of life for our residents. I think it is a shame if St. Helier representatives in particular cannot get behind this plan and show the Council of Ministers that they welcome what is being offered to the Parish and are willing to work hard with the Council of Ministers in the next 3 years to make sure these important improvements are delivered. I would urge the Deputy who has just spoken to think again about his opposition. For my part, I would like to thank the Council of Ministers for the work they have already done. Of course, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. I am not naïve. Ministers know that I have concerns about some of the potential for town cramming at its worst and for some of the issues around putting or making St. Helier bear the brunt of development both in residential and commercial. There are obvious dangers which we need to work with the Council of Ministers to guard the public against, but having spent many years in opposition, and although technically I am still a back-bencher, I think I am looking forward to seeing what 3 years working in partnership with a Council of Ministers who, as I say, for the first time have put St. Helier at the heart of their priorities, what difference that makes to the parish that I represent.

2.8.8 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am rising to disagree with what has just been said by my Constable and to support what was said by Deputy Higgins. While I am glad that there is all of a sudden, seemingly out of nowhere, a new focus on St. Helier, just because I am voting against the Strategic Priorities document does not mean that I support the idea that the Government should not be looking at St. Helier and try to do more. I am voting against the Strategic Plan mostly because I consider it, as a document, to be squalid, albeit slightly less squalid by the fact some amendments have been passed to it. I think it misses the overall bigger picture, and most fundamentally, I am opposed to the Government we have here. I am a member of what I consider to be the Opposition. I think they are doing the wrong thing on many levels and I think they are taking our Island in the wrong direction. For me to register that by voting against this I think is entirely democratically legitimate, even if there may be one or 2 bits and pieces within the Council of Ministers' plan that I may agree with, may support and may wish them success on. Certainly within much of what they have proposed for St. Helier, I want to see it succeed and I certainly will not do anything to get in the way of it when it comes to that, but also in this debate I think we have seen the Council of Ministers reject certain things for St. Helier that, in my mind at least, make me worried that part of their commitment to St. Helier could be insincere. The fact that they would not back an amendment to put it in the Strategic Plan that voters in St. Helier should have equity with other voters, I think that was a nonsensical thing to do if you are genuinely supportive of St. Helier and making it a good place to live. You should want equal democratic rights for the people there. I am disappointed they did not accept my amendment to improving municipal government in St. Helier, because I think a more robust local government system in St. Helier would be to the benefit of the people who live there and the

businesses that are active there. They did not support that and I am disappointed in that. I think that was the wrong thing to do. To pretend that because the word “St. Helier” appears in their Strategic Priorities document, that somehow that is the panacea to all of St. Helier’s problems I think is absolutely wrong, especially when you consider what has been mentioned several times by my colleague, Deputy Southern, which is that if we look at previous strategic priorities documents and how many of the things they have set out to do have been achieved? Largely, from the last strategic priorities document, very few of them have been achieved. On that basis, I partially think that Strategic Plan documents like this are a complete waste of time or it is certainly a waste of the Assembly’s time. The reason I think that is because I think the document that they produced would have served a much, much better purpose if it was a party political manifesto which the candidates who ended up comprising the Council of Ministers - I refer to them as the Jersey Conservative Party - if they had put it to the public before the election ... when I looked at the strategic priorities document when it came out, it reminded me of a document that was put out by the Labour Party several months ago, not in substance, I hasten to add, more in terms of its design and the way it sought to set things out. It reminded me of what I had seen a U.K. party put out, and that document that I saw from the Labour Party I thought was a great package that set out in early terms in the beginning of the election what they stood for quite well. This, as a document, had it been put forward as a manifesto before the election, would have served a much better purpose.

[15:45]

The party who had stood on that manifesto could then get elected and we would not have spent 6 months as the States Assembly with a Government that does not have a set of strategic plans in place. It has taken 6 months after a general election. I would say to any politician who considers themselves to be pro-business - and I consider myself to be pro-business, although certainly not in the way that most right-wing Conservatives would consider that phrase to mean - I think that is outrageous, the idea that you have a Government that for 6 months does not have a set of strategic priorities in place. It is a completely inefficient way of doing things. Constitutionally I do not think it makes sense and so that will be part of why I vote against this, because I consider it to be the Jersey Conservative Party’s manifesto. I am against its direction, I do not like the way this Island is going down. I think the Resources Statement that has come alongside this document is very, very worrying and I think things are going to get worse if this Government continues in the direction it wants to. Of course I welcome more investment in health, who would not? That is a great idea. I welcome the idea of more investment in education. Great, that is a fine idea. But what I cannot support is the fact that this Government wants to do all of this at the same time as taking £125 million out of the economy essentially by sacking public sector workers, by freezing their wages, reducing them in other occasions. It wants to do so by taxing people’s excrement, for goodness sake, it wants to introduce health charges on sick people and it wants to reduce benefits. I cannot support any of that. I think that is the absolute wrong thing for this Government to be doing. This document, at the end of the day, is a wishy-washy piece of rubbish, as far as I am concerned. I hope that is not unparliamentary. I think that is a legitimate political point to make. I think what matters is the Medium-Term Financial Plan, so to Members of this Assembly who do not consider the direction that this Government has set itself out to go down, if you are not a member of the de facto political party which runs this Island, do not feel obliged to vote for it. Members do not have to do that and I would urge them not to. Let us wait for the Medium-Term Financial Plan debate, because that is the one that is going to matter. That is where the money is going to come from and that is where we are going to see the real trouble, and I am not looking forward to that.

2.8.9 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

That is an interesting speech to follow and it is always a temptation in the Assembly to simply rise to speak in response to a previous speaker. I do not intend to spend much time responding to Deputy Mézec, but may I say how, in my view, wrong he is? This is the equivalent effectively of a coalition agreement, a plan for government, and clearly Deputy Mézec does not agree with coalitions. Sometimes coalitions ...

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Misrepresenting my position, Sir.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

No, I am not giving way. I think he has had his go. If he has got a real point, Sir, I will let him have it.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I just wish to rise briefly to say he has attributed a point of view to me that I do not share, so perhaps he could not misrepresent my position.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I said it appears to me as though he might not agree with coalitions, and effectively it is a coalition of independents who have come together after an election who have also consulted, unlike perhaps the party manifestos in the U.K., and have come forward with a set of proposals of what is going to be the priorities and the things that we want as a Government and hopefully as an Assembly, moreover as an Island, that we want to change. If there is some problem with that, in our unique system of government, which is not a party political system, which is not ideologically on one side or the other, which in fact should be rightly described almost as - and I hate to, but I cannot find another analogy - effectively a pick of the best. I was going to say "pick and mix" but that is wrong. It is a pick of the best policies in order to continue the success that this Assembly has continued in the past. I have also been greatly interested by what I can only describe ... perhaps nobody is interested.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Deputy Maçon's cough has left us inquorate. Deputy Maçon has returned. **[Approbation]**

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I have to say that there has been criticism, and it is a shame that the Minister for Treasury and Resources is not here, but I know his Assistant is, and I know how hard the new Treasury team have been working in doing what other governments do not do, which is not only setting out the principles and the objectives of what is being proposed, but providing a tome of information - I cannot see how many pages there are on this, but I think it must be 50 pages - effectively of what the costs and the financial implications of this set of proposals are. Now, there seems to be some sort of hysterical reaction to this, and I use the word "hysterical" because somehow politics in Jersey, as interpreted by our media, which I have to say, I will say, I despair of and I am deeply discouraged by and I am worried about, because I think the message is getting out to Islanders, when they see messages - and it is the written media rather than the visual or audio media that I am referring to - when they put headlines such as: "What went wrong?" or things like that, or we have a statement, a reasonable statement, by the Minister for Treasury and Resources, who is under fierce attack, as often he will be, in relation to how he is going to balance the books. He has asked about issues such as the marginal rate, but somehow it is translated into a statement that 80 per cent of Islanders are going to see the marginal rate cut, that is government policy, and indeed, the aspiration to further cut the marginal rate in the longer term, when economic circumstances allow, to 25 per cent, sort out the system of crazy exemptions that exist as a relic of the past, where you

are worse off getting married as opposed to being 2 single people, or suddenly, just because you are an elderly person, irrespective of your means, you get effectively £600 back from the taxman. I can see the Assistant Minister for Treasury and Resources nodding, which delights me immensely, because ... no, no, it is not an endorsement. **[Laughter]** Perhaps it was a recognition of the huge workload that there is still to be done in effectively making our tax system better, but there should be no hysteria. There is no change today in this debate, and if Members that were here would have read the documents that were published last summer about the long-term fiscal policy options, the challenges of the next Government or Assembly, if they would have read the property tax review by St. Helier and the issues about paying rates, then nothing in these documents will have been a surprise. If they would have read the Green Paper on health, which basically clearly set out the fact that more money was going to be needed to spend on health, then there would be no surprise. I absolutely am concerned that somehow there is now an almost effervescent, bubbling hysteria about the fact that Jersey is going to do, in the next 3 years, what we have done for the past couple of decades, which is look to the future openly, lifting the fog, honestly, based upon good information and is going to take corrective action before the problems of additional spending, because of an ageing society or education or healthcare demands or better health costs because of increased medical science, and do something about it. The Fiscal Policy Panel ... Sir, is there a doubt about how many people there are? Can I continue?

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

No, *le compte est bon*. Carry on.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

Le compte est bon. Merci, monsieur, Monsieur le Président. We have faced challenges before. This Assembly effectively has faced 2 big challenges. One was the introduction of Zero/Ten and one was the adjustment and rebalancing of our income that happened during the last Council of Ministers. I repeat again, we have independent, apparently, headline writers who know better than the Fiscal Policy Panel, who are employed to scrutinise and to alert the public and this Assembly and the Minister for Treasury and Resources and Ministers of the reality of our public finances. I know I am taking time on a long debate that has taken 3 days, but I sometimes wonder whether or not the media or the people that write the reports somehow get up in the morning and forget what happened yesterday. I wonder whether or not they recall the report of the Fiscal Policy Panel and the recommendations that are contained within. I wonder whether they read the statement that there is a significant risk of a structural deficit, but it is unknown, but it should be calculated. I wonder whether or not they read the specific recommendations 7 and 8 that said: "New public sector capital expenditure should be treated separately, based upon its economic costs and benefits and funding of such investment is a secondary consideration." I will repeat that again: "Funding of such investment is a secondary consideration that will depend on the cost of the alternative borrowing or using reserves." Somehow now it is an economic crime, somehow it is profligacy, somehow, according to some correspondents in the written press, it is a tax and spend approach to government that we now have. The Fiscal Policy Panel, who say in their opening remarks what they think Jersey people want, which is prudence and effectively balancing the books and a continuation of the fiscal arrangements of the past, they say that given the strength of Jersey's public sector net asset position, financing issues should be no reason to delay or postpone important investments, particularly those which support productivity improvements and competitiveness. They say that if there is a structural deficit, if there is - there is a risk of one - then it should be dealt with in years 2018 and 2019. Of course they do also say that the way you deal with the structural deficit is also to look at the income line, and that means growing the economy and it means also looking at the efficiency of the public sector, but that does not mean a hysterical headline which said: "What has gone wrong or what is different?" or the fact that 80 per cent of Islanders are going

to face more taxes. The Minister for Treasury and Resources has set out his stall, which I absolutely agree with, that first we should look at expenditure - I will come back to the level of expenditure in a minute, before this Council of Ministers is next accused of being the austerity government - secondly, with equal vigour, as described by Senator Farnham, you should look at economic growth and high productive economic growth and then you should look at raising taxes or charges. Now, there are some taxes or charges that should be considered and that are going to need to be considered. There is the difficult issue, unresolved, of U.K. companies not paying tax. Nothing we can do about that, but we continue to try, and one of the solutions remains to look very carefully at commercial rates. I explained to a couple of Members during the luncheon adjournment that if they want to compare Jersey's figures with the U.K., they just switch billions to millions, and they should look at the amount of corporation tax that the U.K. raises - from memory, about £30 billion; may have got that wrong, maybe £40 million - and look at Jersey, when normalised, about £80 million to £90 million.

[16:00]

We do a lot better in terms of corporation tax, low taxation work, and in terms of the underlying performance we are doing spectacularly well. Business rates raise £24 billion in the U.K., so the cost of property occupation for businesses that are in Jersey is very low and it is something that we should look at. We can protect, of course, small business and we can protect those businesses that are suffering economic difficulties, such as retail and hospitality, with all sorts of arrangements whereby they would be protected. I encourage Members to look at the property tax Green Paper that was published last summer, to look at the real options that are available to properly tax and properly put our taxation system on a fair basis, with the principles of low, broad and simple, and avoid the conclusion of a hysterical headline, which basically tells people that this Council of Ministers is about to reverse the marginal rate. I certainly hope that we do not. I certainly hope that we are successful in cutting expenditure where it can be done, and as the Chief Minister has explained, where because of eGovernment, where because of efficiencies in management practice, we can take out higher-cost employees. This is not anything against civil servants at all, but of course delayering of management, flattening of management, amalgamating functions, just as has been described by Senator Farnham in relation to external relations, economic development and financial services, digital working much more closely together with more policy officers, which need to be properly accountable for what they do and drive to get the right results. That is the way that we are going to effectively get a much more energised, much more motivated public sector. That is how we are going to get productivity in the spending that we have. I am not in any way embarrassed, apologetic or in any way ... while always learning from lessons, and hindsight is always wonderful, I believe that this Assembly starts its road to improvement and to the path to 2020, which is the end game, in a very good position. Other Members may cast their papers aside, but I do not. I look at the previous reports of the Fiscal Policy Panel, the experts, Standard & Poor's, all of the international agencies and organisations that look at Jersey and rate us consistently as one of the most politically stable, the most reputable and strongest in the world. I was looking at various debates during the course of this debate on the different party manifestos in the U.K., and I note that each of one of them is going to end up, according to the I.F.S. (International Financial Services), with a net debt of not less than 80 per cent of G.D.P. by 2020. If that does not mean anything to Members, in Jersey that would mean a debt mountain of approximately £3 billion. That is not assets, that is more borrowings than you have assets, net debt. We have net assets not of zero, but we have net assets of 100 per cent of G.D.P. and anybody who wishes to pass doubts or aspersions of the track record of anybody that has occupied government positions in the past, then I challenge them to find another jurisdiction that is in that strong position, that is able to, with inward investors, say with confidence that we can keep our 10 per cent rate of tax because we can afford it. There are numerous finance centres around the world that do not have

sustainable public finances and their investors doubt their ability to be able to continue to charge their 10 per cent rate of tax. We do not. I am sorry if I speak a little too long but so much has been said and so much continues to be at risk of being said that we are somehow in a parlous, disastrous state. We are not. We are in a sound position, but we are doing what we have always done in the past, or indeed our predecessors have, which is look to the future and look to where we need to make adjustments in order to never be in the position where we would have to borrow for revenue expenditure, which we have never done, which we are not doing this year and there is no plan in this Plan to do next year. Is that going to require some difficult decisions? Yes, it is. It is going to require some difficult and tough decisions that were not possible in the past on savings. We delivered nearly £60 million of savings in the last M.T.F.P. There were cries and howls of austerity and the end of the world. I would ask Members whether or not they think the public sector is in any way worse in performance, in delivery of service, with £60 million having been taken out. Are we not providing benefits to the social security system with income support? Are we not providing many of the things because of those cuts? No. The Constable of St. Saviour may be tired with me speaking, but we have a lot more to do in terms of providing new services, and that is the challenge. We need to provide new money for new services of the things that we need to do. I am responsible for, with the Chief Minister, financial services, so I will say just a couple of things about that. I have to report to Members that the Financial Services Plan is working extremely well. Meetings that the Chief Minister and I have had only in the last week have indicated new business coming to Jersey, trust business consolidating into Jersey from other places in the world, Jersey being held up as the only trust jurisdiction for a number of global institutions. I can report a funds trip to the United States, where interest of funds which currently are being served out of other offshore centres is now moving to being a Jersey activity, where currently we employ about 1,000 people. There is a Business Tendency Survey, which does not need to be my words, it is the people in the industry, which shows that confidence is up. My job, with other Ministers - and indeed, every Member of this Assembly - is to make sure that we give every encouragement to inward investment in our financial services industry over the next 3 or 4 years. I believe that we can see more jobs and more investment and, yes, we are going to have to create jobs fast because the internet and globalisation is also going to evaporate them, and that is why we must put extra effort. I believe that there are huge opportunities in the digital space, in FinTech, in mobile tech and in all sorts of areas there is opportunities which were never previously open for Jersey, serving a globalised market. I am also, finally, extremely proud that St. Helier is part of and is central to the plan. At last we have found a way of describing the way that we will look after St. Helier, and the importance of St. Helier being not only the place where economic growth happens, but the place which is going to be having its own identity in terms of a tourist destination, which also hopefully will be the place where people want to live. If any Council of Ministers is matched in the past with its motivation and incentive of doing something for St. Helier, I do not think this Council of Ministers' ambitions have been matched by any of it the past, and I think that is a fantastic thing, having started my political career in St. Helier. I really hope that the debate on the Strategic Plan can end up as being a positive one, because the world and the Island that we are creating or planning to put, to the extent that Government makes things happen, in 2020 is a really good one. It is a place where there is good healthcare service, good social provision and low taxes and where there is no debt and deficit and despondency of how the Island is going to survive for the next decade after. I will leave it there, but with hopefully a more optimistic note that some Members or some commentators on this plan may have said: Jersey is strong, and I believe truly that in fact, compared to most places, the best is yet to come for Jersey and the best is not in the past.

Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I think the Minister has inadvertently misled the States slightly by omission. The Fiscal Policy Panel, in their recommendations, said: "The States should develop a plan which will address any

structural deficit by 2018 and 2019. Care should be taken to ensure that the range and timing of the measures minimises the risk to economic recovery, which in the early stages may involve the use of States reserves.” A policy of taking £60 million out in cuts from the public sector and other things, sorry, Sir ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

In which way do you think the Assistant Minister had misled the Assembly?

Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I think he does, because with not mentioning this ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Can you explain which way, please? You must not have a second speech. Can you just explain which way you believe the Assistant Minister may have misled the Assembly?

Deputy M.R. Higgins:

He has made the impression that Council of Ministers are following slavishly the Fiscal Policy Panel’s recommendations. I am pointing out they are not. This particular recommendation 3 was: “Care should be taken to ensure that the range and timing of the measures minimised the risk to economic recovery.” Now, we do not know that we have come out of the recession. We all believe we have, but we will not know until September of this year. It says: “...which in the early stages may involve the use of States reserves.” In other words, it is saying: “Yes, we may have to look at efficiencies in the States and so on, but we may use the reserves.”

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Okay. Let us invite ...

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

It is a fair clarification, Sir. Of course the overall spending of the States includes a capital programme and there is to be a separation of course between spending on revenue expenditure and capital, and the Fiscal Policy Panel - and I agree with the Minister for Treasury and Resources - clearly wants to get a much clearer separation of that, because capital expenditure should be, as the Chief Minister also said earlier, spread over the lifetime of the project, whereas previously our accounting rules booked capital expenditure not only in the year that it is spent, it allocates, it means that we have £100 million on the current account. Just on net spending, the point about austerity is the U.K., my comparison, total spending is going to have to go down. We are not proposing that. I know those on the right do not want that, but what we are proposing is to switch expenditure. Savings need to be able to be made to be able to make the new allocations in the area of health, which means that on average public spending will rise, and public spending will rise, hopefully, and in accordance with this, with the growth rate. In other words, it is wrong to say that spending is going down. It is not. It is being replaced by other spending. It is a fundamental misunderstanding, which I think we must work hard to get people to understand.

2.8.10 Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I did not realise we were that close to the end, Sir. I do not know if I am glad to follow the last speaker or not. What I just want to say is at the end of the day, what we have approved, it is an aspirational document, and as I said yesterday and even earlier on today, Members must not forget the reality of what we face. Sorry, this is my reality check. It was not timed to follow the Minister for Treasury and Resources, I was tied up with something else earlier on.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

But you are not following the Minister for Treasury and Resources.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I know, Sir. Sorry, you are right, the former Minister for Treasury and Resources, even. It is all very well about saying how resources will be allocated to fund the spending requirements in the M.T.F.P., it is all very well saying the recent Business Tendency Survey is more positive. The last one was decidedly the opposite. Inward investment and positive things like the finance industry is excellent and is brilliant and that is what we want to hear, but it is also certainly the case that some submissions to us in the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel on other reviews that we are doing have been exceptionally cautious about what is happening the future. We are, in my view, facing the worst position the States has found itself in probably in living memory would be my view. On the basis that I do not think Senator Maclean has managed to spend £100 million in approximately 6 months, in my view, again it is a legacy issue, it is something he has inherited, and I make no apologies for reminding Members of the previous Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel's battles during the course of the last M.T.F.P., which finishes at the end of this year. That Panel clearly stated its concerns of the income forecast being too optimistic. It, and others, including the Fiscal Policy Panel, clearly states its concern over the cut in the marginal rate of income tax. All of those concerns were brushed away: it was fine, they were wrong. But looking at the future, looking at the Resource Statement we were provided with last week in the Strategic Plan, they were right. So why do I refer to the past? Because, in my view, we need to remember those lessons and bear them in mind for the forthcoming income forecasts. Members will need to be considering whether the forecast being used this time around to justify expenditure are sufficiently prudent, even if that means more unpalatable news.

[16:15]

I am not talking about the solutions here, because that is a different argument. It is about us having the clear picture, it is about saying we need to be honest enough to recognise the problem and be clear about it; I mean honest with ourselves, and to an extent I rather feel that was where the main problem was last time round. Do not forget we have also had the damning report by the Comptroller and Auditor General very recently. To quote from her press release, she found: "Significant improvement was required in the arrangement for accountability for resources and for financial planning and that there was too much focus on departmental responsibility at the expense of collective strategic leadership." There is lots of jargon in there, if you like, or lots of big words, but in other words, it is the dreaded silo mentality. She concluded that: "The current system of the allocation of resources lacked transparency and led to behaviours which were not always in the best interests of good financial management." That was said as well in a report by C.I.P.F.A. (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) in their report to the previous Panel a number of years ago: "The current system of financial planning was not fit for purpose and acted as a barrier to reform. However, what was needed most was cultural change. The States faces significant budgetary pressures and it needs better financial management to respond to those in a considered way." It is not good reading, and look at where we are now. What is the quote: "Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair"? That is why we, as the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel now, wanted to make financial matters a priority in this Strategic Plan. You cannot, in my view, ignore the size of the problems we now have. Yes, it is great we can say we are in a better financial position than certain other jurisdictions. There have been comparisons made with U.K. and all that sort of stuff. I did not realise we had Trident; I did not realise we had a nuclear submarine defence fleet somewhere around or that we had a standing army. In other words, let us be a little bit careful about what we are comparing with like for like in jurisdictions. I know that is a stupid comment, and I am calling myself that, but the point is we are a small Island. Such places ... I think it was Chicago, was it not, went bust about 2 years ago? **[Aside]** Detroit, sorry. If somebody of that size

can get it wrong, it is not impossible for us to get it wrong. Yes, I am happy with the positive stuff, but I am also turning around and saying ... and it goes back, if you like, I do not know about the Jersey tradition of prudence, but certainly the principles of prudence and keeping that in one's mind. This is a deficit of £100 million next year, according to those figures - sorry, that graph - from the Resources Plan given to us by the Council of Ministers. Even if there are one-off fixes, there is potentially, I say potentially, a structural problem and it repeats itself the following year and the year after that. It is not £100 million over 5 years, it is £100 million rising to £125 million per year each and every year, assuming we do nothing. At that rate, the Rainy Day Fund will be gone in 7 or 8 years, that is if we do not achieve the planned savings or the charges or whatever, we have a problem. Now, we may have other Members leaping up and saying: "Do not worry, economic growth will be the answer." It may well be, but we have not got it yet. You cannot fudge the income forecast on yet more optimistic numbers. If we get more cash than we expect, brilliant, of course it is. Put it in the Stabilisation Fund or something, but do not spend it before you have it, and that is the path that led us to the ruinous state we are now in. I suppose that is a bit too much of an emotive word, but it is not. It is trying to demonstrate the seriousness of where we are; it is trying to get us to recognise the reality. Now, I have to say that, for the record, I am glad that the Minister for Treasury and Resources is going to look at the cut in the marginal rate of income tax and potentially reversing it. It was unaffordable when it was done. A whole number of people said so, and it is clear now that that is the case. Ministers of the day need to recognise their responsibility on this. Now, I am going to move slightly away from money. I want to come to closing by referring to 2 matters. One is the rationalisation of the States office space, which has been referred to on a number of occasions in the last few days. Now, it is my understanding that the level of savings that could be achieved is around £10 million a year, give or take. The figures may have changed and that may have been if one did everything that was in the original proposals, I cannot remember, but it was that sort of number. When we were looking at it, it was 5 years ago, so notionally that is £50 million of savings that we have not achieved by pontification on the matter, and that would probably have paid for most of the new building, if that is where we are going. But equally, I am stressing that if we want to properly deal with what we are facing, we need to be nimble, and that is not a word that one tends to easily use when looking at some parts of the public sector, not all of them; 5 years, £50 million. But that is different, I hasten to add, to being hasty. You do need to properly evaluate decisions, make right decisions, and in these times generally they must be based on sound financial reasoning. I will give an example, which is one of the reasons I said what I have just said. A couple of days ago, there was an article in the media about using a site not very far from here for States offices are part of the consolidation strategy. Fine. Now, my understanding is that that site in question is not in our ownership, so there is a cost and there is a delay. I understand part of it might be listed ... sorry, I should say part of the site is not anywhere in our ownership, as far as I am aware. It needs the walls supporting on each side; technical. It therefore represents more time and will be more expensive. When I am aware it was evaluated about 5 years ago, that particular site was £20 million more expensive than the preferred option of that day, so what I am trying to say is when one gets to that point about looking at the office rationalisation strategy, great, we have got to do it, but in your site selection, let us be driven by the cost as well. What I am trying to say is I have this vision of like an expenditure clock or something, if that makes sense. Every day that clock is ticking, every day. If you take £100 million as the problem we have, it is £30,000 a day added to the problem each and every day, tick tock, as they say. That is only the £100 million growth, not the £700 million or whatever the number is that we spend now. So going back to the office strategy side, that whole issue around that side, yes, we want to look at the financial side of things, but it also ties into the point we have now adopted as part of the Strategic Plan, which is to see whether we can achieve urban regeneration at the same time as a by-product. I will be clear: I favour north of town. I am not precious about it. It is probably within the evaluations, but if you look at north of town at the

moment, I have to say it is in decline. I can see West Centre potentially starting to struggle. Once more people move down to the Esplanade and that area, it may even get as far as impacting upon the Central Market and the fish market, which we own, it is part of the property portfolio. In other words, we will then directly suffer the impact on the valuation of our assets or having another problem to sort out. Therefore we should be looking at what can assist and it is no use promising some scheme that will regenerate in 5, 7 years' time. There will be businesses that will be struggling long before then if that trend shifts and we do nothing to try and counter that. That is probably the thrust of what I will say we, as a Panel, have been saying: "Be prudent, be clear, be honest with the public as to the extent of the problem and make financially rational decisions." That is one of our roles going forward, and although I have been partially critical, I hope the Council of Ministers will recognise that we aim to work constructively and to assist where we can on the problem that we face and I hope we can all do that. But I also again thank the Ministers for the support they have given us in our amendments particularly. Now, as I say, I am guessing there has been a couple of references to stuff in the media recently, and I make no apologies. I would like to refer to a letter and an article that was in the press last night, because to an extent it gives a flavour, at least, of what at least one part of the Island think and how they react and how they look at what we are doing. If you like, it is their view from their part of the real world. The comment by one writer was: "Go back 20 years to a Chamber [us] that believed in thrift and only legislated or spent money on essentials. We had a booming economy, no public debt, annual budget surpluses and money saved for a rainy day. Now we have politicians who want to be seen to be doing something, even if that something is a nice to have or sometimes unnecessary. The result is public debt of £250 million, most of the Rainy Day Fund committed to the new hospital and a deficit of £125 million to 2019. Remember last year's talk of tough decisions, a stronger economy and robust States finances? I congratulate the new Minister for Treasury and Resources for telling us the facts and initiating corrective action. The States must support him and must also ask themselves the fundamental question: 'Smaller or bigger government?'" If they answer: 'Bigger' the cost savings initiatives will fail and lead to higher tax bills." I accept not everybody in this Assembly will agree with that point. Another commentator said, and I am not too sure if somebody has already said part of it or not: "There is at last an admission from the Minister for Treasury and Resources that the condition of the Island's finances is far more parlous than previously acknowledged. Presumably this will come as a surprise only to those who believe in the tooth fairy. The Comptroller and Auditor General has identified shocking weaknesses in the whole financial accounting and control system, weaknesses that even the most complacent States Members will find hard to ignore." It is not particularly flattering comments about ourselves, but it is also recognising the fact that that type of report is incredibly boring, it is incredibly technical, but is incredibly serious. That is why we need to sit up and take notice of those things: "Thirdly, and more broadly, there is our lacklustre economic performance and a growing sense, even among those politicians who previously felt that money worries were not their concern, that we cannot go on as we are. G.V.A., the measure of economic output, fell for 5 successive years from 2007 to 2012 and barely changed in 2013, the last year for which figures are available." I am not too sure if that is still correct or not: "Our economy is now 16 per cent smaller than it was in 2007, yet public sector employment and expenditure have continued to soar. Decades of prudent economic management have been abandoned. The tax and spending lines have crossed and we are now drawing down the hard-won reserves of early times. Sooner or later, to avoid disaster, either tax rates must rise or spending must fall. Absent a wholly improbable economic resurgence, there is no logical alternative. For many States Members, this will be a revelation and an unpleasant one. For others, it will be a case of welcome to the real world." As I said, there will be lots of other views on that one. All I say is one of the commentators is a former senior partner in what was then one of the largest trust companies on the Island. The other is a former C.E.O of a significant financial institution, has served as a regulator and also on one of our utilities. These are people who

understand money, I would suggest they do understand and care for people, they understand finances and they also support the finance industry and Jerseymen. They are not alone in the concerns and views they express and they can hardly be described as radicals. At the very least, that is the perception of one part of the society as to where we are. We are in the reality check. We are facing an organisational turnaround situation, which basically means we need to decide what projects are the critical ones, and almost, in effect, not do anything else. That is probably a bit extreme, but it gives you the flavour of what one is trying to say. We have to deal with that first. We may have to accept that nice to have projects might not happen, that delays may occur, as one of the priorities must be money. That is really what we have been trying to say when we put the priorities through on the Strategic Plan, and all I conclude, I just go back to my vision of this clock, of money clocking up all the time, tick tock, tick tock, it is moving, and where, in terms of achieving public sector reform, if we do not achieve it quick enough, we are adding to the problems we have. On that note I shall stop. Thank you very much.

2.8.11 The Connétable of St. John:

Sorry, my legs have gone to sleep. **[Laughter]** I would like to congratulate the Chief Minister on this plan. It was an excellent election manifesto that he had last year and he has skilfully translated it into the current Strategic Plan.

[16:30]

I must, however, stress that this is what the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers want to do in the next 3 years. However, he must not lose sight of what he needs to do. Perhaps I could explain the difference between need and want. A very good friend of mine took his daughter to university in London. He was very anxious leaving his daughter there, because she is not, or was not, financially wise. He explained that she would receive £300 a month and that was for her food, her allowance, pens, papers, pencils, all the things you need at university. Finally, he took the plane back to Jersey and arrived somewhat exhausted and 2 days later he got a phone call from his daughter: "Dad, I have no money left." Well, you can imagine my poor friend's position, and I am afraid Standing Orders prohibit me from relaying exactly what he said: "How could you spend £300 in 24 hours?" "You do not understand, Dad" and I am sure we have all had that from our dearest daughters: "It was the Freshers' Ball last night and I needed a ball gown." No, she wanted a ball gown; what she needed was food for the next month. This Strategic Plan is the Chief Minister's ball gown. It is what he wants to do, not what he needs to do. What the Chief Minister needs to do is produce full and proper accounts, department by department, so we can see where the money is going and where the savings can be made. What he needs to do is to modify the M.T.F.P. - my teeth usually fall out when I say that - so it works and provides the States with a workable, flexible plan. What he needs to do is not just balance the budget, but aim for a surplus by 2019. When those needs have been fulfilled, I am sure the Constable of St. Helier would be delighted to take him to that little shop to buy the necessary ball gown. On this basis, I will support the Strategic Plan. Thank you.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Does any other Member wish to speak? If not, I will call on the Chief Minister to reply.

2.8.12 Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am not quite sure now what to say after the Connétable of St. John. From my own recollection, I do not think I have ever worn a ball gown. **[Laughter]** All I can say is I do not think I will be voting for live-streaming! I think we have had a good debate about the Strategic Plan and I want to make some general comments, address some of the issues raised and then come back to general comments. We set out, I think as has already been said, that the Council of Ministers has to, under statute, bring forward a Strategic Plan for debate and agreement by the Assembly and there is a

timeframe for us to do that and we are not able to deviate from that. But a Council of Ministers, when they are newly formed, by necessity therefore has to agree what the priorities are going to be within the Strategic Plan. I think I have been in this Assembly for every Strategic Plan under the ministerial system, and each time we do it there are elements of criticism about the process. I have got to say I am grateful that today there have been fewer criticisms about the process, because I think that process is being refined and it is getting nearer to the document that is appropriate, but Deputy Mézec himself suggested that, I think, he would like some further refinements, which would require a law change, about whether Members can amend the Strategic Plan or not or whether a Council of Ministers stands and falls on the Strategic Plan as lodged. But that is a debate for another day. But what I am clear about is that Ministers decided that this plan should encapsulate areas that we thought needed the most attention over the next 3 to 4 years, and that is why one sees fewer priorities, but priorities that we think, with respect, are not at all a ball gown, but are necessary changes that we need to make. I will come back to the ball gown, because I think the thoughts about wants and needs are quite important and we need to just consider how we might act upon that later in my comments. I have got to start by saying some people would say I am a glass half-full person. To my mind, there is no point in going through what I think is one life with a pessimistic outlook, we should be optimistic and make the most of the opportunities that we are given. One or 2 Members suggested that the issues that we were facing arising from the Strategic Plan were largely my fault, but then in their second breath they went on to say it was the fault of Zero/Ten, so I am a little confused about that. But what I want to say is - and I know that I will be accused of spinning - but it is fact that we have a strong balance sheet; it is fact that we have £700 million or thereabouts in a Strategic Reserve; it is fact that we have a £1.2 billion Social Security Reserve Fund; it is fact that we have another over £1 billion in the States Pension Fund. On top of all that, we have many capital assets. I hear and am alive to those who will say to us: "Oh yes, but you cannot sell a road, Chief Minister. You cannot sell your historic castles." That is absolutely right, and I have got no intention of doing it, but they are valued, they are on our balance sheet, and if I was the Chief Minister of any other jurisdiction virtually in the world I would already have mortgaged those assets and there would be lending against them, and that is not the case in Jersey. It is a fact that we have a strong balance sheet and we have a strong base from which we are working. I think it was Senator Ozouf that said we have a history of facing up to problems and planning for the medium and longer term. Deputy Le Fondré again said if we do nothing, we will have this shortfall. It is not if we do nothing, it is if we invest for the future that we have the shortfall. This is where I will come back to the Connétable of St. John, because there is a relationship there between investing in the future and doing nothing to help with the funding shortfall. The Council of Ministers strongly believes that we must prioritise investment and transforming our health service and continue the work that we started. We accept that Senator Cameron has some areas that she thinks we might finesse and we need to make sure that the service is provided in the appropriate place by the appropriate clinical person for the benefit of as many Islanders as possible and we will continue, rightly, to have those debates. That fits into want and need, because I think we accept that there is a need, but we need to make sure that that funding that we provide is not based on want, is appropriately governed, there is proper oversight over it and that Ministers and that we in this Assembly, and therefore hopefully the community, have confidence in what we are doing in transforming that service and see the need for that spend - call it spend, call it investment - it is putting money into a core service for our community. I am not one often to quote the *J.E.P.*, it probably will come as little surprise that in my busy life, I do not often have time to read it, but it has been quoted from rather extensively, or one commentator has been quoted by the Chairman of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. Some of the items raised there, understanding the relationship between tax and spend are important, understanding the levers that we can pull around taxation and charges and the relationship that this has to spending is important, and that plays in again to the Connétable of St. John wants and needs. But I understand that today

there is a commentator writing in the *J.E.P.* that talks about the experience that they had while they were in the hospital, so we have heard today that the service that is provided is the most important thing, not necessarily the environment in which it is provided. Ministers accept that, but at the same time there are times there are services that the hospital are having to give in an environment which is inappropriate, which means the service is inappropriate because the environment is inappropriate. I do not want to say too much more about that issue, but it just goes to show that there is an individual who has had very recent experience in our service and acknowledges that we need to invest in that particular area, because that service, with the best of staff doing their absolute best, it is the environment that means they cannot offer the service that they would like to offer to our community. We want to invest in education. That was an issue that really came through during the election, that we have got to give every child the very best opportunity that they can, and that ties in again to not just the child in education that we spoke about over a number of hours this morning, but right from the start. What support are we giving to families right across our community to deliver a better future? Other Ministers have spoken at length about economic growth and I was grateful to Deputy Southern for his comments that funding this gap could be done by greater acceleration of economic growth, and then of course we have had extensive debate about St. Helier and putting that at the heart of the Strategic Plan as well. Ministers believe that this plan is the right plan for Jersey. We have been clear about what the resource implications are from spending this money and creating these priorities. In fact, some of the opposite benches have said that these ... they did not use the term “no-brainer” but they said this investment was necessary and could not be avoided. As they, I think, will admit, in the past it has been avoided.

[16:45]

In the past, it has not been provided. Sometimes in the past this Assembly has not accepted need and done something about it when they have experienced it. We are not a Council of Ministers, and I do not believe that this is an Assembly that wants to put off problems into the future for future generations to pick up. Deputy Le Fondré said we should not spend before we have the money. I think I understand what he is trying to say and the Resources Plan that we have published alongside the Strategic Plan is a plan to balance the books over the term to 2019, and Deputy Higgins spoke at length about what the independent economists on the Fiscal Policy Panel suggested that we should do. Deputy Le Fondré also spoke at length about a number of pounds being spent every day by Government, but I think it is worth reiterating what I said in my opening remarks about the plan. If we do nothing between now and 2019, we will have a largely balanced budget and there will not be the potential of a funding gap or the potential of a structural deficit in 2019. We are not proposing to do nothing. We are, as I have said, proposing to invest in health, proposing to invest in education and proposing to continue to invest in our capital infrastructure and go even further and account for it in an appropriate way, which includes depreciation. There is a choice before Members. There is a choice to say: “We are not going to fund those services that we believe are long overdue being funded. We are not going to invest in our children’s future. We are not going to provide health services for those in our community that need it.” There is a choice, but I do not believe that any Member of this Assembly, even those who say they are going to vote against the Strategic Plan, that they do not want to invest in health, that they do not want to invest in our education system, that they do not want to see a vibrant economy providing jobs for our community and I certainly do not believe that they do not want to see a vibrant St. Helier. One or 2 new Members might be surprised that some other Members have said they are going to vote against such a good Strategic Plan, particularly when in their own comments they have said they support investing in health, they have said they support investing in education, they said they support St. Helier, but they are not going to vote for the Strategic Plan. I am sorry to say that some of the Members, to the best of my recollection, have not yet voted for a Strategic Plan in all the days that they have been in this Assembly. That of course is their democratic right, but this is an opportunity

to send a message to our community that we are going to address the issues which concern them, that we do understand that our community deserves an appropriate health service fit for the future that is invested in, that we are going to support each child in our community to reach their full potential, be that academically, be that creatively, be that working with their hands. We are not going to judge that, we are going to support each child to be the very best that they can be and we have made a great start on doing that. **[Approbation]** It is nearly 5.00 p.m. I am going to draw to a close, **[Approbation]** much as I would love to keep going. **[Laughter]** But I shall take the stamping as an indication that Members would prefer the first option. I wholeheartedly believe that we have a Strategic Plan with a Resource Statement, a plan to balance the budget, a plan to invest in the areas that we need to invest in for the benefit of all Islanders, a plan that works. It is not going to be easy, I accept that. Part of the plan about cutting and reprioritising current expenditure in order to be able to do that investment, asking the public to consider whether they want to pay a little bit more to improve their health service, redesigning our services is not going to be easy, and we are going to have to, in the words of the Connétable of St. John, ask ourselves which category this growth falls into. Is it need or is it want? We are all going to have to be vigilant, but we are all going to have to work together because we know that the future that we potentially produce is a public service which is perfectly aligned to delivering what the community wants at a fair cost that we all agree is appropriate, cutting out duplication, driving out inefficiency, allowing us to invest in further frontline staff to benefit all of our community. We have a plan that works, we have a plan which is necessary. I know that we can work together to keep Jersey a special place. This is a plan for Jersey and I ask all Members to vote for it. Thank you very much. **[Approbation]**

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The appel, Chief Minister? Very well, the appel is called for on the Strategic Plan as amended. If Members are in their designated seats, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 41		CONTRE: 4		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator P.F. Routier		Senator Z.A. Cameron		
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Senator I.J. Gorst		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Senator L.J. Farnham		Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H)		
Senator A.K.F. Green				
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of Trinity				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				

Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				
Deputy S.J. Pinel (C)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Bryans (H)				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy A.D. Lewis (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S)				
Deputy R. Labey (H)				
Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H)				
Deputy S.M. Bree (C)				
Deputy M.J. Norton (B)				
Deputy T.A. McDonald (S)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy G.J. Truscott (B)				
Deputy P.D. McLinton (S)				

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well. Chairman of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee), you had proposed that the 2 Social Security items be taken. This would seem an appropriate time to ...

The Connétable of St. Clement:

That would seem appropriate, Sir.

3. Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal: appointment of members (P.30/2015)

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

There is a certain urgency for the Minister, therefore we come to P.30, the Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal: appointment of members, and I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of the opinion to appoint, in accordance with Article 15 of the Income Support General Provision (Jersey) Order 2008, further to a process overseen by the Jersey Appointments Commission, the following persons as members of the Income Support Medical Appeal Tribunal for the period stated against their name: Advocate Charles Thacker, Chairman, interim period until 30th November 2015; Dr. Nicola Charles, Medical Practitioner, 5 years; Dr. Brendan Kellett, Medical Practitioner, 5 years.

3.1 Deputy S.J. Pinel (The Minister for Social Security):

I think we are all exhausted after 3 days of intensive deliberation and debate, therefore I will not add further pressure to Members. The following 2 propositions merely require unanimous agreement. I am pleased to propose the appointment of a new chair and 2 new medical practitioners to the Income Support Medical Appeal Tribunal. The tribunal deals with appeals regarding medical grounds affecting a claim to income support, the level of care being provided affecting the award of Home Carer's Allowance and care levels affecting the award of Long-Term Care. A tribunal panel will consist of a legally-qualified chair or a deputy chair, a medical practitioner, a layperson, being an individual who has an understanding of the impact of disability through their own experience. The previous chair, Advocate Zoë Blomfield, resigned at the end of

2014. Advocate Blomfield has been in position since the inception of the tribunal in 2008. With changes to the structure of the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal also taking place, this provided a good opportunity to review the role of chair across the 3 tribunals which hear appeals on decisions made by Social Security, the Social Security Tribunal, of which Advocate Thacker is currently chair, the Social Security Medical Appeals Tribunal, and the one under consideration, the Income Support Medical Appeal Tribunal. It is recognised that the chair is required to provide a more encompassing role, providing advice on process and standards across all 3 tribunals and assisting the Judicial Greffe in the establishment of a tribunal service. I am pleased to say that Advocate Thacker, with his considerable experience, has agreed to take on this role in the interim to allow time for a full recruitment process to be undertaken. Advocate Thacker's appointment has the support of the Appointments Commission. A separate recruitment process, overseen by the Jersey Appointments Commission, took place to recruit new medical practitioners. The recruitment panel selected Dr. Brendan Kellett and Dr. Nicola Charles. I am satisfied that the proposed chair and the medical practitioners have the appropriate professional qualifications and will bring considerable knowledge and experience to their roles. I ask Members to agree that the proposed candidates are appointed to the Income Support Medical Appeal Tribunal: Advocate Thacker until 30th November 2015, and the medical practitioners each for a 5-year term of office starting from 28th April 2015. I ask Members to support the proposition.

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? All Members in favour of adopting the proposition, kindly show; those against. The proposition is adopted.

4. Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal: appointment of members (P.31/2015)

The Bailiff:

We now come to P.31, Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal: appointment of members lodged by the Minister for Social Security and I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of the opinion to appoint, in accordance with Article 6 of the Social Security (Determination of Disablement Questions) (Jersey) Order 1974, further to a process overseen by the Jersey Appointments Commission, the following persons as members of the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal for the period stated against their name: Advocate Charles Thacker, Chairman, interim period until 30th November 2015; Dr. Nicola Charles, Medical Practitioner, 5 years; Dr. Brendan Kellett, Medical Practitioner, 5 years; Dr. M. Richardson, Medical Practitioner, 5 years.

4.1 Deputy S.J. Pinel (The Minister for Social Security):

I am pleased to propose the appointment of a new chair and 3 medical practitioners to the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal. The tribunal deals with appeals regarding the award of Long-Term Incapacity Allowance. Previously this tribunal consisted of 3 medical practitioners. Recent changes to the constitution of this tribunal now requires a legally-qualified chair and 2 medical practitioners. With the resignation of the chair of the Income Support Medical Appeal Tribunal coinciding, it provided a good opportunity to review the role of chair across the 3 tribunals which hear appeals on decisions made by Social Security, the Social Security Tribunal, of which Advocate Thacker is currently chair, the Income Support Medical Appeals Tribunal and the one under consideration now, the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal. It is recognised that the chair is required to provide a more encompassing role, providing advice on process and standards across all 3 tribunals and assisting the Judicial Greffe in the establishment of a broader tribunal service. I am pleased to say that Advocate Thacker, with his considerable experience, has agreed to take on this role in the interim to allow time for a full recruitment process to be undertaken. Advocate Thacker's appointment has the support of the Appointments Commission. A separate

recruitment process, overseen by the Jersey Appointments Commission, took place to recruit new medical practitioners. The recruitment panel selected Dr. Brendan Kellett and Dr. Nicola Charles. Dr. Mike Richardson was previously appointed by the Minister on 18th May 2013 after a similar recruitment process, and so is being proposed following the changes in constitution of the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal. I am satisfied that the proposed chair and the medical practitioners have the appropriate professional qualifications and will bring considerable knowledge and experience to their roles.

[17:00]

I ask Members to agree that the proposed candidates are appointed to the Social Security Medical Appeal Tribunal: Advocate Thacker until 30th November 2015, and the medical practitioners, Dr. Mike Richardson, Dr. Nicola Charles and Dr. Brendan Kellett each for a 5-year term of office starting from 28th April 2015. I ask Members to support the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? All Members in favour of adopting the proposition, kindly show; those against. The proposition is adopted.

Deputy S.J. Pinel:

May I just thank Members, and I wish everything was this easy.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

Very well. We come to M, the Arrangement of Public Business, Connétable.

5. The Connétable of St. Clement (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

It is clear the next sitting is on 12th May, and as per usual, the items which are deferred from today will be put at the top of the Public Business agenda for that date. The Arrangement of Public Business therefore is as per the Consolidated Order Paper, plus the items left over from today and I would suggest that Members allow 2 days for that sitting on 12th May.

The Bailiff:

Very well. If I may put you right, there is just one other meeting of the States before 12th May and that is on 9th May at 3.00 p.m. in the People's Park. May I just mention to Members that we are honoured by the presence of Her Royal Highness, the Countess of Wessex, on that occasion. Theoretically she will be a stranger and therefore she should not be attending unless Members agree. I am sure Members do agree that she should attend and perhaps I could ask for that signification in the usual way. **[Approbation]** Thank you very much. The States now stand adjourned until 3.00 p.m. on 9th May.

ADJOURNMENT

[17:01]