

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 10th JUNE 2009

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER	4
PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption	4
1. States Strategic Plan 2009 - 2014 (P.52/2009): second amendment.....	4
1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	4
1.2 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:	4
1.3 Deputy A.T. Dupre of St. Clement:.....	5
1.4 Deputy D.J.A. Wimberley of St. Mary:	5
1.5 Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier:.....	6
1.6 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	6
1.7 Deputy F.J. Hill, B.E.M., of St. Martin:	7
1.8 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	7
1.9 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	7
1.10 Deputy J.G. Reed of St. Ouen:	7
1.11 Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:	8
1.12 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:.....	9
1.13 Senator J.L. Perchard:.....	9
1.14 Connétable J. Gallichan of St. Mary:	9
1.15 Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:	10
1.16 Deputy S. Pitman of St. Helier:.....	12
2. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 4 (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))	14
2.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):.....	14
2.2 Senator P.F. Routier:	14
2.3 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:.....	14
3. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 5 (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))	15
3.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):.....	15
3.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	15
3.3 Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:	15
3.4 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:	16
3.5 Deputy A.K.F. Green, M.B.E., of St. Helier:.....	16
3.6 The Deputy of St. Mary:.....	16
3.7 The Deputy of Trinity:.....	16
3.8 Deputy M.R. Higgins:.....	16
3.9 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	17
4. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 1(c) (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))	18

4.1	Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):.....	18
5.	States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): second amendment paragraph 2 (P.52/2009 Amd.(2))	18
5.1	Deputy S. Pitman:.....	19
5.2	The Deputy of St. Ouen:.....	19
5.3	Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:	19
5.4	The Deputy of St. Mary:.....	20
5.5	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:	20
5.6	Deputy T.M. Pitman:	20
5.7	Senator P.F. Routier:	21
5.8	Senator J.L. Perchard:.....	21
5.9	Deputy A.K.F. Green:.....	21
5.10	Deputy M. Tadier:	21
5.11	Deputy A.E. Jeune of St. Brelade:.....	22
5.12	Deputy S. Pitman:.....	22
6.	States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): eighth amendment paragraph 3 (P.52/2009 Amd.(8))	23
6.1	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	24
7.	States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 1(d) (P.52/2009 Amd(6))	24
7.1	Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):.....	24
7.2	Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:	25
7.3	Deputy M. Tadier:	25
7.4	Deputy T. Pitman:	26
7.5	The Deputy of St. Ouen:.....	26
7.6	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	27
7.7	Senator T.J. Le Main:	27
7.8	Deputy A.T. Dupre:.....	28
7.9	Deputy A.K.F. Green:.....	28
7.10	Senator T.A. Le Sueur:.....	28
8.	States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009).....	30
8.1	Senator P.F. Routier:	30
8.2	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	30
8.3	Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour:	31
8.4	Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:	31
8.5	Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:.....	32
8.6	Senator J.L. Perchard:.....	33
8.7	Deputy D.J. De Sousa of St. Helier:.....	34
8.8	Senator B.E. Shenton:.....	34
8.9	Deputy P.J. Rondel of St. John:	35
8.10	The Deputy of St. Mary:.....	35
	LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED.....	42
	LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.....	42
	PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	42
8.11	Senator A. Breckon:	42
8.12	Deputy T.M. Pitman:	48

8.13	The Deputy of St. Ouen:	49
8.14	Deputy G.P. Southern:	50
8.15	Deputy J.M. Maçon:	53
8.16	Deputy M. Tadier:	53
8.17	Deputy A.K.F. Green:	59
8.18	Deputy M.R. Higgins:	60
8.19	Senator S. Syvret:	61
8.20	Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	64
8.21	Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville:	65
8.22	Deputy J.A. Martin of St. Helier:	65
8.23	Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	65
8.24	Deputy J.A. Martin:	68
8.25	Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	69
8.26	Deputy G.P. Southern:	69
8.27	Senator T.A. Le Sueur:	69

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS 70

	The Connétable of St. Mary (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	70
	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	70
	The Connétable of St. Mary:	71
	Senator S. Syvret:	71
	Senator J.L. Perchard:	71
	The Deputy of Trinity:	72
	Senator J.L. Perchard:	72
	Senator S. Syvret:	72
	The Deputy of St. Martin:	73
	The Deputy of St. John:	73
	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	73
	The Deputy of St. John:	74
	Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:	75
	The Deputy of St. Martin:	75
	Deputy M. Tadier:	75
	Senator J.L. Perchard:	76
	Deputy M. Tadier:	76
	Senator J.L. Perchard:	76
	Deputy G.P. Southern:	77
	Senator S. Syvret:	77
	The Connétable of St. Mary:	78

ADJOURNMENT..... 78

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

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Deputy Bailiff:

Before we return to the debate, I can inform Members of one matter. Government House has announced this morning that the Queen has approved the appointment of Mr. William Bailhache as Deputy Bailiff in succession to me. **[Approbation]**

Senator S. Syvret:

I may be alone, but can I say that I think that is a reprehensible decision? **[Members: Oh!]**

The Deputy Bailiff:

I was going to say I hope Members will wish Mr. Bailhache every success for his term of office. **[Approbation]** Now, if we return to the debate on the amendment of Deputy Shona Pitman, I had seen Deputy Tadier next, I think.

PUBLIC BUSINESS – resumption

1. States Strategic Plan 2009 - 2014 (P.52/2009): second amendment

1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will not talk for long on this one. I simply wanted to try and shift the focus somewhat of what we have been talking about. There is a political saying - I am not sure if it is from Germany, I think it may be - which goes: "Nothing about us without us." I think that the focus really needs to be shifted back on to the actual youth workers themselves, and I hope, since we are privileged enough to have a former member of the Youth Service or maybe more than one in the Assembly, to hear what his comments would be. I have not had a chance to speak directly to anyone in the Youth Service about this. I did try to contact someone last night, but I suspect ... and first of all let us acknowledge the fact that they all do very worthwhile and often difficult jobs. Remember some of these people may not have children of their own, but they give up voluntarily ... well, not necessarily voluntarily all the time, but they do give up their time often in the evenings and at very unsociable hours to look after our children and do very worthwhile work, so I think that needs to be acknowledged. I really ask what is it that people at the coalface, so to speak, want. Given the choice of on the one hand giving the Youth Service a statutory position or not, I can only suspect that if we did give it a statutory position that could only strengthen the Youth Service. I do not buy into the I am sure quite well-intentioned arguments that have been put out that the *status quo* is fine, because I know from speaking to people in my own Parish at Communicare and the youth workers that I suspect that they feel that they need more teeth and I believe that the statutory provision is going to do that, so I would really like to hear perhaps from another Member in particular what his thoughts are on that, and that is all I have to say, really.

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I have just checked with the Town Hall, and the Constable is indeed out of the Island.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, so Members are content for him to be marked as excused to enable his amendments to be presented by the Chief Minister. Very well, thank you, Senator.

1.2 Deputy J.B. Fox of St. Helier:

As a recently retired Assistant Minister for Education, Sport and Culture responsible for youth, I think it is appropriate that I should be allowed to say a few words. I concur with the principle of the desire in this amendment to bring back some statutory support for the Youth Service. I think it is very important. I am not sure whether it is appropriate at this time that it could be included as an add-on to a strategic plan because I think it needs more detail. Many people think that the Youth

Service just provides youth centres outside school hours and some holiday activities but, in fact, as Deputy Green alluded to, their remit is vast and huge and it is a catalyst among other things for a great deal of both professional and voluntary work involving young people throughout the Island and sometimes beyond in its support for other youth and the activities that visit the Island. It is a very important area but it also has links with the Children's Service and all the activities for the vulnerable of our Island. That is also an important part. It also has links with disabled groups and again a very strategic area in ensuring that these people have the best opportunity for quality of life and they need a great deal of support in doing so. The other side of the coin is, apart from the uniform organisations that we familiarly know of, the Scouts, the Cubs, the Guides, *et cetera*, they are also very much involved in providing the necessary support that goes into ensuring that standards are maintained, that the safeguards are in-built for the people that are organising and are at the front line. It is very important, and with the dangers of child abuse and everything else that we have been hearing about in recent times, it is very important that we have structures in place that have the right people that are able to provide the service that provides the safeguards, but at the same time maximises the amount of volunteers and other professional people in making the service to our young people, who, let us face it, are our future leaders of tomorrow. The other area, of course, is during the last 3 years the Parishes - the Comité des Connétables - have agreed and are actively working on bringing partnerships together between the States, the Youth Service and the many other organisations that they already deal with, such as the *Jumelages*, *et cetera*, in bringing young people together in a wide variety of activities. It not only provides social aspects, it also provides educational aspects that are above and beyond that which the Education Service itself or the Sports Service itself provide, so it is very, very important. As I said, one of the problems I have with this is that this is an add-on, and I suspect that like most things that come to the States, if one does not put a comprehensive proposition forward with sufficient detail for the understanding of States Members, it is less likely to go through. If this proposition is not successful today, I would still urge that a proposition be brought forward because there are some among us who do not appreciate the value that a Youth Service requires, and one of the problems there is that when it comes to cuts, efficiency savings, *et cetera*, it is an area that is seen as: "Why can it not be attached to the schools?" or in Comptroller and Auditor General reports: "We can cut £500,000 off it or whatever, and you come back to us with a reason if you cannot do so." I think it is important that, yes, it is part of the overall Business Plan structure and, indeed, the Strategic Plan, but it needs rightfully to take its place and to do that it needs a properly presented document for the States to fully understand the importance - that there is a need for some statutory backing - but I am not sure whether it is possible in its present form to ... there is enough detail for it to be coming. I know the argument is to bring forth legislation and to bring it back to this Assembly, but I do not think that is sufficient at this moment in time. I do support the principles and probably one of the few politicians that have been working with the Youth Service for many years. They do a tremendous job. From the front line to the volunteer supporters and also all the other agencies that they work with deserve our thanks for all that they do. We cannot live without them. Thank you, Sir.

1.3 Deputy A.T. Dupré of St. Clement:

Just one thing, I will be very brief, but with regard to Deputy Southern's presumptive dismissal of all that Deputy Green said yesterday evening, I would like to point out to the Deputy and the Assembly that Deputy Green has had many years of experience in the Youth Service, including several years on the panel of the Youth Court. He is, in my opinion, far more in touch with the youth of today than Deputy Southern. Thank you.

1.4 Deputy D.J.A. Wimberley of St. Mary:

I, too, will be brief. I totally agree with Deputy Fox about the importance and the value and the success of our Youth Service. The recent report into the Youth Service was startlingly good and we should be proud of what they aim to do and of what they do. There are 2 points I want to make. One is this business of how the Youth Service acts as a catalyst for non-States workers in the way

that the Youth Service works with volunteers and encourages and guides and yet also regulates in a sense the non-States organisations like the Scouts and the Guides and so on. I think there is such a lesson there for how we can work together - States and the voluntary sector - and that is so important going forward at a time when where we are looking at government revenues, obviously with the credit crunch, declining. That is the sort of area that we really do have to take very seriously, and I noticed from my carers report that came in my *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* a week ago that exactly the same process, although much earlier in the whole process, is happening with carers; this notion that there are a huge number of carers out there. They need support. They need a bit of training. For instance, they are having first aid training this week, I think. That has to be co-ordinated and brought forward and that is a government role and it is very valuable. The Youth Service is like a template for that whole area of co-operation. So that is my first point. The second point is please let us not go down the route of the youth workers spending their time fund-raising. My son worked in Liverpool for a time as a youth worker and he rose to some sort of semi-senior youth worker as opposed to a pure youth worker, with teeth, as Deputy Tadier put it so beautifully. Youth workers need more teeth. Well, I think he means youth workers need to do youth work and be protected from the swinging axe. They need to be able to focus on the young people they are working with. His experience was of spending half his time doing grant applications, scrabbling around for money to this trust and that trust because Liverpool and the government would not support youth work in the way that it should be supported. So I do hope that Members remember just how important it is that youth workers be allowed to get on with youth work. He was so frustrated that he left the Youth Service, so we do not want that to happen here, and if it takes statutory, then that is the road we should go down. Whether it should be done now or, as Deputy Fox said, in a separate proposition I am not so sure, but really this is a strategic plan. We are not talking about detail. He did mention, I think, in his speech that it needs more detail, but that is not what strategic plans are for. So I think if we do feel that the Youth Service needs this extra protection then we should vote for the amendment.

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

As a former youth worker of 14 years standing I am, as you would expect, a firm supporter of the Youth Service. I will be supporting this amendment because I believe that the service requires much greater recognition and standing than it has at the present time. I believe that the work of the service goes largely unreported and is undervalued by some States Members, who are very quick to criticise the actions of a very small minority of children, but are unaware of what is an inadequately resourced service and of the likely cost-cutting pressures that the service is likely to be under in the coming years as the education budget, like all budgets, is going to come under intense scrutiny. The service plays an important role not only in providing children with an alternative to hanging around street corners or roaming the streets but also in helping many children broaden their horizons and achieve their true potential. The youth workers also provide children with an independent shoulder to cry on or to discuss confidentially their problems when they cannot go to their parents or their teachers. The youth workers at First Tower, for example, are also providing hot meals for some children who I suspect would not get a hot meal otherwise. I believe that this service deserves the support of the States and this particular standing, a statutory standing, and support for funding in the future. Thank you.

1.6 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

This amendment seems to have been brought for 2 reasons: firstly, to give the Youth Service recognition and, secondly, to give it financial protection. I suggest I have heard something like 20 speeches yesterday and today and every single one of us has recognised the valuable work that the Youth Service provides in the Island and I do not think it needs legislation for us to be very well aware and very much appreciative of the quality and diversity of that service. The second reason is a suggestion that a statutory provision would give enhanced financial protection. I think that is not the case. Whether the service is statutory or otherwise, the financial contribution will be down to

us as Members when we debate the Business Plan. Indeed, the Deputy of St. Mary, when he spoke recently about funding in Liverpool, which does have statutory protection, was saying the difficulties they were having in obtaining funding. So, statutory provision does not of itself provide the appropriate level of funding. So whether we accept this amendment or not will not, in my view, improve the quality of recognition or the degree of financial protection. What it does do is provide yet another law, and over the years one of the criticisms that this House has received time and time again is that we are making more and more laws, employing more and more people to enforce them, and there is no need. We are getting over-regulated, over-legislated. So, from my point of view and from a strategic point of view I would question any proposition for a new law: do we need this law? What additional benefit would this law give over and above what currently exists? In my view a law to enshrine the Youth Service does not give it any additional protection, it does not give it any additional recognition, and for that reason I see no point in adding to our burden of legislation.

1.7 Deputy F.J. Hill, B.E.M., of St. Martin:

Could I just ask the Chief Minister that in the Council of Ministers arriving at the decision who did they consult? Was it the Youth Service themselves or via the Education Minister? I think it is quite important we know where the information came from for them to make that decision.

1.8 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

The Strategic Plan, as the Deputy well knows, has been consulted upon widely by all parties and we have had many submissions including primarily, I suppose, that from Education, Sport and Culture but from a variety of organisations, individuals and particular pressure groups.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Could I just ask then were they totally opposed to the proposition or were they supportive of it?

Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

The amendment was lodged 2 weeks ago and I have heard nothing since that time.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

So there has been no consultation.

1.9 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

Members will be well aware that several Parishes have close connections with the Youth Service and, in fact, ratepayers contribute to the funding of the Youth Service within their Parishes by support in various ways to sessional youth workers or providing costs towards premises in which they can work. I would be interested to know if the proposer of the amendment has considered the Parish/youth worker relationship and whether the creation of a statutory status would, in fact, affect that relationship. Secondly, there is a move from certain sections of the Youth Service to make certain areas into a charitable status in order that they may be able to access funds which are at present not available to them. Would she confirm that she is aware of this and whether this in addition would have an effect on the creation of a statutory status?

1.10 Deputy J.G. Reed of St. Ouen:

I would just like to first of all congratulate Deputy Shona Pitman on bringing the Assembly's attention to this most important area, and I mean by that the contribution that the Youth Service plays in providing for the needs of our young people. I equally would like to assure the Deputy and all States Members that in my view and that of the department and my Assistant Ministers, we are aiming to ensure that the benefits of informal education are both protected and fully utilised. That said, I would like to again draw Members' attention to the issue of statutory status. First of all, it has got to be recognised that statutory status secures a provision but what it does not do is secure the level of that provision and it is solely dependent on funding levels. This has been the

experience, and still is the experience, in the U.K. (United Kingdom). If one goes on the Internet you will find many, many, many comments regarding the statutory status of the Youth Service and the need for continual improvements and highlighting the fact that over many years funding of the area has been reduced even though, in picking up the point that the Deputy of St. Mary makes with regard to the experience of his son, they do have this statutory provision. Mention has been made about who was consulted. Well, clearly my department and the individuals involved within my department were asked for their opinion. Furthermore, the Strategic Plan has been open and available for quite wide consultation over a period of time and, again, this issue has not been raised. I will tell you that there is a general issue of ongoing funding which has been highlighted, both at my department and by others, and this will need to be addressed but, and it is a big but, the secret is not in statutory status. The secret for maintaining and further developing the Youth Service is the ongoing commitment that this Government gives to the Youth Service. Indeed, I would say that over a number of years, and especially in more recent times, many Parishes have recognised the need for that commitment. This is another area that has been and is a difficulty within the U.K. because, although there is a statutory status in the U.K. that protects youth service provision, there is equally a voluntary service that is outside and separate from the statutory status provision. Our secret on this Island is that we encompass everything, albeit that it is not statutory; it is in policy. It is an ongoing policy that this States and others have committed to over many years and I would say that that is where the strength lies because it enables us not to be linked to some legislation - slavishly linked perhaps in some respects to legislation - but it allows us to be flexible enough to adapt to the needs of the young people as we see them develop. It is for these reasons that I am unable to support the amendment that Deputy Shona Pitman brings.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour:

On a point of information, the Minister said there were issues with Youth Service funding. I wonder if he could elaborate on what he saw as the issues.

The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Very briefly, there are areas that we would like to see further developed. There is also the issue of the Comptroller and Auditor General's relatively recent emerging issues document where he highlighted there is a possibility of reducing funding for the Youth Service.

Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier:

A point of clarification, if I may. The Minister seemed to imply that statutory basis somehow interfered with what he was able to do. Could he elucidate?

The Deputy of St. Ouen:

I think I made it quite clear in my speech that statutory status is not the miracle cure for the Youth Service.

1.11 Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:

The financing of the Youth Service does worry me rather because we have a situation in my Parish where the premises are given to the Youth Service free of charge. In the first case the land was owned by the Parish. The Variety Club put the money up for the rehabilitation of the premises and bringing them up to standard, which they did, and the then Education Committee said that they would pay for the staffing. Well, that has now changed and the Minister, these days, says that he cannot afford to pay for all of the staffing so the Parish pays £7,500 a year towards that. These are obviously things that we are happy to do and prepared to do, but I really would like to know from the proposer what the effect will be on the charitable side from her proposal; what is going to happen? If you have a statutory situation you are going to have a statutory financial situation as well. Are you going to say that the Parish is no longer needed for its money to be put into it or are you going to say the States should fund the whole thing? I do not know. Perhaps she would like to answer that, please, when she has finished chatting to her friend.

1.12 Deputy A.E. Pryke of Trinity:

I shall be just very brief. I am president of Trinity Youth Club and have been involved in that for many, many years. My concern, picking up the point of the previous 2 Constables, is that different youth clubs around the Island have evolved over the years, run how they would like to see it by the community. It has been on their need how the young people have seen it and wanted it and this has been one of the strengths. So I would like to think that all youth clubs and all youth projects have been down to the specific need. I would just like to ask the Deputy, thinking of that point, with Trinity Youth Club we are part of the Trinity Youth Centre Management Committee. It gets a bit confusing but it works. We have a youth management committee so how does she see that role of the Youth Club Management Committee? One of the roles of that youth club management committee is to fundraise and to allow the youth worker to get on with the job that he is supposed to do and not fundraise, to take the point of the Deputy of St. Mary. One of its strengths has been, because I think it is not strategy, that it can work with other organisations - like the Lions Club and the Variety Club - to get some funding and we have been very fortunate with Variety for our youth café but also the Association of Jersey Charities and the likes of TSB. I would like the Deputy to confirm that she thinks that this will not change, that the other charitable organisations will still want to be part of the Youth Service.

1.13 Senator J.L. Perchard:

I shall be supporting this amendment quite simply because it is a function of government to ensure that the youth of Jersey have adequate support and facilities and it is an obligation, and for the Council of Ministers to try to sidestep this responsibility is quite extraordinary. This debate has been contaminated by the suggestion that the private sector or the voluntary sector may have a problem with how to comply with the statutory status, but can I remind Members, for example, of the statutory obligation of governments to provide policing. We have an honorary service and we have honorary police working and we have no confrontation between the statutory obligation and the honorary provision. Education, we have a statutory obligation to provide education but we have the private sector. We have the private sector working perfectly adequately alongside the Government in the provision of education. Of course, health and social care, we have a very, very active voluntary sector working in the provision of health and social care without the confrontation between government's statutory obligations and their good work. So to confuse this debate by saying the Youth Service, so much of it is done in a voluntary way or manner and therefore statutory obligation could not be confirmed, I think is a bit mischievous. It is an obligation. We have got huge social problems, particularly as families are busy and there is little doubt that the family unit is not what it was, many single parents trying to bring up children. We need a vibrant, successful Youth Service and I do believe it is an obligation on government to provide it and, as I say, to try and sidestep is a shame. We should accept it is an obligation, it should be a compulsory obligation on this Government, and that is why I will be supporting the amendment.

[Approbation]

1.14 Connétable J. Gallichan of St. Mary:

Very briefly, just to echo some of the concerns that have already been raised, I too am very concerned that a statutory footing for the Youth Service would impact on the charitable funds which are already accessed by a number of youth organisations and youth clubs, because many of the charitable objects in the charities providing the funds look to fill a niche where there is no statutory provision. I am also concerned about the community aspect that is involved here. We are not looking at a U.K. situation; we are looking at the unique situation in Jersey where it has already been highlighted there is a huge amount of Parish involvement in all sorts of different ways, direct funding, indirect funding, whatever. Also that allows the network of community support to go in finding extra community helpers to assist the qualified youth leaders, *et cetera*, in general running. I am only concerned that having something provided as a statutory obligation takes away perhaps the focus of the voluntary side to assist when there are other areas that need voluntary assistance

that have not got a statutory provision. People may think their attentions are better perhaps directed there. I would also like to know from the proposer of the amendment exactly how this would affect the organisations that are affiliated to the Youth Service. For a long time I was a uniformed Scout leader and of course there were affiliation arrangements in place there. I want to know how the statutory status of the Youth Service would impact on that. I really do not know so I look to her for that. As I say, I just have concerns that this would, in fact, work to be counterproductive to the extreme esteem with which the Youth Service is held in the Parishes. Contrary to what some of us have said, I think the work done by the Youth Service is entirely recognised at those levels and is actively supported.

1.15 Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:

I do speak really reluctantly and I was not going to speak until the comments yesterday from Deputy Green. In this case I do think the House would appreciate why I was not going to speak. As someone much wiser than me said, it is better to be criticised for what you have done rather than what you thought you should have done later. So, not a speech, really, just a load of points. I have every respect for Deputy Green, lots of respect. We have probably exchanged more emails on trying to sort out my constituents' problems than anyone else, but I really cannot concur with his observations about statutory status and what that does. It is quite correct what some Members have pointed out, and I have deliberately not got involved in this, but it is quite true that to my understanding having statutory status is no guarantee of having a million dollar budget or whatever but it certainly does help protect any service, the fact that it has got to be delivered. What I think it does - and the proposer may differ - it certainly helps to protect the identity of that service and I think that is a key issue. I think the Minister did not touch on that but I hope he would agree with it on reflection. Deputy Green also said we had a very good Youth Service and other people have touched on that and he is absolutely right. It is like an old song used to say, you do not know what you have got until it has gone, and I can tell you only a few years ago it was a very, very different story. We are looking at problems now with social workers and we are really short on social workers and I do not need to go into all those issues, but if you go back just to 2001 a third of the professional staff left the Youth Service because of stress-related illness and that is a fact. There was a joke among us, and I was one of them, that we should have T-shirts saying: "Powered by Prozac". I do not say that in any flippant way but that is how bad it was and that is because back then the service really was not valued to the extent that it is now. Yesterday the proposer made quite an issue of complimenting the Constables, and she is right about that. I think there is probably almost every Constable now who is involved in a partnership. The Chairman of the Connétables Committee is not here but if there is one Constable who is not involved now then I think he or she needs to be taken aside at your next meeting and made to sit in the corner on their own until they do agree. It is really valued and I believe that having statutory status would only cement those relationships. I certainly cannot imagine any of the Constables now going back on those agreements. Funding: I do not like to talk about my own involvement too much, but I can say that over the 10, 11 years prior to this and changing my career I brought in around £250,000 and I am really proud of that and the people who worked with me. I know Deputy Fox could say something on that. It is not as rosy as you might think; it is a lot, lot better but let us not kid ourselves. I do not want to criticise people because I believe there are a lot of Members who do not know enough about the Youth Service so maybe some of the comments have just been due to the fact that they do not know. Some of the comments about charitable status, I was scribbling points and let me say the real drive for the talk of charitable status within the Youth Service comes from 2 areas: the first is because for donkey's years the service, which is meant to focus on 12-plus and teenagers primarily, has also had to deliver a service for very young children. It is not what I went to university and was trained for and I have to say I found it more difficult. People are often critical of teenagers but it is a completely different ball game. That is one of the reasons the Youth Service were looking at charitable status in certain areas because they were trying to fund areas of work which are really valuable but frankly not their job. So let us get that quite straight. The other

reason for a drive towards some form of charitable status, and there are various ways being talked about this, having the Friends of Grands Vaux or the Friends of Gorey or whatever. The other drive behind this was, quite honestly, purely and simply to try and get funding for things that the education budget could not achieve, and that is no criticism of this Minister for Education, Sport and Culture. He has only been in the job 6 months. It is just reality. I have done a fair bit of work on this and there is absolutely no conflict, as Senator Perchard said, between charitable input and having a service delivery protected by statutory status, absolutely no conflict. I would say to Members who generally might not be clear about that: that is the case. It is a red herring, it really, really is. I think with the budget pressures the Youth Service, like many others, are going to have to continue going to charities. From my own experience - I think the Deputy of Trinity mentioned it - the Lloyds TSB Foundation: absolutely phenomenal service, absolutely brilliant. The support they have given to young people in this Island has been - I cannot really put it into words but certainly in my own experience - second to none but there are pressures on them now. We might lose this so let us not think we can start relying on them. They often only fund 3-year projects so, while what they do is absolutely brilliant, it is not a long-term answer. Again, I may have got the wrong end of the stick with what the proposer is getting at here. Contrary to Deputy Green, I believe there is some real value that can be gained from statutory status in at least achieving a bottom line funding but I think it is more about securing the identity of that service, in this case the Youth Service which, let us face it, it is education and there are a lot of people who do not know that. I did not change my careers to go and play ping-pong - although I have got nothing against ping-pong - but the intervention that youth work does, I have obviously got a lot of friends there but I have got a lot of respect for those people. There are some politicians over the years who really have helped and perhaps we would not naturally recognise who they are. If I go back years and years, I think Senator Le Main put a lot of input into Gorey. I may be wrong but I am sure he did when I first started. It is a long time ago. Senator Syvret, he is not here but he sat on my own committee for a long time and that made a huge difference. In recent years, I think it was the Minister - it might have been Deputy Fox - who said how things had improved the last few years, and there are 2 Members who deserve real credit here. One I will not even mention but one is Deputy Fox himself. My politics are very, very different from Deputy Fox in a lot of ways but he has been a real constant support for young people and the Youth Service and he deserves a lot of credit for that. **[Approbation]** So does the other one who I will not mention. But we all should. If anyone feels left out stand up because I know a lot of politicians do sit on youth committees now. I know I spent a lot of time badgering Deputy Le Hérisssier to sit on mine and that is what you have to do because the service is not valued. It was often said that the social service side was the Cinderella of health, and really understandably in many ways the Youth Service has been like that with education. I echo really everything that Deputy Fox said in his speech; however, I do not see a problem with agreeing to this now, none whatsoever. That brings me to the other point, and again it is not an attack or criticism but a point I think the Constable of St. Peter made yesterday about the comment that was made about silly laws. There are many reasons to disagree with a proposition or amendment and, like I say, I have got no problems when it is based on a different political perspective, but I have to say when I saw in the comments the line about we are committed to not introducing new laws I thought that was rather unnecessary because I could just think of a couple off the top of my head. I mean, the fisheries bagging law. I think that is with Scrutiny and frankly if that escapes from Scrutiny intact I think some of the Members might feel that they should be bagged. It is a really silly law. I am bringing a proposition myself next week about States employees standing for election. That was a law that the intention was meant to make it easier for people like me to put ourselves forward for election if we thought, rightly or wrongly, we had anything to offer. That made a situation where people were not allowed to earn and had to go out and get loans to cover the loans of their mortgage. You could not use your annual leave yet you could go and campaign for any sitting politician. That is not good use of a law draftsman's time. So I would just say on that, let us not get too pious. We do make silly laws but this would be a good law. I have already spoken a lot more than I wanted to but I would just say anyone who

thinks it is all rosy just think of what has gone on with the drop-in café. That was a really valuable project and it not being there, I think most of us in St. Helier would say there has been a real impact with it being closed. All that can come out of this, I would say to Members, is positives; there are no negatives whatsoever. Again, completely predictably and at the risk of being criticised, I am obviously going to support it. I would just thank all the politicians who have worked with young people and I thank all the Constables who have made the move in recent years to support that. Statutory status really will not impact ... like the Constable of St. Mary who is obviously concerned about some of the voluntary groups. It will not impact on it at all. It is really, really valuable the voluntary work but we are asking people to be a professional service and you cannot just rely on volunteers for that. It is like a patchwork almost that has come together over here and it is really good but let us not kid ourselves that it cannot be improved. In the light of the vulnerable children's issues that have come up in Jersey in the last couple of years the Youth Service does do great work, great intervention work, great support work, and I really think we should recognise that more than we do, as Deputy Fox has said.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Does any other Member wish to speak on the amendment? Very well, I call on Deputy Shona Pitman to reply.

1.16 Deputy S. Pitman of St. Helier:

Firstly, I would like to thank all those who have participated in the debate. To start with, just to answer some of the questions, going back to the Constable of St. Saviour, in pointing out that I should not have brought my criminality to this debate, I think he was probably right.

Connétable P.F.M. Hanning of St. Saviour:

Sorry, I do not think I spoke on this.

Deputy S. Pitman:

The Deputy of St. Peter, sorry. The Constable of St. Peter. Yes, I admit I made a mistake here but I do not think it is any worse than States Members who vote on the proposer and what has been wrongly said as opposed to what is in the proposition, and I would ask Members to vote as a representative of the people who voted for them. I am afraid I cannot remember the second question of the Constable and he is not in the House so I cannot answer that question. Deputy Fox - who I too recognise the work that he has done and he has been very supportive of the Youth Service over the years and I probably have not appreciated it while I worked in the service - points out that it is probably not an appropriate time to bring this and there is not enough detail in the proposition. I would have hoped that Members would have read at least some of the reports of 2008 by the Youth Service to get some idea of what they do but I probably, having listened to what has been said, recognise that I should have put more detail in the proposition for people to understand the service much more. But as Deputy Wimberley pointed out, this is an amendment to the Strategic Plan which is not a detailed document in itself. The Deputy of Trinity asked if the service had statutory status would it affect her management committee. Well, as I know from my experience working at Grands Vaux Youth Centre, I do not see any impact on the relationship or the workings of the management committee and neither do I see this affecting the Parishes' partnership with the Youth Service. The issue about charities, I do not see any conflict there or change there, and indeed the States have formed public-private partnerships involving statutory bodies and private bodies and these have worked successfully. Okay, they are not with charities but I should point out that schools receive monies from charities and it has no impact, it just enhances the services, and so I do not see any conflict there or any change there. What they have really gone for is additional services facilities, and really money from charities to the Youth Service should be about that and not providing the ultimate service of education which it has in the past. Youth workers who have run youth centres and youth projects have spent a lot of their time raising

this money for essentials when the States should have been providing those services. In response to the Minister, who I must say I do believe recognises and appreciates the service more than the previous Minister, he said to me yesterday the Comptroller and Auditor General's report recommended to the Ministers that £500,000 should be cut from the service. If the Council of Ministers are to follow this recommendation but we have the Minister saying we cannot afford that then statutory status for the Youth Service will support him in his quest for that funding because if it means that we cannot provide a baseline service, he can say: "Right, it is statutory. We have an obligation, we have to do it." So I can only see it strengthening his position. I have to say to Deputy Green's response, as Assistant Minister responsible to the service who said this proposition will achieve nothing not already achieved, I am sorry but I do believe that comes from a Deputy who does not understand fully the work of the Youth Service in that it is an educational service. I will give an example of somebody, a young man who had a mother who was an alcoholic, a father who was an alcoholic who beat his wife and was violent towards him, the school system he had been failed by, came out with nothing, and through youth work he then went on to university to qualify as a youth worker. He is now married and he has children. So that is the power that it can have. That young man could have gone off, that very vulnerable young person could have gone off in a very different direction. I refer to what Deputy Le Claire was saying yesterday; it does catch those young people before they go on in the wrong directions. Not all of these vulnerable young people do but this is what we need to catch them at a young age and in turn that will save the States long-term. Lastly, I refer to Deputy Southern's speech and Deputy Pitman's speech who really sum up what this is really all about in that Deputy Southern said that statutory means priority and apparently we are now prioritising vulnerable young people. Saying we have got a commitment is not enough. By making the service statutory it will ensure minimum standards are met and that we will not have to rely on charities so much. It will also ensure that this service will remain, which is primarily an educational service and it will remain. Most importantly, it is about securing its identity that it is an educational service. Thank you. I make the proposition and call for the appel.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, the appel is called for on the amendment of Deputy Shona Pitman, the second amendment number 1 relating to the statutory state of the youth service. The Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 21		CONTRE: 22		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator S. Syvret		Senator T.A. Le Sueur		
Senator P.F. Routier		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Senator B.E. Shenton		Senator F.E. Cohen		
Senator J.L. Perchard		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Senator A. Breckon		Senator A.J.D. Maclean		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of Trinity		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		Connétable of St. Martin		
Deputy of St. Martin		Connétable of St. John		
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		Deputy of St. Ouen		
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		Deputy of Grouville		
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)		Deputy of St. Peter		
Deputy S. Pitman (H)		Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)		
Deputy M. Tadier (B)		Deputy of Trinity		
Deputy of St. Mary		Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)		
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)		
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)		
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		Deputy E.J. Noel (L)		
Deputy D. De Sousa (H)		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		

2. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 4 (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, we now come to a series of amendments lodged in the name of the Connétable of St. Helier. As yesterday, the Connétable has given notice under Standing Order 70(1)(a) that the Chief Minister will propose the amendments as he is excused from Assembly. The first one is number 61 on the list, amendment 6(4), amendment to priority 12 and I ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “attached as appendix 1” insert the words: “except that in priority 12 on page 26”; in the section entitled “What we will do” after the last bullet point insert an additional point as follows: “Continue to encourage and support Islanders in the pursuit of sporting excellence.”

2.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):

The previous Strategic Plan contained a considerable amount of detail and one of the comments after that debate was that there was too much detail in it and we should try to focus on the essentials. One of the details in the previous plan not in this plan was to do with the encouraging and supporting of Islanders in the pursuit of sporting excellence. This is not something that the Council of Ministers has turned their back on, we were just anxious to carry out what had previously been suggested of not trying to put too much into the plan. But there is no reason whatsoever to object to this amendment, indeed the Council of Ministers is entirely supportive of it, and for that reason I am happy to propose the amendment on behalf of the Constable of St. Helier and to accept it on behalf of the Council of Ministers.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

2.2 Senator P.F. Routier:

Just very briefly, I think this is a very worthwhile amendment and I hope that Members will take up Deputy Hill’s offer of participating in the Guernsey cricket match.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We are talking about sporting excellence here, Senator. **[Laughter]**

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

It is if you bowl out the Chief Minister of Guernsey for a duck.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

That highlights a very important point whether we are pursuing sporting excellence or genuine participation in all sections of society.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Do you wish to reply, Chief Minister?

2.3 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

Just to thank those who have spoken and I maintain the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I put the amendment. Those Members in favour of adopting it, kindly show? Those against? The amendment is adopted.

3. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 5 (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We come now to priority 13 in the name once again of the Connétable of St. Helier proposed by the Chief Minister, amendment 6(5). Are Members content to take that as read? It is a relatively lengthy amendment. Very well, Chief Minister.

3.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):

Again the same arguments as previously. Originally the Council of Ministers had opposed this simply on technical grounds but this was more to do with how we should do it rather than the strategic objective but, again, there is nothing in the amendment to which the Council of Ministers has any objection whatsoever. It is something that we would do anyway. To put it back into the plan simply adds detail to the plan which is supportive of the general direction of the plan and I am happy to propose the 5 bullet points set out by the Constable as being worthy of approval by the whole House. I propose the amendment to 6(5).

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

3.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Can I just address the first bullet point, please? When I was recently looking at some minutes to look at the situation in regards to the reciprocal health agreement to refresh my memory on health about that issue in 1999, when I was looking at the minutes on the opposite page my attention was drawn to the fact that the Health and Social Services Committee was making an argument for the air quality strategy. I laughed and remarked with the other people in the room - and I will not say who they were - how it seems to be that the States tend to kick things around and around and around and around and around. Ten years ago the Health and Social Services Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee were kicking around the air quality strategy. We recently finished a scrutiny review on Environmental Scrutiny where we identified that one of the failings of the last Strategic Plan was that there was no Minister that had taken on board the responsibility of the air quality strategy. Now, without getting into all of the arguments about air quality, we do know for certain climate change will decrease the air quality; it will increase the risks and the numbers of respiratory conditions within the community. If we continue to allow the Council of Ministers to kick this around for another 10 years without some Ministry taking responsibility and delivering an air quality strategy in short order, we are piling up for ourselves huge medical bills and huge numbers of people that are going to be unable and unfit to be productive in society. Some of the issues obviously are to do with some of the other bullet points in relation to a sustainable transport policy, but I implore Senator Le Sueur - implore him - before the end of the year for his Council to refresh their thinking on air quality, to review the recent Scrutiny report on the air quality and, please, deliver an air quality strategy that will help people in this Island breathe better air because it is not just a case of quality of life, there is a cost to the society because of the respiratory illnesses that are on the increase.

3.3 Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

The critique in the *J.E.P* of the strategic planning process by Mr. Body was, as we have discussed here this morning, quite a good one and he goes on about platitudes and hollow phrases, not that we have heard any of them obviously, but there is always that danger. All I would say, could the Chief

Minister give us a promise that there will be this air strategy plan, as the Deputy has called for, and that - and this is almost in tune with the *New Directions* song that we always sing, where are these *New Directions* - there will be a sustainable transport strategy. It is as simple as that. Can we get a promise that these 2 documents will appear, something achievable and practical as opposed to swapping hollow platitudes and phrases as Mr. Body said?

3.4 Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour:

Within the delegated responsibilities by the Minister for Planning and Environment, I note that there is responsibility that rests on my shoulders for the administration of the Water Pollution Law, Waste Management Law and a whole host of other laws. It seems only right that the Chief Minister, having accepted the first bullet point, that an air quality strategy for Jersey will be pushed and that I support the move to introduce an air quality strategy to Jersey as fast as possible. I think we do have the support of the Council of Ministers in this respect and although perhaps the request by the Constable of St. Helier to have the thing done and dusted by the end of 2009 might be somewhat difficult to meet, I certainly give an undertaking to the House that if I have anything to do with it I will bring forward air quality strategy as fast ... or assist in the bringing forward of an air quality strategy for Jersey as soon as possible.

3.5 Deputy A.K.F. Green, M.B.E., of St. Helier:

Like the previous speakers, my main concern is around the air quality and I think the residents of St. Helier, and particularly the residents in my district, have had to put up with some pretty awful air quality around Bellozanne. To be frank, if this was a private concern belching out the toxic fumes that we are currently belching out at Bellozanne they would be shut down and prosecuted. So in the strategy I would like to see real teeth to ensure that we comply with the latest environmental conditions with regard to air quality, not just words. Thank you.

3.6 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Yes, on a similar tack to some previous speakers I am concerned about the haste. I know that Deputy Le Hérissier said: "Let us have something practical, let us have something quick." Well, frankly, I would rather have something thorough, something, yes, that is achievable but also has proper goals in it that comply with - as we have heard in the report, I think - best international standards. I really do not want this to be quick and cheap and shoddy because these 2 issues of transport and air quality are really important and I fear that the reason that the air quality strategy has been dithered and dithered and dithered over is Bellozanne and the costs that might accrue if we had a serious air quality strategy which spelt out just how much we failed the people of the Island. So I think there is a little nettle that might have to be grasped even if there is a cost implication. Thank you.

3.7 The Deputy of Trinity:

Much has been said about the lack of air quality strategy and I agree with previous Members. For some reason the air quality strategy comes under my remit and with my former hat on as Assistant Minister for Environment I was keen that it should be pressed forward. So now I am in another seat I will endeavour to press it forward and get it at least to a draft fairly soon and be hopefully sent to Scrutiny before it is debated by the States. But to be realistic, by the time it has come through the States and implemented we are looking at end 2010-2011. But it is on my radar and I will press forward with it.

3.8 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I just want to echo the comments of Deputy Green and the Deputy of St. Mary. I have been analysing temperature readings from the Bellozanne incinerator, going through looking at how they have met the minimum temperature to make sure that no dioxins are coming out of the chimney. I can tell you they have failed on many occasions. I will be coming back to the States with results of this investigation, which I think is absolutely scandalous because we are poisoning the community

in First Tower. We cannot wait for an air strategy thing, this thing has been on the go for years, lots of things have been said, and the States are going to have to live up to its responsibilities because I think they are going to be liable for an awful lot of damages. Thank you.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I call on the Chief Minister to reply.

3.9 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

I am grateful to those who have spoken primarily on the questions of air quality strategy and sustainable transport. I think that the wording of the amendment from the Constable of St. Helier is, in fact, very clear and very good because to reassure Deputy Le Claire the proposal we now have within the plan is to set a date and a target that in 2009 we will debate and implement an air quality strategy. In 2009 we will debate and implement a sustainable transport policy. So we do set targets for both of those and in terms of what is in those activities the air quality strategy would include proposals for monitoring and publishing air pollution targets, policies and timescales. So I think the detail is there contained in the Strategic Plan. The fact that it is enshrined in the plan now rather than simply a nebulous idea I think should give reassurance to those Members who are concerned about the delay that this may have taken to get right.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sorry to interrupt the Chief Minister but I just wanted to know if maybe he could address a concern. The Minister for Health and Social Services has expressed a view that she will do her best to bring it forward but realistically we are looking at the end of 2011-2012. Given that the Chief Minister has just said that the Strategic Plan will enshrine the words: “debate and implement by the end of 2009” how does he see that already conflicting message going out to the public?

Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

I do not see it conflicting at all because what the bullet point says is to include targets, policies and timescales so it may well be that the timescale of this is that some bits can be implemented straight away, other bits may be implemented over a period. So I think the amendment is very helpful there in setting out those sort of requirements which we will need to address when we bring forward the detailed proposals. So, in summary, I welcome the extra clarity this amendment brings and I maintain the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The appel is called for. As the Chief Minister has summed up Members should be aware debate has come to an end; therefore, I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 34		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.A. Le Sueur		Connétable of St. Brelade		
Senator T.J. Le Main				
Senator B.E. Shenton				
Senator F.E. Cohen				
Senator J.L. Perchard				
Senator A. Breckon				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Senator A.J.D. Maclean				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy of St. Martin				

Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy D. De Sousa (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				

4. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 1(c) (P.52/2009 Amd.(6))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, there are no amendments to priority 14. We come to amendments to priority 15, firstly an amendment in relation to the list of priorities on page 8 which is the amendment 6(1)(c), once again in the name of the Connétable of St. Helier, and I ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words: “attached as appendix 1” insert the words: “except that in the list of priorities on page 8 (c) in priority 15” after the word “protect” insert the words “and enhance” and make consequential changes to the wording of the priorities where they appear in other parts of the plan.

4.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):

This is simply a matter of additional clarification in the wording. The report from the Council of Ministers makes it quite clear we are talking of things like improved sense of confidence and greater abilities so the fear of enhancement ... within the Council of Ministers ideas this amendment gives pursuant to the title. I am happy to accept the suggestion and I propose we add the words “and enhance”.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment? I put the amendment. Those Members in favour of adopting it, kindly show? Those against? The amendment is adopted.

5. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): second amendment paragraph 2 (P.52/2009 Amd.(2))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We now come to detailed amendments on priority 15, the first of which, under 65 on the list, is in the name of Deputy Shona Pitman, number 2 of the second amendment. I ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “attached as appendix 1” insert the words: “except that in priority 15 on page 30-31” in the section entitled “What we will do” in the fifth bullet point after the words “distinctive local culture and tradition” insert the words: “further still ensuring that young people are taught about local history, culture and the workings of Jersey’s political system is a key part of the personal, social and health education (P.S.H.E.) curriculum.”

5.1 Deputy S. Pitman:

In the interests of keeping this very quick and noting that the Council of Ministers are supporting this proposition, I will be very brief with this speech. From my own experience in researching for my Masters Degree some years ago I can say that it is absolutely essential that we devote more focus to what we are now certainly beginning to deliver. Our local history culture and crucially the workings of our political system simply must be given central recognition within what we teach for our young people. If we do not then the implications can only be detrimental to the long-term community of our Island. How can we criticise young people for not valuing such things if we do not even give them the information to allow them to do just that? So I make the proposition.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

5.2 The Deputy of St. Ouen:

Really it is just to say I fully support this amendment and would just like to reiterate the fact that much work has been done in this area and tribute should be paid to the many teachers across all our schools **[Approbation]** for the ongoing development of this particular part of the curriculum. Thank you.

5.3 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

It is an area I have been interested in for a long time and have been involved in some of these courses. There is no doubt obviously one of the developments we have seen in Jersey is that knowledge, particularly of local politics, of how things work, it was passed on in a sense hand to mouth through families where there was discussion at the dinner table and so forth. It was all done in an informal way. In some areas, particularly outside, I suppose the countryside that has broken down and we have a lot of people who find the way we do things here, not only people from outside but people from inside who find the way we do things perhaps rather strange and they need to be involved in a more formal way in learning about it. I think there are 2 things. There is teaching or working with people about the system and how it works, which can be very dry, can be very historical and we have got to be very careful about how we handle that, but we have got a lot of people who have not picked it up at their mother or father’s knee, so to speak, and there have to be new approaches to that. Secondly, there is the issue of how we get people interested in politics, particularly in a system which is a more personality-based system as opposed to what you might call an issues system. I am pleased to say there is going to be a scrutiny on this later in the year led by not an erstwhile Member but by a current Member of the panel who is very interested in this issue. So we will look at that. But I think the important thing to realise is - and the Minister I am sure is taking this on board - you cannot give people continually dry lectures, and I am very experienced in that having seen those eyes and those lids drooping and drooping and drooping. You cannot give people a whole series of this; you have to come up with innovative ways of doing that. Of course, it is worth repeating that is what, for example, Scrutiny is doing by contributing to civic education in the schools. Their involvement is practical, it is based around real case studies, real Ministers or real former Ministers appear, like Senators Shenton and Perchard, and they get

involved and students quiz them as politicians. It has got to be at that kind of level with that kind of fresh thinking, not just old formats. I think it is great that the Deputy is promoting this and that Deputy Reed is behind and I fully support it.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Could I just ask the Deputy whether he might be slightly conflicted on this particular amendment?
[Laughter]

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

No, I do not teach Jersey politics any more. [Laughter]

5.4 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Briefly just following from Deputy Le Hérissier, I just want to lay down some kind of marker that I will be watching this closely because of the experience at the last election. That is a kind of marker, it is not part of the process in a sense that is being put forward in this amendment about educating our young people so they are aware of the political process but, if after all that, one finds that it is next to impossible to arrange a public meeting where all students can meet all candidates then it is a little bit bizarre and pointless. So I do hope the Minister will take that on board and that is a kind of indicator of where we are with this in 2 or 3 years' time, whenever, that real progress has been made that in advance it is all sorted and that candidates in districts or Island-wide, whatever the format is, will be able to meet students in a way that really encourages them to participate.

5.5 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:

I would just like to congratulate the Deputy for bringing this amendment to the States Strategic Plan. I have been calling for more involvement from the schools and the States for a number of years and, as I have said on a number of occasions, I first came to the States when I was about 10 or 11 and had it in my mind that I wanted to come to the Chamber in the future and it worked out that it did occur that way. But I think in bringing this amendment it is going to improve the understanding among the community because the young people will educate their parents and that is the greatest way for it to filter through to the community. So I would like to congratulate her on a very important amendment to this Strategic Plan.

5.6 Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I was feeling like Senator Ferguson the other week, you just did not catch my eye before. I do not really want to say too much just I think it is a really positive move, not just on the political education but the culture. Having visited Jersey Heritage the other week with a few Scrutiny colleagues it is really important that young people get to value more of what we have got because we have got an awful lot. I cannot remember who touched on it, it might have been the proposer, but the real issue here I think is for young people ... we cannot really criticise them if we do not assist them to know what it is all about when it comes to politics. That is not indoctrinating them, that is just ... example, I ran a big question time project with some help a few years ago and it was just like a question time programme on T.V. (television), we had 6 politicians of the day. I think a couple of them are still here. But what that did, it made young people who did not see that they were remotely interested in politics because they thought it was all highbrow intellectual debate - obviously they had never listened to the States - [Laughter] but it was that their park bench had been taken away and that was a political issue. Or it was the time when the law had just changed on smoking, so one minute they had been quite legally smoking, suddenly they felt, without any debate or any consultation, the law changed. So I think I have got to support this and I am really pleased that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture is supporting this. I think the Deputy is right, there have been progressive moves to improve this but certainly, as the Deputy of St. Mary says, experience of the election shows we have got a long way to go. I hope all Members will support this. It is valid in every area, history, culture and politics. Thank you.

5.7 Senator P.F. Routier:

Yes, I will be supporting this and I am pleased that most Members recognise how important it is. I think it is obviously very useful for us to continue the work that was started by the previous Minister for Education, Sport and Culture who was a champion of ensuring that we had this topic brought to the fore. We are already experiencing children coming into the Chamber now, sitting in our seats and having their own debate. So I think there is a good sound basis for us to work from and we should take this forward.

5.8 Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just briefly, I too will be supporting this amendment. I just want to say something about the educational system of which I have recent experience because of my children. One of them is still in school in Jersey and another is at university. I found their experience during school was all about achievement of high grades. The schools were judged on the amount of G.C.S.E. (General Certificate of Secondary Education) and A level passes their students got, the students are judged on the quality of their G.C.S.E.s and A levels and the whole school ethic was about promoting high standards in that very important area. I do feel that education has to be more than academic qualifications and I am not sure ... this is why I have got a lot of sympathy for this amendment and am supportive of it. But teaching children how to use bank accounts, how to use money, how to be responsible in society, ethics, philosophy... - I know these are A level subjects, but very important pastoral care within schools - responsible members of society. I think we do need to have less emphasis on academic qualifications and more on preparing our young people for society and adulthood and it has to be more than just academic qualification. **[Approbation]** How we put that into the curriculum is a challenge for the new Minister but it is something that I think most parents would wish their schools to try and help them with, as parents, when bringing up their children. It is a very difficult experience, as many of us know, we are parents, and any assistance we can get from the Education Department and schools in this area has to be right. That is why I support this amendment and perhaps, had I really studied it, I may have even added a little to it. But I think Members understand what I am saying and looking around I see a lot of nods so, yes, great. Looking at the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture, this may be an area I quiz him on in 6 months' time.

5.9 Deputy A.K.F. Green:

Following on from the last speaker I can assure the Senator, as a Ministerial team, we are determined to measure all sorts of outputs in terms of our young people for too long. I am not knocking those that have got A stars and so on, but I think for too long we have only celebrated that success rather than looking at the rounded whole individual. We will be measuring the literacy skills of different people and their numeracy skills because I think that is important as well. We will be driving forward the need for more vocational training and possibly a transfer to vocational activities at 14 for those who do not want to follow an academic route. I entirely agree with the Senator and as a team we have already taken this on board and we are working very hard to do that. Can I just have a plug on culture as well? I am one of the unfortunate people, although Jersey born, never had the experience of the use of Jèrriais. Can I assure people that we really want to pursue that as well as one of our objectives in E.S.C. (Education, Sport and Culture). We want to see more use of it. We would like to see road signs with the proper Jersey names on there. So we will be pushing for that side of our culture as well. Thank you.

5.10 Deputy M. Tadier:

Very briefly, I think the actual amendment... it goes without saying that we will all support it, I think that is a given. I would just like to pick up on one of Senator Perchard's points. I think he raised the quite important issue of what I would term diversification within our education system. We hear about diversification in the economy but, of course, we do need to provide rounded individuals not just so they can enter the jobs market, but so that they can be fully trained-up for

life in general. I would just like to plant the seed at this moment of the International Baccalaureate which I know has already been introduced in some of the colleges and I know Hautlieu, for example, is piloting that project. I believe that really is something which is going to become more and more important as we enter what is ultimately going to be a period of uncertainty economically, and certainly we can see mobility within Europe which I think is a good thing and it really will produce more rounded individuals. Because at the moment there is a perception that the A level is pretty much on its last legs and that we do need to ... not everyone agrees with that but, let us face it, A levels are not for everyone and we know that in Europe it is pretty much standard that somebody will speak 2 or 3 languages and then on top of that they will have their own specialisation in education, so they might be an engineer, they might be a lawyer, a physicist, or whatever. But it goes without saying that they can speak 2 or 3 languages. Indeed, there is a saying that the illiterate of the future can only speak one language. So we want to move away from a system of monoglots to being polyglots. But that is only just one aspect and I am biased in that respect. So I will just leave that thought with Members because I am sure this is going to come on the agenda and I would hope that as part of the diversification of education we would really, when the time comes, fully back the International Baccalaureate as an alternative way forward.

5.11 Deputy A.E. Jeune of St. Brelade:

Would the Deputy in her summing up please confirm that what this amendment does is to incorporate the words of what is happening in the schools currently and thereby highlighting the Assembly's commitment to it? Thank you.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

I call on Deputy Shona Pitman to reply.

5.12 Deputy S. Pitman:

In answer to Deputy Jeune's question, the answer is yes but I think we also need to concentrate - and this is one of my big issues with politics being taught in schools - on teaching young people to be critical thinkers. I do think that is being done now but we certainly do need much more about the whole political system because I have studied the P.S.H.E. curriculum a short while ago and it was teaching young people how the U.K. voting system worked when it was not teaching people anything about the Jersey voting system. Let us not just stick to politics: these young people are also being taught about British history and not local history. When I was at school, something I left with was very little education in my own history and heritage and culture. The only thing I was taught about was the Occupation; the rest was about the U.K. or mainly English history. So we must get that into the curriculum. The problem is that the curriculum is very tight already, especially the P.S.H.E. curriculum. There are so many issues that are being put into it that it can only give little time to each issue and things like local culture and history are just getting a little bit of room in there. But that leads me to on to what Senator Perchard was saying about we do need more personal and social education to prepare young people for their future and taking responsibilities... but this is where the Youth Service comes in. This is where the schools should be working with the Youth Service because it has been proven - and I experienced it through my research - that young people have a tendency to open-up and be more honest with youth workers than teachers. Basically what was happening during my research is that young people were giving me answers they thought I wanted to hear. So there is definitely more work that needs to be done between schools and youth services. It is the whole environment that is less formal as well and, as we all know, young people in that kind of environment, an environment where they think they are having fun and things, they will learn quicker. It is a very effective method of teaching young people. I make the proposition and call for the appel, thank you.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

The appel is called for on this amendment. If Members are in their designated seats the Greffier will open the voting.

POUR: 37		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.A. Le Sueur				
Senator P.F. Routier				
Senator T.J. Le Main				
Senator B.E. Shenton				
Senator J.L. Perchard				
Senator A. Breckon				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of Grouville				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				
Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)				
Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy D. De Sousa (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				

6. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): eighth amendment paragraph 3 (P.52/2009 Amd.(8))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

We come now to an amendment in the name of Deputy Le Claire. This is the eighth amendment, the third one of those, number 366 on the list. I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “attached as appendix 1” insert the words “except that in priority 15 on pages 30-31” in the section entitled “What we will do” after the second bullet point insert the following additional bullet point: “We will work to improve the public trust in government and establish a system of greater transparency, public participation and collaboration to strengthen our democracy

and promote efficiency and effectiveness in government; introduce time limits for the public release of government information with appropriate safeguards in relation to these rules to protect matters such as the privacy of individuals in appropriate circumstances.”

6.1 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

The Council has accepted this amendment so not to put it too shortly but quite succinctly, what I am trying to do is to open up the activities of government and the accessibility of information in general. The Council has accepted the first part in relation to context of priority 15 protecting our unique culture and identity. I must confess that when I wrote it I was trying to tie it into the amendment that was accepted in regards to the aim: “Create a response of government that provides good and efficient services and sound infrastructure and which embraces a progressive culture of openness transparency and accountability to the public.” I do not know if the Council of Ministers or the Chief Minister has a difficulty with that. That was what my thinking was; maybe it was not particularly correct. Indeed, the second comment from the Council of Ministers referred to the fact that the second part of my amendment would have been more appropriate within the Business Plan. I must confess that I am a little bit at a loss to understand that so if possible maybe I can sit down with the Chief Minister some time over the next few days, or hopefully before the Business Plan comes, so I can appreciate exactly what it is they are saying to me because I am a little bit at a loss to understand that. Without making it too short, that is the aim, it is really to help to support the total aim of the Strategic Plan and I am very willing to move things in the Business Plan that would help this if the Chief Minister can find time for me. I make the amendment.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Is the amendment seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment? I put the amendment. Those Members in favour of adopting it, kindly show? Against? The amendment is adopted.

7. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009): sixth amendment paragraph 1(d) (P.52/2009 Amd(6))

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Finally, in relation to the amendments to certain amendments of the Connétable of St. Helier to which there is an amendment in the name of the Council of Ministers to insert a new priority 16, Chief Minister, would it be logical with Members’ agreement for you to propose amendment 6(1)(d) which inserts the priority together with the sixth amendment of the Constable of St. Helier which gives detail, but propose it as amended by the Council of Ministers’ alternative wording, which I understand the Constable is happy. Are you content to propose it?

7.1 Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister - rapporteur):

I think that makes sense, yes. I am happy to take it as read as well.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Perhaps I will just ask the Greffier to read 6(1)(d) which gives the title of the priority without the full detail of the wording.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

After the words “attached as appendix 1” insert the words: “except that in the list of priorities on page 8” after priority 15 insert a new priority as follows: “16. Support the development of arts and heritage in Jersey and make consequential changes to the wording of the priorities where they appear in other parts of the plan.”

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

Very well, so just to confirm, Chief Minister, you are proposing that amendment together with the full wording of that priority as amended by the Council of Ministers' own amendment which amplifies the Constable's original wording?

Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

That is correct. One could go on putting priorities indefinitely but this is certainly one which we entirely endorse, indeed in the original priority 15 we talked about needing to preserve and enhance our rich heritage so what this is doing is putting it as a separate priority in its own right. The Council of Ministers is happy to accept that and in doing so the Council of Ministers felt it only right that we should put in sections like "Why we must do this" and "What we will do" and indicators to put this amendment on an equal footing with the previous 15. The amendment which the Council of Ministers does simply achieves that in a way which is consistent with the objectives of the Constable of St. Helier. Just as the Council of Ministers is happy to accept the amendment of the Constable of St. Helier, so I understand the Constable of St. Helier is equally willing to accept the further amendment of the Council of Ministers. So it seems as though we are in total accord over this one and I am happy to make the proposal on priority 16.

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

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

7.2 Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:

Just a few quick words. As Deputy Trevor Pitman said, Scrutiny visited Heritage recently and we will be visiting the arts community also. What is striking with these bodies is the phenomenal work they do, the phenomenal dedication and commitment, but the fact is obviously they are not top of the pile when it comes to financing and there is no doubt with Heritage there is a moment of truth because it was a system predicated on the basis of tourist visitor financing. That, of course, has been in rapid decline and that poses some real problems for the Heritage bodies and for all the work they do, let alone just maintain sites for tourists. There is no doubt, while the problem is not of the same nature or the challenge is not of the same nature in the arts community, they do phenomenal work. I think as an Island the variety of facilities we have from the Opera House, the Jersey Arts Centre, the artists' group in places like Westmount... the variety of provision we have is incredible, but there is no doubt there are issues there and I know the Minister of Education is struggling, for example, with the role of the St. James Centre and scaffolding and so forth. Well, he is not struggling with the scaffolding but he is **[Interruption]** ... it does, yes. It is a problem he is trying to get to grips with. So, just to congratulate those bodies who do phenomenal work, but let us not disguise the fact that there are real funding pressures behind the work they are doing. Thank you.

7.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

I welcome the amendment that has been brought as presented by the Constable of St. Helier simply because up until this point in the document there was not any real mention of arts or culture in the real sense of the word. We have 15, which I will go through in a moment, which talks about our unique cultural identity in some kind of quasi Jersey context. But there has been an absolute disregard in the whole document for the arts for their own sake and we have talked about the economy before and how it is essential that Jersey keeps on making money hand over fist. But essentially this is not what civilised societies are about. We live for our leisure time and it is things like the arts, whether it be music or the visual arts or whatever manifestation they may take, is what we are all about as civilised and advanced human beings. That is presumably why we work. We work for the leisure time; it is not the other way around. So that is why I commend the Constable for bringing these things. But I do want to bring us back slightly to the previous part, number 15, just to really go through it. In some ways this may be better suited for the actual subsequent debate but I do believe it is relevant in the sense that in the context of why we should support the Constable's amendment here. So if we look at the first part - and this is really something which I

felt very strongly about, this whole cultural part - there is language used in this... for example we are talking about moving towards a society that has an improved sense of self-confidence; it is really language like this which is why I think a lot of people, a lot of Members, cannot take this document seriously at all. I mean these are completely meaningless words. It is debatable whether there is any such thing as a unique identity or some kind of collective ... or self-confidence, this is the next word. This is all meaningless. Is there any suggestion at the moment, because it says we have to protect our unique cultural identity, that this is under threat? First of all, if we do not even have any kind of commonality of language as to what that unique culture might be then how can we even strive to protect it? Moving slightly further down, and I am working from the old document, which is the original ...

The Greffier of the States (in the Chair):

You will get the chance to make these comments in the debate, Deputy, so please relate them to the amendments.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Okay, I will probably reserve my right to do that in the main debate then, although it may be a rather more drawn-out speech. So I will simply say that I welcome this because effectively 15 on its own has nothing to do with culture in the real sense of the word. It has to do with protecting Jersey's identity as a pirate state which it has had, protecting rights which may or may not be dubious, and later on it talks about basically if Jersey needs to go independent so that we can carry on in our piracy that is what we will do. So I believe that the amendment of the Connétable of St. Helier is much needed and on that basis I will be supporting it.

7.4 Deputy T. Pitman:

I can be very quick. I just want to reiterate everything that Deputy Le Hérissier said. Having visited Jersey Heritage, it is certainly something I am really keen to help. I feel I have not been as aware of that as I should have been so I will definitely be badgering the Minister for Treasury and Resources, I think, in the near future. I am obviously going to support this. I echo some of what Deputy Tadier said, but something I would have liked assurances on, that says it is brought by the Constable of St. Helier because I would have liked to know if I am going to vote for this I just hope that does not mean I have to sit through any plays of what he wrote because that might be a step too far for me.

7.5 The Deputy of St. Ouen:

I am indeed pleased that the Constable of St. Helier has drawn specific attention to the development of arts and heritage in our Island by proposing the insertion of this new priority in the Strategic Plan. He rightly points out the emphasis given to the cultural strategy in the last plan and it is important that we recognise that this continues to play a major part in the ongoing development of our Island's identity. I would like to add, as has been mentioned before, that although some would believe no specific mention has been made in the draft plan of arts and heritage, under priority 15 there is a commitment to reinforce a strong sense of local identity both internally and externally through policies designed to promote the Island's distinctive local culture and tradition. The wording might be classed as ambiguous; however, it was designed to cover the further development of the cultural strategy which is now embedded in the day-to-day business of the States and particularly my department. That said, I fully support the view that arts, heritage and culture are central to the life of the community and need to be recognised as such. We have, as others have already mentioned, a rich and diverse heritage which should be celebrated and nurtured as this is, indeed, the main tool used in shaping who we are and what we want to become. It is easy to take for granted the wealth of artistic talent found on our small Island, together with the many voluntary organisations and individuals who, year after year, help support this particular area. In my view, far more recognition needs to be given to this group. Equally, we are fortunate that our main

cultural organisations work tirelessly to ensure all aspects of arts and heritage can be enjoyed by young and old alike. I accept that funding is always going to be an issue; however, somehow a balance needs to be found that allows us to cherish our past and create a future that we all would like to be part of. There are areas I would like to develop further and my intention will be to identify these within the department's annual business plan. In particular, I have been extremely impressed with the creative ability of many of our young people and I would like to promote a greater awareness of their work. Opportunities exist to develop better working relationships with other States departments on a day-to-day level and I have been much encouraged by the willingness of the Minister for Planning and Environment to include local craftsmen in a delivery of 'Percentage for Art.' For all of these reasons, I have great pleasure in supporting this amendment and thank the Constable for identifying the need to underline the previous States commitment to the development of arts and heritage in our Island. Thank you.

7.6 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I would like to support the amendment and I would like to congratulate the Constable of St. Helier for bringing this important amendment into the Strategic Plan. The Minister for Education, Sport and Culture has just spoken about a rich diverse heritage which should be nurtured and secured. As this amendment particularly puts the emphasis on a key indicator to be developed by Education, Sport and Culture then I trust that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture will strive on a continual basis to implement this key strategy. I did mention on a couple of occasions in questions to the Minister, and I have done this with a number of Ministers on issues, and regretfully I have not really had much good feedback which does not engender very good co-operation from independent Members or Back-Benchers, I must say. Maybe it is early days but I did inquire on a couple of occasions on the possibility of the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture investigating a local scheme for visitors to important heritage sites as is done in other communities and I expressed myself to him in the manner that having visited recently a heritage site in Portsmouth I noted that locals within that area were able to produce documentation that proved their residency in that area and were able to receive access to the sites at a reduced rate. Now, footfall is an important feature of any heritage site in relation to the services that are provided, perhaps by private enterprise, to support those organisations. Unless the States is willing to continually shore-up the Jersey Heritage Trust, which I have questioned they do, we need to encourage footfall on these important sites. On a number of occasions I have expressed concern about the falling footfall in relation to Elizabeth Castle. I have also expressed concern from a heritage perspective about what we are building in its vicinity. If the Puddleducks are to be financially viable, and if the services within the castle are to be financially viable as private enterprise, then we need to increase footfall. So I would request that the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture looks at this, possibly next week even, if possible, or the week after or the week after or the week after ... no, shaking your head. When then, through the Council of Ministers, through the Chief Minister, will the pressure come? Where will it come from? Because it is an important site and we are not giving it the due regard we should. I would also like to congratulate Senator Cohen on his drive to improve the statues in Jersey, to give us a feature within Jersey that will improve tourism, to come to look at works of art. Also, Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your efforts in relation to the art gallery. I would hope that as part of this amendment the Council of Ministers picks this up because we have a wealth of art in Jersey that is disbursed throughout the Island that really does need to be accessible to all.

Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

Just a minor point of correction for the Deputy, the Puddleducks are the previous company that operated the service. The present company, I believe, is Castle Ferries now owned by Heritage.

7.7 Senator T.J. Le Main:

Just one point I would like to make, is that Jersey is a small country of much international presence and importance. It still is an opportunity for people on holiday to visit this Chamber and I think we should do a lot more, because I speak to people who come to Jersey who would love ... if they knew that the parliament was sitting they would come and watch and see. But there is nothing outside that really indicates to the visitors of this Island - many paths down these roads - that the States are in session and the public are welcome to come and see this Assembly. I think we have got a lot to be proud of in Jersey with this Assembly, we might not all agree and disagree but you see the chaos in other countries, including the U.K., when they are shouting and screaming and manic behaviour. We have got a lot to be proud of and I would like to see much more effort made in promoting this Chamber and our presence around the world by at least having something outside that says: "We are open, come and see us."

The Bailiff:

I am sure the Greffier will take note of that, Senator. [Laughter]

7.8 Deputy A.T. Dupré:

I think we are extremely lucky to have such a diverse and yet unique heritage. We must nurture and protect this culture for our future generations. I think, too, that we often take for granted our wonderful heritage and all that it involves, whether it be in buildings, traditions, or our cultural background. I think it is also imperative not to underestimate the importance of Jèrriais, and this must be kept alive. To this end the Department is encouraging the learning of our language by a few dedicated teachers. More and more children are now learning Jèrriais and it is hoped to include this as a G.C.S.E. in time. We are so lucky to have such a thriving art and cultural society and many of our young people go on to be extremely successful in the arts in its many forms. I would, therefore, urge all Members to accept this amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Do any other Members wish to speak?

7.9 Deputy A.K.F. Green:

Just picking up on a couple points. Again as a team we are absolutely dedicated to ensuring our culture and heritage is preserved, and not only preserved but promoted. Picking up on the point that Deputy Le Claire made about footfall, one of the difficulties the Jersey Heritage Trust - who run the castles and monuments - have is the huge fall in visitors from other countries; the people, the holidaymakers. That has been one of the difficulties. We already give schoolchildren free access and pensioners free access and while that is important, and I concur with what he is saying, what we need to do is to get people ... what the Trust needs to do is to get people in that are going to be paying, that can contribute towards the upkeep of these very valuable things. That does not mean that Government does not have a role to play. In fact, I think in the short time that this Ministerial team has been in place we have probably done more to support and encourage the Jersey Heritage Trust than previous people. So I will be supporting the amendment but it is not a simple question of just getting more people in, we have got to get more people who are paying in. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

I call upon the rapporteur to reply.

7.10 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

I thank all those who have spoken and I think some people have recognised the difficulty of splitting this between priority 15 and priority 16 because, in fact, we have been speaking about arts, heritage and culture and quite rightly they are all part of an interlinking activity. I certainly take the point made by Deputy Le Hérisier about funding, which I think has been echoed by others as well. That is a challenge. He suggests not so much of a challenge for the arts as for the heritage. I think

it is a challenge for all areas and I would not single out any one as being any easier than the other. I think what does give me a great deal of comfort is the willingness of Members of this House generally to give this adequate support and, indeed, enthusiastic support. That, I think, is further reflected in the attitude of the Ministerial team in Education, Sport and Culture. I do not normally like to pick out individual Ministers or individual people within the States, but I think the enthusiasm which that team has given to putting equal emphasis on Sport and Culture as to Education highlights the fact that we do have a balanced team anxious to promote, as we the Council of Ministers are, the development of arts and heritage in Jersey. I thank Members who have spoken in terms of matters like Deputy Le Claire talking about footfall. Those are some of the activities in the “What we have to do” which we need to develop as time goes on. But I think the commitment is certainly there, it is highlighted and enhanced by this additional amendment, this additional priority, and I have pleasure in maintaining the amendment.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Can we have the appel, please?

The Bailiff:

The appel, yes. I invite any Members in the precinct who wish to vote to return to their seats. I invite the Greffier to open the voting, which is for or against the amendment of the Constable of St. Helier.

POUR: 35		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.A. Le Sueur				
Senator P.F. Routier				
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf				
Senator B.E. Shenton				
Senator F.E. Cohen				
Senator A. Breckon				
Senator S.C. Ferguson				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy of St. Martin				
Deputy R.G. Le Hérisssier (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy S. Pitman (H)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy M. Tadier (B)				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy of St. Mary				
Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)				
Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)				
Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)				

Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy D. De Sousa (H)				
Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)				

8. States Strategic Plan 2009 – 2014 (P.52/2009)

The Bailiff:

That completes the amendments to the Strategic Plan and the debate returns to the plan itself. Does any Member wish to address the Assembly? Senator Routier.

8.1 Senator P.F. Routier:

Well, it has been a long and protracted debate but on reflection I do think it has been very worthwhile. I think there have been some really good debates. I know some people have found it rather tiresome but I do think we have covered some extraordinarily good subjects and I think we probably are now going to be in the position where everybody has had an opportunity to have their say and, hopefully, everybody will be in a position to get fully behind the whole of the Strategic Plan. So I do hope that will be the case. From this position, the Council of Ministers will obviously move from this debate on to deciding how we are going to fulfil all those priorities and aims and how the money is going to be used; how the Council of Ministers are going to come forward with spending that money. I would just like to take an opportunity to remind the Council of Ministers of some of the commitments that are being made. My particular interest is in and around social issues and the aim is to enable everyone to have the opportunity to achieve their full potential. I hope the Council of Ministers will not forget that. Then moving on to the priorities, priorities 8 and 9; 8 is to increase social inclusion by encouraging and supporting people to help themselves and 9 is to enhance support services to vulnerable children, families and others at risk. I only highlight those because I know that the Council of Ministers in the next few days is going to be thinking hard about how to allocate the available funds. I know they will have some very, very tough choices to make. I would ask them to consider the social issues to be a very high priority at this current time. I know we have a lot of priorities which do cross-culture and all of those sorts of things but I think we are going through a period at this present time, of our cycle of initiatives, where I believe that social issues should come to the fore. In particular, I do declare an interest. You may be aware that I chair an organisation, Les Amis, which does provide homes for people with learning disability in the community, and at this particular time they are going through very difficult times in keeping the service at a level that we would want to keep it to. So I would ask the Council of Ministers when they are thinking about the funding issues for the future to keep in mind that people with learning disabilities within our Island do need additional support.

8.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sir, I imagine you are going to miss this quite a bit. This will probably be your last States Strategic Plan that you are presiding over. I, for one, feel that there have been times in this Assembly where I have tried to put amendments into things or propositions before the Policy and Resources Committee and then subsequently the Council of Ministers and they have just been dismissed out of hand. I feel for the first time - and it is a refreshing change - the Council of Ministers has taken on board the things that it could take on board, not just my own but other people's, and has accepted them wherever they thought they were acceptable and have not put up vociferous resistance to things and allowed debate on them. I did not get everything I wanted to get done. I narrowly lost on the Children's Commissioner but I am very grateful for the Council of Ministers who have accepted to extend the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child to Jersey within the States Strategic Plan timeframe. It is an important decision that this Island is making and it certainly is going to be an historic day. I am glad that it has been agreed within your time, Sir. I thought this morning and last night, as one does from time to time in politics, of whether or not I could support this plan and get behind it even though some things that were not supported I

lost. In the past, probably immaturity, I have voted against things *en masse* when I did not agree them and I think that really reflects, when I think back on it, probably immaturity on myself. I think maturing in politics... and I do not know how much more I want to mature in it, but having matured into politics now I feel that it is time to get behind the Council of Ministers on the States Strategic Plan. I implore all Members to back it because life is never 100 per cent the way that one wants it to be and you have to live with people and you have to live with different views. I think the community needs us to get behind this States Strategic Plan. I think the Council of Ministers would appreciate it if we got behind them. It does not mean to say that we are always going to be in agreement but this is an opportunity today of delivering a vote which sends out a signal of unity to the community. So I am going to support it and congratulate the Council of Ministers for doing it and also compliment them on their discipline. The Chief Minister remarked during the beginning of the third or fourth day, or week, of the debate that he had asked his Council of Ministers and Assistant Ministers to curtail their speeches wherever possible and the Council of Ministers and their Assistant Ministers have curtailed them significantly. In fact, perhaps a little bit to their detriment because they have not said things when perhaps they have wanted to. It seems the attitude of the Chamber was coming across pretty much from the Back-Bench side. We know there are more voices than just the Back-Benchers to be heard. I would like to thank the Chief Minister and the Council for having let us have a say on this important plan.

8.3 Deputy T.A. Vallois of St. Saviour:

As a new Member experiencing debate on the Strategic Plan for the first time, I would have to disagree with Deputy Le Claire on the basis that I find this whole situation of 5 days quite appalling. The Corporate Services Panel were asked to scrutinise this document. However, after reading it many times I could not understand how something so woolly, as Deputy Egré put it, could be scrutinised. Understandably this has had to come to the House as per the States of Jersey Law 2005 but maybe the Law is wrong. Maybe we should not be debating a manifesto of the Council of Ministers for the next 3 to 5 years for those Ministers to focus their minds. Now, us Back-Benchers do appreciate being able to have an input on this but does it really need to come to the House? Can it not come as something such as a report? To me it seems like a Christmas wish list and just to brush up on the last Strategic Plan that was brought forward. What I saw from this was a chicken as if it had been plucked, the feathers are left behind and the chicken has run away. The meat and the bones are not there. I understand the Strategic Plan is the “whats” and not the “hows” but we should be debating the hows because we are here to do something, not speak with words but take action. The biggest problem I had with the Strategic Plan was the population policy. There is no general consensus on the policy and the figures that were provided were based on a baseline 2005, which does throw the figures out significantly by about 3,000-4,000. I would ask, therefore, for the Migration Advisory Group to seriously bring forward, as soon as possible, the Migration Law because it is something that we do need to continue to go forward with the population in Jersey. On that note, I will say finally that I am unable to vote in favour of the Strategic Plan because of the reasons I have just mentioned and also because I am firmly of the belief that there should be a report of the Council of Ministers to go away and get on with. At the end of the day, we do not have a crystal ball, we do not know what will happen, things are always changing. This is a perfect example of why the States is not a business and shows that they have a long way to go to achieve any form of an appropriate corporate approach that will work for Jersey.

8.4 Deputy S. Power of St. Brelade:

I have also listened with some patience and indeed some interest at times to this Strategic Plan, but I have to say - as I did say last week - that I have reservations on the delivery of this plan. It is largely an aspirational document, it has no legal bearing on the Assembly, and I again repeat what others have said that it is an incredible investment in the time of the Assembly. I really feel that the Council of Ministers must look at streamlining the delivery of this plan because for me it has not worked this time and it did not work 3 years ago. I have learnt 2 things from the process of dealing

with the amendments. The first thing is that the Strategic Plan in its current form has got little or nothing to do with the challenges that face the Minister for Housing or the Assistant Minister for Housing in the next 3 years. There are a whole series of challenges there that will come before the Assembly in due course. The second thing I have learned from this - and I am sure Members will agree - was to appreciate the absolute professionalism of the office of the Greffier and the Deputy Greffier and the Assistant Greffier in the way they carried out the structure of this debate **[Approbation]**, their forbearance when challenged at times and, indeed, their patience throughout the - how many days, has it been 4 and a bit - days of this debate.

8.5 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I am sorry to hear from the Assistant Minister for Housing and from Deputy Vallois that they do not think that this is an important and necessary debate. In our political system, we do not have party politics. I am one that believes that the Island is better served by a non-party political system. We are seeing party politics around the world have a shadow cast upon them and different systems of coalitions, different systems of single transferable votes being even suggested in the United Kingdom which are much more along the lines of a model of democracy which attempts to reach some consensus among the elected individuals. I regret and would ask her - Deputy Vallois - to reconsider the remarks that she made. We do not have a general election which returns one party and, therefore, there is a direct connection between the outcome of the election and the direction of the government that has been elected. We have an interim step in Jersey and the interim step is the Strategic Plan. I sometimes think from the Ministerial side that the Council of Ministers cannot win. On the one hand we cannot win by bringing forward the plan on which the Island is going to be governed in the next 3 to 4 years - I will come to the substance of the plan in a second - on the other hand, if we were to simply publish that plan we would be criticised. It is absolutely right that this Assembly decides every 3 years and has a proper debate - a detailed debate - on the individual components of what the government plan should be. To Deputy Power, I say to him, look at the Strategic Plan. He said, I think, that he thought that it was not much use to him, and there has been previous suggestions that the last Strategic Plan did not deliver anything. I would ask Deputy Power and others to look at the performance indicators, to look at the reports that have been published every 6 months by the previous Council of Ministers that reported on the delivery of new services, better arrangements of the States of Jersey. This plan is exciting. This plan further improves services, further improves efficiencies, delivers new things to our resident community, and I hope the Assembly supports this plan because it is the mandate on which the Council of Ministers will go about a work programme. We will deal with some of the detail of that in the Business Plan but, effectively, the States Assembly is being asked in this Strategic Plan to sanction the general direction of the Island, and I think that that is a good day for democracy in Jersey after having that debate. I also think that this plan, like the last one, will do as much as it can to improve the lives of all Islanders in improving services and providing better facilities. I think where the Strategic Plan is an improvement on the last one is that it has been more, I think, transparent - I hesitate to use the word "honest" - on the issue of resources. Some people will not agree, but having a Strategic Plan that did not deal with the issue of population was inappropriate. If the States decided to cap the population then there would be a resource requirement and to settle the issue of population in the Strategic Plan has to be a much better way, has to be a much more honest way, to deal with the real issues of land and labour and cash in any allocation of resources. On the issue of resources, clearly, and in the short-term and long-term sections of the Strategic Plan, the resources issues are very clearly set out. The challenges are enormous and that is why the Council of Ministers needed, and I hope gets, the mandate that it needs to deliver a programme of efficiency and saving throughout the public sector. That is going to be necessary because we are going to have to find money from existing services - from more efficient services - to deliver some of the aspirations that the plan has, and I know some of the aspirations that many Members have. This plan gives the Council of Ministers the mandate to work on improvements to incentive to work, something that I know that all Members of the Assembly, and I know Members of the J.D.A.

(Jersey Democratic Alliance) and other people, think is important. We think that is important, and this gives us the mandate to improve that. It gives us the mandate to work on long-term care and putting in place arrangements for an ageing society. We heard last night on the national broadcasts in the U.K. a funding deficit in the N.H.S. (National Health Service) of £8-10 million. In our context that is about £60 million. That is about a deficit in the N.H.S. equivalent to £50 million. I am not saying that the health service here has a structural deficit of £50 million in 3 years' time. I am aware that there are serious funding issues that we are going to have to face up to in relation to the health care. The long-term resource structure, the long-term resource area of the Strategic Plan, says that we will focus our attention on 5 issues, but 3 really important issues as far as resources is concerned. We will debate, and this Assembly will be invited to make decisions to sort out and to put on a long-term footing (a) the ageing society, (b) the health service, and (c) liquid waste strategy. That is the mandate that the Assembly is being asked to vote on in the Strategic Plan to instruct the Council of Ministers to work on. Those challenges are going to be enormous. We are going to first of all have to extinguish all possible savings and efficiencies out of our existing expenditure and then we may well have to come back when economic conditions allow to come back and share with the public some of the requirements of having to pay higher amounts of money for those areas of health spending and finding a solution to the current, frankly, unacceptable unfairness of liquid waste where there are people who get a mains drains connection for nothing and other people have to pay. I think this is an exciting Strategic Plan. I think that after 3 years we will have improved the Island. We will have improved the aspiration of the Island. We will have improved services and we will have delivered efficiency, and I hope all Members will give the Council of Ministers the mandate on so to do.

Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:

A point of clarification about what the Minister for Treasury and Resources has just said. He commented about working on efficiencies until there are not any left, but has he not also previously said that there are always areas which can become more efficient?

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

I am happy to clarify that to Deputy Maçon. My view is that all organisations never stop finding efficiencies and after this 3-year plan there will be further improvements and efficiencies to be delivered. What I am saying is that for the next 3 years there is a programme of efficiency, of prioritisation that has to be delivered. Will that be the end of it? Will that be the end at the Atlantis that we have found all the money for the services that we want to deliver? It never ends. Government is a process of constant improvement and constant efficiency. Something, if I may say, I do not think has been certainly seen in some departments. There are some departments in the States that have had money put, quite rightly, into their budget but we have not challenged them on prioritisation and efficiencies, and the discussions at the Council of Ministers tomorrow are going to be designed to deliver just that; efficiencies which never end.

8.6 Senator J.L. Perchard:

I know Members have expressed publicly, as Deputy Power and Deputy Vallois just have, and many privately, their frustration over the procedure for developing a Strategic Plan for the lifetime of this Government. I share a part of that frustration but I wonder, and I suggest to Members, this is probably the only way to do it. That this Assembly, for the lifetime of this Assembly... we need to set out our priorities and goals and albeit they have been described as fluffy and non specific, but our priorities as itemised on page 8 of the Strategic Plan are quite clear and simple, and I think for the States to say these are priorities and now for the Council of Ministers to be charged with delivering them is perhaps the only way to do it. I will be interested to talk privately with Deputy Vallois or Deputy Power and others as to how else we can set about this. Perhaps amendments to the Strategic Plan should be accompanied by at least 10 or 15 signatories to ensure that the States are not wasting their time on amendments that are destined to fail, but how else does this House

give directives to the Council of Ministers other than through this debate, albeit it does last for days? If Members do take the priorities on page 8 and drill down into them, while they are general I can suggest to Deputy Power if Housing are looking for work they can look at priority one: “Support the Island community through the economic downturn.” A role for Housing there. Priority 6: “Provide for the ageing population.” A very important role for Housing there. Priority 7: “Protect the public and keep our community safe.” Again, Housing need to be involved in that priority. Priority 10: “Maintain and develop the Island’s infrastructure.” Very important role for Housing and his Minister and he. Priority 11: “Enhance and improve healthcare provision and promote a healthy lifestyle.” Again, Housing have an important role to play in the provision of that priority. “Protect and enhance our natural and built environment”, priority 13, and: “Adequately house the population”, priority 14. Plenty for Housing there, Deputy Power.

Deputy S. Power:

We are already doing most of that without needing to spend 5 days on the Strategic Plan.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Similarly with Health. Plenty there for Health. Priority 6: “Provide for an ageing population” and then priority 7: “Protect and enhance the community safety.” Plenty there. So what each Ministry now will need to do is take away these priorities and see how they can deliver them. That is the role for the Council of Ministers and the role for us in the Assembly now is to hold Ministers responsible for the delivery of these priorities. How else do we do this? I certainly would be reluctant just to receive a Strategic Plan from 10 Ministers after their knees-up in Hotel de France and be told this is it. No, I think we have to drill down, dissect, understand, and albeit it is a long process, what else? What is the other mechanism? I support the process, albeit it is tough. I support the plan and I support the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers’ initiatives before the plan was produced in draft form to consult with Members and the public. There were many opportunities for Members to attend consultation at St. Paul’s and Société where a very early draft of the plan was put out and Members were given the opportunity to pick it apart and direct the Council. I think the process is tough, it is every 3 years, but what are we here to do? What are we here to do? This is strategic planning. It is a great opportunity for the whole House to give the directive to the Council of Ministers as to what our Strategic Plan must be. So with that, I support the plan and recommend to Members that they do so as well.

8.7 Deputy D.J. De Sousa of St. Helier:

We have constantly been told that this is a high level document. You would not sign a legal document unless you totally agreed with it. Now I know that my amendments were accepted unanimously but, as a whole, there are a lot of issues that still have not been accepted by this House to be implemented in this plan. The main one is the contentious issue of population. This is not going to go away. Nearly every day we read in the paper letters from concerned Islanders raising issues that we do not exactly know how many are here, raising issues that where should we be with the level of accepted inward migration. It is for this reason, because I cannot agree with the whole of the Strategic Plan, that I feel I cannot sign up to this. I will be voting against the overall plan.

8.8 Senator B.E. Shenton:

I would just like to say that I am glad I am not in business with Senator Perchard. [Laughter] If I was a running a business ...

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So am I. [Laughter]

Senator B.E. Shenton:

... selling potatoes no doubt he would come back with a strategic plan that just said: “Sell lots of potatoes” whereas I would be expecting a strategic plan of how we were going to sell the potatoes,

how we were going to get there, who we were going to sell them to, what the costs were going to be, what the environmental impact was going to be, what the employment implications were, what the effects of increase in production were, what the transport was, and so on. This is just a very wishy-washy document and if you read back through the old Strategic Plan it is absolutely incredible the number of things this House did not achieve that was in the old Strategic Plan which under the new Strategic Plan they are not charged to achieve with any timeframe. A lot of them fall within wishy-washy statements. They can say: "Oh, well, we are still doing that" but it is just there for them to do as and when they so wish. Personally I do not think this gives the Council of Ministers a mandate to do anything, to be honest with you, because you can interpret more or less anything you want from the plan and, to be honest with you, if I should die and go to heaven and if St. Peter meets me at the gates he may well say: "Well, I hope you had a good productive life and I hope you did not waste any time" and I will say: "Yes, I believe I did have a good productive life" and St. Peter will probably say: "Well, what about the Strategic Plan debate [Laughter] in 2009? Go away." Although I will support it I certainly will not read anything into it, if any Member of the Council of Ministers stands up in future debates and says that we sanctioned anything, because in my opinion we have not sanctioned anything at all.

8.9 Deputy P.J. Rondel of St. John:

This is the first Strategic Plan I have sat through. I was not in the House 3 years ago, but given that to me it is a wish list for the Ministers and those Members who have added to it by amendments, because I believe over the next year, 2 years, much is going to change within the world as we know it, and therefore I - and I did say earlier on - I believe that we should have been waiting at least another year, 18 months, to bring this. You had another couple of years left on your original Strategic Plan. Yes, I know the law says that the Council of Ministers have to bring a proposition to the House but in this particular format I would have expected the Ministers to bring a document asking for the existing plan to be continued with until we saw the political climate change, or the climate in general with the way the world has gone. But they have not done so and we have spent some 5 days debating this, and I think there would be plenty more changes to come over the next year or 2. I sincerely hope that when the next Strategic Plan comes to this House it comes in a slightly different format because if it is the Ministers' Strategic Plan it should not be open to all these amendments on the floor of the House because it becomes a Strategic Plan of this Chamber, at the end of the day, and I would like to see the Ministers stand all for by any future Strategic Plan. They should, in my view, lay it and debate the actual Strategic Plan but not accept amendments on the floor of this Chamber. That is my personal thinking and I sincerely hope at any future debate on a Strategic Plan the Chief Minister takes that on board and comes up with some other format. Maybe even in the form of a report and the Council will stand all for on that particular report. I know you will not be around in 3 years' time to be sitting in that Chair as the presiding officer, but that said, I would have thought that listening to 2 Strategic Plans, Sir, you would be quite happy to leave your successor take over in that particular position. I think I have said sufficient but I do have concerns, not only for Jersey but for all of Europe and the rest of the world over the next couple of years, and I do not know if this will fulfil what will be required.

8.10 The Deputy of St. Mary:

My remarks are prefaced very well by what the Deputy of St. John said, but I will be taking a slightly different tack from, I think, what other people have been saying. I just want to start out by making my basic position quite clear. The flaws of this plan are so great that it should not be supported and it does not begin to meet the problems that we face. There are deep issues which explain why that is so. It just does not meet the situation. In fact, it could not because of the way it has been done. But I just want to pick up, before I go into the main... talking about the Strategic Plan itself, on this issue of the process and the 5 days and how we are wilting under the ... not the heat today, but anyway ... Deputy Vallois and Deputy Power gave their remarks. It showed a lot of frustration and understandably so. What we are given here is a shopping list and it is not a strategy,

and if you look at page 8, the priorities, there is a little note at the bottom: "These priorities are not listed in order of importance." There just is not any kind of hierarchy. There is not any kind of: "Well, because of this then this" and that is why when the amendments come we have these sort of *ad hoc* debates on fundamentals like equality or public expenditure, but those issues should have been worked out and be part of the strategy. So, by default the assumptions get debated but not really in a strategic way. Senator Ozouf said quite rightly: "We must have a general discussion of this type" and I fully agree with that but not in the way that we have been having it, with 70-odd amendments to a shopping list. A classic example was one of the last amendments we put through today which was that we should aim for sporting excellence. Yes, sure. It is just item number 207 on the shopping list and if I can afford it, if there is any money left in my pocket then I will do something about sporting excellence. Really a lot of the amendments have been on that basis, and it is understandable because what we have is a shopping list, and I do want to put on record that I think that some parts of the shopping list are better than others. So I want to make specifically the point that I think priority 11 on health and priority 7, "Protect the public", have been well worked out. I agree with what they say and how they say it, but that is not enough. That is 2 pages in this document that more or less fit the bill. So, moving on to the Strategic Plan. What would you expect a Strategic Plan to do? Senator Shenton touched on this. If your aim is to sell potatoes then you have to round it. But what are the constraints? What is underlying where we are now? The Deputy of St. John touched on his sense that maybe things will not be quite the same in even 2 years' time. The document mentions twice in the opening remarks of the report, and I think the introduction... it talks about the long-term future of the Island. Well, if you are looking at the long-term future of the Island then I would have thought one of the first things you would look at and you would analyse and you would put into your document so that people could discuss it is the constraints and, in fact, it is mentioned on page 5. They say, the Council of Ministers: "Which are firmly set, the long-term policy direction, including aims and priorities, are firmly set within the constraints that exist" and that is the last time you hear the word "constraint" or you get anywhere near any constraints. I have just listed 5 that occurred to me as being absolutely fundamental and they should be in here as our starting point. The first, of course, is climate change. The second is peak oil. The third is falling government revenues. The fourth is ageing population and the fifth is background. This is background feel of how the Island is. What are people thinking and feeling out there? How are we doing as a society? Then obviously using that information to make our plans. So I am going to deal with each of those in turn. Climate change: *Turning Point* was a good document produced by the Planning and Environment Department. It spells out the science of climate change and then it moves on to the direct impact on Jersey. It is quite a good first stab at what Jersey might expect in the way of climate change. In there, I just pick out a few impacts on the Jersey Royal, just a minor impact that we are going to have to look at pretty carefully; fishing, changes of species, changes of whole eco systems, run-off and pollution. Well, we know that is already a problem because, my goodness, the emails are flying around on the topic of pollution of our seawater. One of the causes is increased run-off. Why is there increased run-off? Because of the increased incidents of heavy rain, but that has been predicted that we are going to have more of those events. That is the sort of impact that should be talked about in the document, and rising sea levels of course. That is just one or 2 impacts on Jersey itself, and then of course there is the share that Jersey must take in global responsibility for making sure that we avoid catastrophic climate change. In catastrophic climate change there will be the highlands of Jersey left. So I do not think that is a very good scenario for the people of St. Helier, St. Clement and St. Aubin. So we do need to take climate change seriously and, before my amendment, this document was a climate change free zone. It was not mentioned, I do not think, once. Now moving on to peak oil. Peak oil will affect every aspect of our society and already the prices are creeping back up because the world is beginning to recover in conventional economic terms. Demand is going up, the factories are starting to turn and the price is immediately rising in response. That will have an impact. It is not a figment of Deputy Wimberley and Senator Syvret's imagination. It is real and it does impact on every aspect. Again, where do you find the word "peak oil" in this document? It is not there. I

brought a couple of amendments. I brought an amendment that says that we must look at these issues. Each year we have to have a report, but I will remind Members of the tone of the comment, and it is important that we look at these things because we can vote on this on the basis that they have accepted that amendment, so it is okay. We are going to get a report on peak oil and climate change and the policy implications for Jersey. Now, there is a comment in accepting that amendment. Part of their comment reads: "The Council of Ministers accept the amendment only on the basis of monitoring at a level commensurate with existing resources within the work currently planned for the energy policy." First of all, climate change goes way beyond energy policy and so also does peak oil. But secondly, that is a pretty grudging acceptance. It says: "Well, we will do it if we can." That is the kind of attitude to a major constraint. It is as if we are piloting the ship of State without reading the weather forecast. The third point is falling government revenues. There is an appendix on this topic and it is considered, but the solution is completely one-sided and it contradicts the rest of the plan. Yes, to savings and efficiencies, of course; although I am not sure about efficiencies in perpetuity. I am not quite sure where that takes us. But savings and efficiencies, yes. But then we come to the third priority, page 14 of the original Strategic Plan: "Reform the public service to reduce costs." That is what it is about; to reduce costs. The third bullet point on that page: "Pressures on finances mean that the public service must concentrate on essential services that meet the needs of the community." That is one possible response. On page 3 of the report - it is in the report - we read a reference to "nice-to-haves." It is in the foreword to the Strategic Plan: "We cannot pay for the nice-to-haves when there is a real need to maintain essential services." So the decisions about resources have already been taken. When we were faced with a bit of a shortfall in public revenues then we are going to cut. I question that and I will be returning to that point later. It is a one-sided response to this constraint. Who says nice-to-have? Who says this is a need and that is not. There are fundamental questions here and it is back to front. We tell you what is nice to have. As I say, I will be coming back to that when we talk about how we identify the needs of the community. The fourth constraint is the ageing population. Again, this is covered in the document on page 18, priority 6, and I do not have too much quarrel with what it says, but there is one thing missing. They list the various initiatives that will have to be taken - quite right - but it is, once again, a lopsided managerial top down view. The one thing that is missing is the people themselves. There is no mention of the elderly population and what they think. There is no mention of the I.S.A.S. (Island-wide Strategy for an Ageing Society) process in which they were asked what they felt about their lives. There is nothing about the demand for housing. There is nothing about that contact between Government and the people who are affected in this question. We hear about participation in the community and working longer. That is in there. But what is not in there is any real engagement with the elderly themselves. That is symptomatic of the whole way this document proceeds and, as I say, I will be touching on how we arrive at what people need later, but I am on the constraints now. The last constraint is this question of background. Where our society is; how people out there feel; how do we get to that; and how do we respond? Now, the official version - the Council of Ministers' version - is in their report which accompanies their proposition, the third paragraph on the first page 3. I am going to quote it in full because it is symptomatic of how this document works: "While there is still much to be done we have come a long way in the last 3 years. We have developed and sustained a strong economy. We have made progress with many of the social issues identified 3 years ago and we have provided a firm foundation for Jersey's future. Now we have to take that extra step. We must work to create a community in which every Islander, no matter what their background, has the opportunity to fulfil their potential." It is so rosy. Is it not wonderful? What about the picture in the Health Department's annual report to which Senator Syvret referred in our first week? Suicide, alcohol related problems, drugs and alcohol and the link of that to our crowded prison, and the cost of that, of course - time lost to depression - I think, is higher in Jersey. I am not sure about that but I have a memory that I have read that also. Obesity in the J.A.S.S. (Jersey Annual Social Survey) report and we know that obesity is reaching serious proportions in Jersey. There is a sense of stress. There is division in society which we have just aggravated with our

population decision. Jersey losing its specialness which I referred to in that letter from that person who was just identifying and representing on behalf of a lot of people out there the unease, and a point I want to pick out, the economic activity rates. These are usually held up as a good thing about Jersey. Our economic activity rates are so high, is that not wonderful? We pat ourselves on the back. Actually, that means 2 people in a family going out to work. That means that there is surrogate care for the children. That means all kinds of implications which, again, do not appear. What that leads to in terms of family life, it is not here. I just want to say on this point about how you get a picture of what people are feeling out there, J.A.S.S. could be used as a source of self-assessment on more aspects than it is now. For instance, I had a quick look through it before this debate. There are 2 pages on cleanliness. How do you rate cleanliness in public places, on the beaches? How do you rate the toilets, and so on? Now that is very simple, asking the public: "What do you feel about your Island?" That could be extended into a general honest background report. I have a lot of respect for J.A.S.S. and the work that goes into it. I think that it is a relatively unbiased source and I think the weighting and so on and the care taken with it are exemplary, and I think we could use it to get this picture more accurately of how people ... what their feelings are about their lives. We have a Strategic Plan then which does not put the main constraints - the main background issues - into the picture at all. So, that really makes it very difficult to vote for it because if you have a Strategic Plan that does not set out the constraints, does not say where we are now in an honest sort of way - and "where we are" means not where we 53 are but where the 90,000 are out there - then I do not know what the basis is for going forward. Now, there is another way of looking at the inadequacy, if you like, of this plan. It is very sad to say - I mean I like chucking bouquets around and not brickbats, it is much, much nicer, -but the fact is I did find something to agree with in this document, but then it was not followed through, and how sad. The mission statement is: "Working together to meet the needs of our community." I do not disagree with a single word of that. It is absolutely spot on: "Working together to meet the needs of our community." If only the document had followed that through we would have a Strategic Plan. I am going to take those 3 concepts that are in there: community, working together, needs. Our community. What does this mean? What I am saying is how a Strategic Plan could look like and then you can compare it to the shopping list version that we have in front of us. What does this word "community" mean? Deputy Tadier touched on this when he was talking about arts and heritage. What is this cultural identity thing? Is it everyone living in Jersey? Well, yes, it is. But how do you build identity and pride and solidarity among 92,000 people who are so diverse? Now, I was in a working group as part of the racial discrimination forum looking at the role of voluntary organisations. One of our members enlightened us on the complexity of this word "community". It is a very multi-faceted word. We are all members of lots of different communities. We are not just one single identity. We have our religious communities if we belong to them. We have our sporting community. We have our ethnic community, which is a pretty fundamental identity and geographical. The Parish, if you like, but also the street or the neighbourhood. I just want to give a couple of examples of where this kind of thinking takes you. Firstly, that when the Portuguese ... there was a Portuguese team that came to the football festival 2 or 3 years ago, I think. The Madeiran community were there in force adding to the sound levels in that part of town. It was great to see that they were able to support their team. In other words, not a Jersey team but a Madeiran team or Portuguese team, I forget which. But the point is that gave them a stake by being themselves in a different way even though they are also Jersey residents. Another example of that was a concert organised by, I think, the Community Relations Trust, or certainly with their involvement, and the lady afterwards who said: "You know, that is the first time I have felt really at home in Jersey" because it was a Portuguese concert with Portuguese stars and she just felt warmed by it. That is the kind of thing we are looking at when we talk about our community. Now there is also old Jersey. Do they feel ... and I cannot say "we", I am not old Jersey, but there is an old Jersey layer in society; how do they feel about what is happening to Jersey? I have spoken to people in the election and it is quite unnerving what they say about their feeling, about how the Island is changing. So they too are part of this thing called "our

community”. Then there is also the racism that can so easily arise. I was shocked to talk to the granddaughter of a guy I know really well, who is old Jersey, out in the countryside, and his granddaughter came out with this comment, which I will not repeat here, and I was really shocked by it, an anti-Portuguese racist comment. But where did she pick that up from? She picked it up from somewhere because she was only 6 or 7. So she picked it up from somewhere. These issues are real, they are important and, again, they are in the mission statement: “Working together to meet the needs of our community”, but that is as far as it went. There needs to be a real looking at that and it is fundamental to how people feel, whether people are happy in their lives, and whether they are healthy. The second part of this mission statement is working together, the first 2 words of the mission statement. How do you work together? What does it mean? What are the preconditions for working together? Well, I know the first one. Trust. Trust and confidence. I just feel that this is a difficult area and one that the States has a lot of progress to make. We need genuine openness, we need accessibility and we need 2-way communication. Now, before I go on to how one could build trust and confidence and how we fail, I just want to add some additional issues which are almost like pre-conditions. They are like markers. If we cannot do these then we are going nowhere with this. Some of these have been mentioned but I am not sure that, again, any of them figure in here as part of this heading “working together”. Whistle-blowing. Now, we have been talking about whistle-blowing a fair bit but if you do not have robust procedures that people trust where people can complain or mention unease or get redress outside the system then you have not got trust and confidence. Regulation and the separation of regulation and operation: we have seen the problems that this leads to with the pollution and the incinerator issue. How close together were Planning and Environment and T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) in the whole process leading to the E.I.A. (Environmental Impact Assessment)? I will not talk about that in detail because we are reviewing that in Scrutiny, but there is an issue of that separation, and that is part of working together and building trust. Freedom of information: without freedom of information how can you have trust, if people cannot get to know what they want to know? All those aspects are part of restoring confidence. They are just some of the preconditions. Now, so how do we get to this trust and confidence? We have to learn how to do it. We have to do true consultation. There are many ways to genuinely consult, and I refreshed my memory last night of an excellent document produced by, I think, the Chief Minister’s Department, possibly even the Communications Unit who, by the way, get a lot of slagging off. They are an easy target but I want to put on record that if they were a true Communications Unit then their job would be very valuable indeed. That document, which I think they produced, is about all the different ways that you can genuinely consult and listen to people. I will not bore you with the list but the point is, it is there. Some thought has been put into it. We must reconnect with our people. In contrast to that, I will quote from this document what it says about participation and communication, page 30, bizarrely under: “Protect our unique culture and identity” - part of the shopping list. I do not quite know why. There are 2 bullet points, the third and the fourth on priority 15: “We need to enable the public to understand the reasons behind government policy.” “We need to enable the public to understand the reasons behind government policy by developing strong 2-way communication.” Well, I am sorry, you have just said that the task is to help the public to understand the reasons, then you claim that it is 2-way communication. It is just a misunderstanding of how this process should work. The fourth bullet is: “We need to show that Islanders’ views are valued.” Well, I am sorry, it is a bit of a catalogue of disaster. We have the Waterfront where the results show how good that consultation was. We have Imagine Jersey 2035. I was going to explain how that disgraceful process was ... the detail of how that was managed, but I will not. The fact is that it did a lot of damage to the credibility and the relationship between the States and the people. If we are going to have genuine consultation it has to be open-ended. You have to have the background information which has to be honest. It has to be without political steer and then the discussion has to be free of political steer, because you are trying to find out what people really think. There are real problems here of disconnect, and I have to ask why do we so often fail in this area? Why is it not even touched on, seriously, in this document? Because we have the phrase “working together”

and then we do not deliver it. I have a little phrase which I think puts it in a nutshell: if we ask people what they want we will not get what we want. I think that is something to do with why we do not go out and really ask people what they want because then it might not go the way that we want, whoever “we” is. In this case it is the Council of Ministers. So working together you need trust, you need confidence and I do not think we have got it. We certainly have not talked about it. Finally, needs. The needs. The needs of the community. What an important concept. What a pity that we have not gone to ask. What a pity that we do not know what the needs of the community are. We assume we know so we have this managerial list of things we are going to do. I came across the beginning of the U.S. (United States) Declaration of Independence. “We hold these truths to be self-evident.” Wonderful, wonderful phrase: “We hold these truths to be self-evident” and then I forget how it goes on. Then it says: “inalienable rights” and then it says: “to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” “Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” There is not much life, liberty and pursuit of happiness in this document. **[Approbation]** It is absolutely key. How do we define the needs? How do we get to people and ask them what really is important in their lives in a way that is robust and genuine? It does go to the heart of what a Strategic Plan should be about and I feel that we have not gone, we have not asked, and the reason is the direction has been pre-judged. We have this problem, it is going to be tight on money and we have got the answer. The answer is that we will reform a public service to reduce costs. Now, I know that phrase has gone because we have amended it away. The Deputy is looking at me in amazement but I am pretty sure the Constable of St. Helier’s amendment has been accepted on that and the phrase “reduce costs” is no longer in the plan as the title, and “improve efficiency”. But what I am saying is that that was the original version. I really think that it shows what it is about, and I have already read out the quotations about how the emphasis is on bearing down on anything that is not essential. Who is going to define “essential”? We are, of course. Or they are. The Council of Ministers will and “nice-to-haves” will simply go. So which of these is nice to have? Children’s services; underfunded at present. Air quality; we have not got the money to deal with that. Maybe the compensation bill possibly at Bellozanne is such a blocker that it just will never happen. What about early years’ strategy? What about arts and heritage? Are all these, which we have just written in as a priority, are they going to happen? Anti-discrimination Law: there was £400,000 pencilled-in for drafting that as an enabling law and then you bring in things like anti-ageing discrimination so that more older people can go to work. That died a death because the prison needed the money. I have got the reference here. Some report about the prison service, but that is where the Anti-discrimination Law money went. There was not any money left for it, so that was a reduction in costs. What we have to do to regain the trust of everyone out there is to find out what they really want. To find out what the needs of the community are. The needs have been defined in this document, and this really bothers me in purely materialist terms. By default, because it is not explicit, but if you go to page 7 and you look at the aim - the working together - and then the 5 bullets, the heading, the main bullets of this Strategic Plan, underneath is a note: “If we are to achieve this we must also support and maintain our economy.” That brings me to the education page, which is page 26, priority 12, which is an appalling page. It is the priority which made me think there is no way I can support, and nor should anyone else support, this plan. It is headed: “Maintain high quality education and skills” and they have defined education entirely in terms of the economy. A child does not have a spirit, does not have any relationships, does not have a life to look forward to in terms of values. It is about the economy. The first bullet which can support the Island’s economy. These skills and the second bullet support the Island’s economy. The third bullet is changes in the Island’s economy. The fourth bullet is the workplace and ensure that no one is ... it is a disaster, which is why I did not bother to try and amend it. I was amazed at people trying to amend that page and adding in that the economy is not just the finance industry. But it is very indicative, is it not, of a whole understanding about what it is really all about. It is about the economy. It is about prosperity and the standard of living, which are phrases that we hear again and again, and the fact that arts and heritage had to be added in by a Bank-Bencher, I am sorry, it is not adequate to leave the human spirit out of the Strategic Plan document. Okay, I know it sounds

wishy-washy and fluffy but it is not. It is what we are really here for, is to help people to be happy or fulfilled or to have the challenges in their lives which they need and then go out and meet them, like walking across the Arctic, whatever is your bag, but not just to be a cog in the machine. I just want to add a couple of points on specific issues. The environment: well, you would expect me possibly to say something about that, although you might also have noted that I have gone 20 minutes without mentioning the word, so I am not just a sandal-wearing greenie. But, anyway, the environment. Now, there is no understanding in this document of the relationship between the environment and the economy. As some economist once said - I think it is Herman Daly - the economy is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the environment. All resources come from the environment. All waste goes to the environment, and it does not matter whether you burn it or bury it, it goes into the environment and we cannot exceed the carrying capacity of our environment and the whole eco system must be able to regenerate otherwise we are toast. That insight, that whole awareness is not in the document. There is constant reference to economic growth ... not constant because we are in a decline, but there is an assumption that we are going to head back there, as soon as ever we can. Well, there is a review - quite a good review - of a recent book by the Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies. The book is the *Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability*, which is what we should be doing. Crossing from crisis to sustainability. In the course of this review, summing up what the book's theme is, the author writes: "The current obsession with G.D.P. (Gross Domestic Product) growth at all costs must be abandoned. Shifting the emphasis to human welfare in a post-growth strategy where jobs, communities and environments are no longer sacrificed." That is what we should have been talking about. That is what we were talking about in the population debate. Not sacrifice the community, not sacrificing the environment, and trying to head for a sustainable economy. Well, it did not happen. This document talks about the balance between the environmental, the social and the economic. I have to shake my head. I will not quote that sentence but they do say there has to be a balance: "and the environment is of equal importance." Well, I have to refer Members to page 15, priority 4, the third bullet from the bottom, and I have a rude word beside it in my copy: "Introduce a range of environmental taxes to fund environmental initiatives at their current levels." In priority 13 - the Deputy is looking at me - priority 4, third bullet from the bottom, that is in the original version, not the marked-up version. It is under "What we will do" in priority 4. So we are going to ... the initial aim of the Council of Ministers was to keep environmental initiatives at their current levels if we can find the taxation revenue. Now, I did amend that but the fact that it was there in the first place more or less destined the whole of priority 13 to the bin. We were going to do things about transport. We were going to do things about air quality ... well, we are now. We were going to introduce environmental education into schools. We were going to persuade people out of cars on the basis that we would keep our environmental initiatives as they are now. It was complete nonsense. It is slightly less nonsensical now but the fact is that was the world's view in this document, and I believe that it still is the world's view behind this document. Others have spoken about our failure to deal with the population issue. I will just point out that we were misled and that does not bode very well for how we communicate with the public. So, to conclude ... as one good Deputy pointed out to me - actually it was a Minister - it was pointed out that one should not be intimidated and also this is an important debate, as Senator Shenton pointed out ... Senators Ozouf and Perchard said that we cannot duck having a Strategic Plan or debate or a review every now and again of major, major issues. So, in conclusion, I would say that in this plan ... and the reason why I believe that Members cannot vote for it is that in the first place reality is omitted. It leaves out reality. The constraints and issues which we face are simply not there. Peak oil, climate change, and this picture of where the public is, they are not there. So how can we have any kind of strategy based on not facing reality? Linked to that is the fact that it is a managerial top-down document. It does not ask people, it does not relate to people. Where we could bring them in we do not, so the second reason we cannot vote for this is that people are omitted also in connection with the ageing population. The education page, which I have outlined, is an indictment of the view of the human potential that they talk about in one breath

and then trash in another priority. It is the economy above everything else, which is my third reason that you cannot vote for this. It is a reductionist view of the world. It is all about material, prosperity and it omits quality of life. It gets a few mentions in the document “quality of life” but it has not been put at the top. We do not ask people what they mean by it. We do not want to know for some reason, and for those 3 reasons I just remind you, life, liberty and happiness is what it is really about, so with my last gasp [**Laughter**], I urge Members to vote against this plan.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Bailiff:

Do Members agree we adjourn until 2.15 p.m.

The Connétable of Grouville:

May I give notice under Standing Order 84 that I shall ask for closure of the debate in half an hour after we resume?

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

The Bailiff:

The debate continues on the Strategic Plan. I call Senator Breckon.

8.11 Senator A. Breckon:

I was reminded during the course of this debate of a couple of phrases that came from a strategic debate many years ago, I think it was “2000-something and Beyond” from the then Policy and Resources Committee. One of the phrases talked about rolling back the frontiers. We were not doing anything like that; it was just “rolling back the frontiers”. The other one was reducing red tape. The reason I say that is because at the time I had something that was burning a hole in my desk about Sunday Trading and I went to the Policy and Resources Committee at the time, the Connétables and others, I thought: “Well, let us just scrap all this and if you are going to roll back the frontiers let the market decide”, not that I am a rabid free marketeer. Of course, nothing has been done about Sunday Trading. In fact we have added a couple of amendments, one to allow a jewellery shop to open in the country and the other one is to allow flowers from holdings from which they are not grown because there were complaints about them being sold outside convenience stores and florists could not open. The reason I say that is because that is some of the strategic high level of phrases and things that have been said in the past, and I remember when I met with P. and R. (Policy and Resources) they went: “Ooh, that is not what it means at all. No, no, we do not want any of this. No, no, do not go anywhere near this” and so the issue, I think, I do not know if it is back with the Connétables, the Minister for Economic Development - somebody has it. Anyway on to this. When this report - and there was some consultation in meetings beforehand with Scrutiny hats on - when it came out we said: “Well, okay, it is a bit tight but we will see if we can allocate some time and space to look at this” and I agreed at a meeting just before it came out that I would try and produce a paper for Members, and perhaps we would have a session with Ministers asking them questions relevant to the report. There are things in there that are obviously important about population, about healthcare, about housing, about the income support system and vulnerable children and families. There were various things in there. Then what I said I would do, and I went through it and picked out a few phrases and said: “Well, okay, maybe we could put that into a letter and send it to Ministers and see if they could reply.” But when we looked at it we thought: “Well, I am not sure that works either.” So, I would just like to give Members a few examples. In the foreword to the plan on page 3, it talks about... plan for an ageing population and providing adequate housing for everyone. The question is: who is

“everyone”? Are we talking about people who are not here at the moment will be adequately housed? It is also about adequate. What is needed? What are people’s genuine ambitions? The other thing is the million pound question: what is affordable? When I looked at the very back of the plan in here it talked about housing. It says, this is on page 20 - some of the numbers are a bit confusing because it is at the back of the appendix - housing: “Approximately 6,150 additional homes will be required from the start of 2009 which could be provided from existing known sources already identified for housing, including windfall developments for within the existing built-up area.” From the time I have been in the States these things have always been said. We were going to build on Springfield. There was going to be Royal Crescent. There was going to be some infill. There was going to be something else. There was going to be something else. As Members will realise a lot of this has not happened. The other thing where I did have one or two problems were where there was a phrase - and, okay, we are talking about a higher level... and then the question is where is the substance: it is in the Business Plan? Is it? That is a question that Members will be able to apply their minds to over the summer when we get that in mid-July for debate in September. Where does this link with what it is supposed to do and where is the joined-up thinking between some Ministers, which I think we were promised on other areas, elderly care being an issue? Because it talks about in some of the bullet points: “Meeting our health, housing and education challenges.” What does that mean? What exactly does that mean and how can we vote for that with any confidence? Yes, we are going to meet the challenge because I was reminded of something else, and there was a Deputy who is no longer a Member of the House, his favourite was: “But we have already agreed this.” Have we? The Strategic Plan, page 78, item (c)(iv) says this, and that is what it means. Does it? We have agreed it. Now, it was unknown to many Members that they had already agreed something that came forward on the back of what other Members have described as the “woolly stuff”. That is where I have some problems. “Prepare for an ageing society.” How are we going to do that? Prepare for an ageing society. These are really big questions. Also under there is creating a responsive and efficient government. Who to? To each other? To the people? I do not know, it does not say. Also, as I have gone through this, there are other things in there that talk about: “While Jersey offers an excellent quality of life for most people there are still some areas that have to be addressed: social inequalities, public engagement, anti-social behaviour, cost of living, transport, standard of public housing and roads.” Those are major issues on their own and other Members have said we had a plan: how far are we with the plan? I know Senator Ozouf mentioned: “Well, we have this sort of self-reporting system where we tick the box in progress. Legislation by the end of 2006: still being done.” But that gets an amber. So the self-reporting thing I am not convinced about. The other thing it talks about there, again it mentions the ageing population next to the Waterfront, incidentally. I do have some problems with some of these areas because, again, to me they do seem to be a bit woolly. On page 8 there are some priorities again and it is: “Promotes sustainable population levels.” I know we have had some discussion and debate about that, but what is sustainable as a population? Adequately housed with care for and consideration for the ageing population, and I do not see where all these bits of the jigsaw fit in together with - and I know we have got business plans to come - and it says under there: “Provide for the ageing population.” How do we do that? People are having problems now when they have to sell their home to provide elderly care. They probably have not got that sorted out yet. We know there is a system not very far from here. I do not want to use the G word, it is not very parliamentary language. But there is a system that we could perhaps learn from not very far away and who is ... we heard the Minister for Social Security saying a few weeks ago he had been on a visit but the Scrutiny Report that came out in the last year asked the Ministers to get their heads together by the end of June and come back with something. That has not happened yet. We are talking about enhanced support services to vulnerable children, families and others at risk. Again, that is a major task, a major challenge, and is going to require some serious funding. Again, in there, under the priorities down at 14 is: “adequately house the population.” Another thing that has not emerged, and I learned the other day - and it is a pity he is not here, the Minister for Economic Development - I learned by accident inquiring about something

else, that for Regulation of Undertakings at the moment we do not have an enforcement officer. So, in other words, if there is a complaint then there is nobody, as I am aware, to ... there is nobody in post at the minute to investigate it. Now, that could be wrong but a reliable source told me that.

Senator T.J. Le Main:

Could I just clarify that? There is a compliance officer, enforcement officer, in the Population Office who would, if need be, go into R.U.D.L. (Regulation of Undertakings and Development Law). We have been working together.

Senator A. Breckon:

I think that confirms that there is nobody in post at Regulation of Undertakings as an enforcement officer if somebody else that is in another role is covering that as well. The other thing when we are talking about on page 17: "Promote sustainable population levels," again it has got the word "sustainable" in but it talks about new mechanisms for managing migration. How are we managing it? We are talking about gathering information, address lists, perhaps cards or whatever else? But it does not really say much about that and we have been waiting a long, long time for this, and I think there was a former Scrutiny Panel looking at migration that fell off the perch, I think, waiting for information to be shared. So I think somebody has gone away, and I understand that there is a draft law or regulations that have been worked up that are very close to being presented to this House. It also says on there why we must do this: "A clear maximum target for inward migration, along with a robust method of managing long-term population levels, will enable effective forecasting and planning to strike a balance between protecting our environment and economic necessity." Perhaps the economic necessity is linked to more people need more money need more services generate more waste, and whatever else, so perhaps if we are all watching a football match, instead of standing on our tippy-toes we should just sit down and we would all be able to see. I think sometimes we might need a cooling period in some of this. Also, under providing for the ageing population it talks about what we will do, not what we might do. What we will do: "Provide better opportunities for independent living in old age including support in the community." How do we do that when the agencies are already stretched? Take, for example, Family Nursing and Home Care. They are already stretched with the level of services they are providing. I know within Health the Mental Health Team do a tremendous job supporting people in the community from Overdale. There is some terrific work that has been done there. But they are not just saying something, it needs to happen, and it needs to happen over a number of years. I have not seen the initial steps that are going to trigger this to make it happen. It also mentions in there, this is what we will do: "Providing health and long-term care provision through *New Directions* in the future, including introducing an Island-wide scheme to meet the costs of individuals' residential care needs." This really is a no-brainer. People will sign up to hypothecated funds that provide an insurance-based scheme for their old age. They will not just give us money to dig another hole or build something or do something. If it is hypothecated in that way then people, I believe, will pay, especially if it gives them security of the family home. This is a problem already and many individuals and others express concern about that. But why are we still talking about it when we have not done it? It is fairly easy to do. Why is it not high up on legislation plans? Why does it not catapult up, parachute in there? I believe it should. I think the public have already shown that they are willing to sign up to such a thing. The other thing that is in there, again about ageing population: "Investigating schemes to encourage people to make more provision for the future." Well, I think sometimes some people feel a little bit aggrieved if they have been a bit thrifty and saved a few bob and then somebody is lining up to take it off them again. So, perhaps we need to be looking at things like funding elderly care from within a proper recognised scheme. Again, within there we talked about ... on page 20 it talks about: "Current trends will, if not checked, result in unprecedented dependency and demand for healthcare and social protection." Again, many people rely on the health system as a first resort and not a last resort, and we need a reliable system. If it does need some funding then we need to be sensible about how we do that because also in

there it talks about while we must do this, Government's role should be to facilitate and encourage people to discourage dependency. But again I do not think we want to be means testing people to the grave, as it were, we need to be sensible about this and provide but do so in a decent and humane way, and allow people to keep their dignity and, to a certain degree, some of their privacy. Again, under what we will do: "Work together with all agencies to co-ordinate efficient and effective social and community services and support the set-up in the social policy framework." Already I feel that we need to identify the agencies, and there is a tremendous amount of work that is going on out there in the community, including voluntary work, but we need to make the best use of the resources we have got and also to get people to sign up to this and not have them believing that it is charitable acts that we are handing down to them. Again, there are issues in there about vulnerable children. Again, there are some major tasks there. I think we have missed some of the things about early interventions in some areas where it is a case of do we put the fence at the top of the cliff or do we put the ambulance at the bottom? I think sometimes there will have to be interventions that support people who are in difficult situations, especially young people, through these times to ensure that they do get a quality of life. It is a very real issue. Also, talking about improving healthcare provision and healthy lifestyles... but again some of this stuff does not have to wait for *New Directions*, which I think has gone to Old Directions, some of it is commonsense. It is about eating, diet, exercise, things that people can do. You do not need strategies for it and you need to be working with schools and others on this sort of thing. We do not need to wait for some of this stuff because, again, it talks about what we will do is find new funding to pay for changes to the health and social care system. In some instances you cannot take the money off people who do not have it. Somebody has to pay for that and then it is a question of who and how. Again, perhaps middle Jersey feels it is going to be under some sort of attack for that. There is another thing in there about housing. "Identify long-term solutions for sustainable housing provision and protection of the environment." I am not quite sure how they are linked together but it comes under protect and enhance our natural built environment, but again not that many years ago the Waterfront was going to provide most of the solution to the ongoing housing problem. Interestingly, under "adequately house the population" it says in there: "Jersey has a good stock of affordable homes to rent across a number of providers..." That is not what people are telling me if they are looking at £1,200 for a 2-bedroomed flat, and that is about that. I think there is a shortage in the market and that talks about: "...which ensures a safety net for the most disadvantaged in society." Well, some people do not have a choice in housing. They cannot go anywhere else and they do not have a choice about renting or buying. Also in there it mentions again about being housed adequately and it talks about: "The affordable housing should be targeted at those who need the support." When it comes to housing and affordable I would respectfully suggest there are many people who need support because of the high level, if we are talking about £400,000-plus for a 3-bedroomed home to buy. While it is laudable to encourage home ownership, I think that particular bubble has now burst. So I think really intervention in the market is okay but it is probably the wrong time for us to get involved, perhaps we should let some of this settle down. If one or 2 get their fingers burned then perhaps we should let nature take its course, as they say. There are a couple of other things from there. It talks about delivering savings. Again, anything where we are looking at needs to be sensible savings and not targeted at services for the elderly or the vulnerable. I remember once we used to have an exercise where on budgeting what happens if you knock 5 per cent off your budget, what happens if you knock 10 per cent off, what happens if you knock 15 per cent off. At the time I was a member of the Health and Social Services Committee and the 5 per cent was close a ward, stop the elderly transport services and we went: "No, no, no, stop all that." I do not know how many debates we have had in this House about school milk. That is particularly an emotive issue. We have been into all sorts of things about that, but again if we are strategically looking at this then we do not necessarily, I do not think, want it filtering down to affect those people who cannot really afford it. When it mentions talking about long-term resource initiatives, it talks about an increase in the pension age between ... and people working longer and things like that. I remember, again as a member of Social Security, we went through all the issues about ...

after an actuarial review, and we sat round the room. We said: "Who wants to work until they are 70?" Everybody was looking out the window and nobody was picking it up, and sometimes, depending on lifestyle, if people have been in pressured employment or physical manual work, digging roads up and things like that, they do not want to be working until they are 70, and there are many areas of work which are now stress-related and people are doing hours over and above. It is a grand idea for somebody else to be working until they are 70-odd or whatever else but sometimes it is not so good if you apply it to yourself, and perhaps I should declare an interest there. I certainly will not be working when I am 70, but I do not know. Again, it talked in there about *New Directions*, promoting public health. Have we not got a department and sections doing this stuff already? I do not think we need to wait for any grand plan to be doing this. It does mention in here about the long-term thing: "In order to fund these new streams of activity, the new hypothecated health insurance style contribution will be required from individuals to provide a ring-fenced fund to cover the increasing cost of health care." Okay, that may be necessary but again how are we going to do that, and have the public themselves been consulted on there? I know it is something that will... - he is not here, the Deputy of St. John - something he looked at years ago was a sewerage charge. People who were not on mains drains - I do not like to open the subject up because he will appear again, wherever he is, the Deputy of St. John - but again it is an issue of where are we squeezing money from? Where are these things coming from? I just have a couple more points. Again in one of the appendices it talks about managing migration, and I am not sure, because I have not seen any ... it says: "The processes for managing migration are currently being implemented through the development of a new migration law." Again, Members have not seen that so I am not sure how they can vote for it at this stage, so it will be interesting to see what that says and what those mechanisms are. There are other issues in the proposal and they talked about, towards the end, the policy balance. It says: "It is important to note that this revision will mean a greater emphasis on the other policy responses in the long term, in particular, increasing pensionable age, working longer, increased workforce participation and new forms of public contribution to fund the cost of old age such as residential care insurance and health insurance schemes. These policy options are included within the priorities in the States Strategic Plan. The further work to assess the nature of other longer term policy responses required to address the long-term planning issues will need to begin immediately." I would suggest that part of that process there needs to be consultation and engagement with the public, and I must say here that when Senator Le Sueur was president at the time of Social Security he did 2 excellent exercises. One, as he mentioned earlier, about putting up contributions when we did not need to - that went up from 10 per cent to 12.5 per cent, half a per cent a year over 5 years, if we are thinking about doing that. That was in part of *Continuity and Change*, I think it was called. The other one was *Fair Play in the Workplace* and we are still working on employment legislation. But those 2 pieces of work and, as I say, congratulations to Senator Le Sueur at the time, that went out to the public and said: "Would you like to pay more to safeguard your pensions?" The resounding answer was yes, and I think on some of these issues the public may well say that, although I cannot prejudge that... but we have to ask them. We cannot make that assumption on their behalf because we need a few bob to do something else, like the safeguard systems, or to keep things running or get them running. Again, there are things in there about the balance of a set of initiatives on a population policy, but I would suggest again it is a very careful balance and, as I said to Members the other day, some of this stuff has been going on since the 1960s when Senators ... the names that were mentioned were Le Marquand and Binnington and others, de Carteret, who were working on some of these issues and at the time they were saying that we needed to be cautious because of ... we would spoil the Island with overdevelopment. That was the issue that we discussed there. The growth to some extent was necessary but it was a case of proceed with caution. For me, there is all sorts of issues in there, and I know the answer is in the Business Plan, but again that is a difficult issue to look at for individual Members. One of the other problems, it is difficult to amend, and I think this is shown. I can well understand the difficulties of the Council of Ministers because this is the second time we have done this. The first time I think there were some problems and then it was a case of:

“Well, we will do it a little better, we will try a bit harder” and I think there is a learning curve here, and I am not sure where this sits on the learning curve, if we are going up or if we have gone down, but I think we really need to look at the process and where it fits in, the timing of it and the opportunity for Members to contribute effectively, because it is difficult when you have changed a few words or something: “Okay, it means that” but something perhaps - a warning to Members - come back in 2 years’ time, look at what was amended and what we have done. I think the Chief Minister had said, and I certainly said, there are some things that it would be nice to have but perhaps we are not in that situation anymore, and where we have that I think it is nice to have but we will need to wait. I do, in conclusion, say that I have some problems supporting this in its entirety because to me it is not quite conclusive. It is high level but it is knitting fog. I think it is a bit too ambiguous for me to say that I can nail my colours to the mast and give this my 100 per cent support because I am uncomfortable with some of the missing links where I would rather see something more dynamic that says: “Well, what we will do ... but what we are working on is this, this and this” and I think there is still a culture that has not revealed - and we will get it after this - what the migration policy is. I would like to have seen it before this debate. I know we had a number to play with for this debate, which was brought forward a little bit, but I would still like to see the policy that some Members have seen but most of us have not. I just say that in general terms I will be voting against this because I am not comfortable as it sits.

The Connétable of Grouville:

The 30 minutes has now elapsed since my calling out for the vote under Standing Order 84. I call for the vote.

The Bailiff:

You move the closure of the debate, Connétable, is that right? Yes. Is that proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** I put the motion.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

May I say that I am surprised you are allowing this on a serious debate. I think it is an abuse.

The Bailiff:

It is a matter for Members, Deputy. There is no provision for debate. Would you like an electronic vote, Connétable? The appel? I ask any Member in the precinct who wishes to vote to return to his or her seat. I will ask the Greffier to open the voting which is for or against the closure motion of the Connétable of Grouville.

POUR: 8		CONTRE: 29		ABSTAIN: 1
Senator B.I. Le Marquand		Senator T.A. Le Sueur		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)
Connétable of Trinity		Senator P.F. Routier		
Connétable of Grouville		Senator T.J. Le Main		
Connétable of St. John		Senator A. Breckon		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Senator S.C. Ferguson		
Connétable of St. Peter		Senator A.J.D. Maclean		
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy of St. John		Connétable of St. Helier		
		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
		Deputy of St. Martin		
		Deputy R.G. Le Hérisssier (S)		
		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
		Deputy of St. Ouen		
		Deputy of Grouville		
		Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)		

	Deputy of Trinity		
	Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)		
	Deputy S. Pitman (H)		
	Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
	Deputy of St. Mary		
	Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		
	Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)		
	Deputy E.J. Noel (L)		
	Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		
	Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
	Deputy D. De Sousa (H)		
	Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		

The Bailiff:

The debate accordingly continues. Deputy Trevor Pitman.

8.12 Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Having put my 2 pennyworth in on a number of the amendments I am just going to stick to what I see are the real fundamentals. Having said that: first I would just like to refer to yesterday: Deputy Maçon was overly kind to me, describing an amendment as brilliant. Well, I would just like to say that having heard the Deputy of St. Mary's speech today, I think he should have saved it up because I think the Deputy of St. Mary's speech was brilliant. **[Approbation]** I will probably be endorsing him as Chief Minister next time because I think he really cut to the heart of what was important. Anyway, enough of the praise. I am afraid I cannot concur with the Minister for Treasury and Resources' assertions that the plan is exciting. Indeed, I am one of those who thinks that the previous plan was superior. I certainly do not think it was quite as woolly, even accepting the nature of such a plan. But where do my key concerns lie? Well, perhaps not surprisingly population to begin with. Concern circulated all Members with their view that really what the Council of Ministers are offering with their statement of intent was pretty much just more of the same. I said in last week's session I felt the Council of Ministers' policy on population rather than a cure for the problem this was a political sticking plaster. This, when you add in the 2 further fundamental issues of the environment - and I mean both the global and local - and the global economy in the light of the credit crunch, this is why I just cannot support it even though there are good things in it. I accept that this view may be viewed from my different political persuasion to that from most of the Ministers, but nevertheless I have to say that I at least am recognising how the world has changed. The Ministers appear totally oblivious to this. I certainly do not want to accuse Ministers of not caring but I have to say it is easy to see why many people out there, certainly who I talk to, feel that way. The approach underlying this plan does nothing more than put off major, major problems for future politicians and, indeed, future generations to deal with. That just is not good enough. We are the Government of the day and we should be facing up to those realities now. Finance, finance, finance, everything will be okay because it has worked so well for the last 25 years just cannot cut it anymore. It might see out a few Ministers' careers pretending that everything is hunky dory but that is all it will do. I am not prepared to just store up problems for young people such as those I have spent many years of my own life working to support. Another point I would like to comment on is that touched upon by the Deputy of St. John in that the Council of Ministers should really stand or fall by a plan that is theirs and theirs alone. Not surprisingly my angle is slightly different. The Ministers of course have to work within the system they find themselves in, so I cannot blame them for this and I will not. However, when we do progress to a full party system - and people have their own different views, I accept that, I certainly believe it will happen within the next 2 to 3 elections - then a party will of course stand or fall by its manifesto so we will avoid this often torturous process of the last few days because the public will have already voted for the direction they wish to see pursued and there can be no argument with

that. I am afraid I really do believe that we need to see change to move away from not supporting something just because, as it appears, it might be leftist or not the current group thought of the day and progress to a genuinely caring and inclusive society. Deputy Southern moved for just such a step forward and yet he has failed. An inclusive society which does not see those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder as a problem to be dealt with seemingly reluctantly or even, as I seem to hear in this House sometimes, by charity. I just cannot believe it. Similarly when Ministers give, frankly, highly offensive excuses about why those who are most wealthy cannot contribute a little more, even in some instances clearly not contributing what they should, that only adds to my sort of difficulty in supporting this. As a middle-earner, which I am, I happily contribute more than those who are less fortunate and I just cannot accept, and never will accept, the thinking that just because you are very wealthy you should not be happy to do the same. That thinking, that political philosophy of apologising for greed, is redundant. It is all but dead and buried. The world has changed and to deny it is the thinking of the political dinosaur. We must act now to ensure our economy and the community is not buried with it, and if we do not grasp that thorn, that nettle, then I am afraid we are in big trouble and I do not think the Strategic Plan has done that, so I will not be supporting it.

8.13 The Deputy of St. Ouen:

I am quite saddened by the speeches of Deputy Wimberley and others. The aim of the Strategic Plan is to develop and promote a shared vision which will secure the future prosperity of the Island. I know it is not perfect but presently it is the only option for the States to influence and create a vision for our community to aspire to. Deputy Wimberley was critical about the vision statement; however, this is a commitment that this Council of Ministers would like all Members to sign up to. What is wrong with working together? Surely it is far better - whatever our philosophy is - to work together to meet the needs of the community than constantly criticise and produce negative attitudes towards virtually everything that is proposed in this House. If we are to be successful we will and have to work together in a constructive, not destructive, manner. We will need to listen and react accordingly as we need to demonstrate attributes within this Assembly that we and other people can follow. We have got to stop attacking one another and work for the common good. Whether certain Members choose to believe it or not this is the current view of the Council of Ministers. It is displayed and mentioned throughout this plan. Some people have chosen to ignore it but I suggest that Members read it not just in one section at a time, but read the whole plan. There is far more concern being placed on the social matters and issues that concern this Island than in the past. The difficulty we face, and it is a difficulty which has been mentioned today and before, is the economic downturn. A vision is one thing. To achieve it is something quite different. Clearly resources will be required and I believe that the Council of Ministers using this plan - and again I say it is not ideal - have tried to identify all of the issues that face this Island, however difficult. We have tried not to bury our heads in the sand and pretend that we are ostriches. We have identified the issues. Then we are criticised we are not coming up with all the answers. I am sorry but there is a responsibility that rests with this Assembly to work together to achieve the solutions necessary so we can achieve the vision that we set. Particularly Deputy Wimberley focused on a particular priority - priority 12 - which clearly is one that is headed: "Maintain high quality education skills." He says: "Yes, it focuses on the economy" and he was selective in the comments he made and statements that were included in why we must do this. But I would just like to take about a minute of your time to read the first bullet point on why we must do this, and it says, Deputy Wimberley: "If we are to keep our population levels under control, make the best use of local people's skills and have a self-supporting inclusive society which can support the Island's economy we need to help them or help individuals realise their full potential and provide access to local job opportunities." That is exactly the thing that you have been critical about in promoting over the last ...

The Bailiff:

which we, by and large, turned down as an ... we have turned down as an overarching measure that we want to put into it, and we have paid lip service to it in the first place. So, those who trust most, those countries: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland and Japan. More equal societies. Those who trust least: U.K., U.S.A., Portugal, Singapore, where income inequality is at its greatest. So much for building trust in our community. So much for working together to meet the needs of our community. I will flip back to the Deputy of St. Ouen and remind him - and again it is a point I had not noticed - I do try and do my homework but I do not think I had got to priority 12, and I thank the Deputy of St. Mary for reminding us what is on that page. It is the most monocular view of education I have ever seen in any educational document - aims and objectives - anywhere ever. Even Margaret Thatcher, at her height, did not reduce education to this level. I point merely to the number of repetitions of particular phrases and one being: "Future economic growth, skills, economy, Island's economy, Island's economy, Island's economy, economic growth" in the document. Monocular, limited and dispiriting view of education, quite frankly, and that is what we have got here.

The Bailiff:

I am sorry to interrupt you, Deputy, it appears that we are not quorate and I require at least one other Member to return to the Assembly. Deputy Southern, please continue.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

It is the lucky leprechaun again. What I want to do now is to take a look at what these fine words mean and as I was thinking about how to do this the expression came to my mind: "This is a nightmare" and for those who have seen it, it is the *Nightmare on Elm Street*. Or transferred to the Jersey position, I think, perhaps, more appropriately, a Nightmare on Union Street. I believe that is where Cyril Le Marquand House is. Just opposite is a little street called Hope Street. Nearby is Hope Street so this, for me, if I were to sum it up, would be Nightmare on Hope Street. We are told that the list of 16 priorities is not in any way prioritised. However, on page 6 of the document in the description of the shape of the plan, the introductory notes, it says: "The priorities are not listed in any order that indicates its importance. While it is recognised that they will all demand actions in the short, medium and long term, the short-term emphasis of the plan will be on dealing with the economic downturn." So there is the starting point. There is the priority. It goes on to say: "Reforming the public sector to deliver savings", second priority, and third, which may or may not be delivered but is a worthwhile priority: "Enhancing support services to children." So at least in these 3, what are effectively priorities, dealing with the economic downturn, reforming the public sector to deliver savings, and this single issue of helping better to protect children is an issue. But the first 2 I believe give the game away as to what this means. This Strategic Plan is undoubtedly driven by economics full stop. It intends to cut back public services. It intends to save money, and how do we know that? Well, to start with we just look at some of the things that are not there. So, no overarching priority, a mere mention of lip service about creating an equal society. Well, what is the opposite of a more equal society? Fairly obviously, a less equal society. So, it is as we were, the rich will get richer under this regime, under this Strategic Plan, and the poor undoubtedly, without a shadow of a doubt in my mind, will get poorer. We have a commitment to reform the public service and we have changed from reduce costs to improve efficiency, which is expressed elsewhere in the document where it says: "Reform the public service to reduce costs and improve efficiency." So the meaning of: "Improve efficiency" and "Reduce costs" are one and the same thing, but at least this Council of Ministers is coming clean. They have said they are going to cut costs. Here is one of the amendments that were accepted. Why was it accepted? I do not know. "Promote sustainable population levels," whatever sustainable means, has been replaced and accepted without an argument that that should be substituted by: "Limit population growth." Well, they have accepted that and that is fine because the "limit population growth" actually means grow the population towards 100,000 by 10,000 or thereabouts. So we know what those fine words mean as well: "Limit population growth" means grow the population. Is it not wonderful, the

English language? We have just hit, apparently, a million words in English and still we can find new meanings to the words: "Limit population growth." We do not need any new words; we can just use the ones we have and make them mean what we say. We have also got a commitment to a diverse economy, despite the fact that for the past 7 years we have been ignoring the advice of our Oxera (Oxford Economic Research Associates) advisers which says that if you grow the low footprint, high value business that is the finance sector, you will inevitably have to reduce your tourism and agriculture and other sectors in the society because you simply cannot grow everything without growing population. So, it is fairly clear. We have the fine words. All elements, for example, of the public sector must work together and continue to work to create an efficient, effective and motivated public sector. Well, that is going to be very easy, is it not, following a pay freeze this year, possibly a pay freeze next year and then we will see where we are, while at the same time we are asking the public service to take the lead in responding to external pressures like the possibility of reduced income as a result of worldwide recession.

The Bailiff:

Deputy, will you forgive me for interrupting you once more, but I do not think it is appropriate for one to address the Assembly with one's hands in one's pockets. Please adapt your posture appropriately to the Assembly.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Thank you, Sir, for pointing that out. I shall attempt to do that. I must have been over-relaxed, which is not like me. Thank you. That is a new one on me and I appreciate the direction. All elements of the public sector work together while we cut their workforce, while public sector costs have impositions made on them because the taxpayer expects it. We must determine that only essential services, whatever that may mean, are delivered and that nice-to-haves and non-essential services, whatever they are, which impact most on the least well off in our society, are reduced and at the same time we will review the terms and conditions of employment for public sector staff. Not, as I would have it, in consultation to ensure good recruitment and retention levels, but we shall review the terms and conditions of employment for public sector staff. We will cut the terms of employment and their conditions while, of course, maintaining a motivated public sector. How many mutually exclusive things can this Council of Ministers and this Chief Minister accept and agree to at the same time, I wonder. Perhaps the number is limitless. Perhaps there are no exclusions in the logic that the Chief Minister affects to display. At the same time, where we cannot cut services we will promote private sector involvement and more commercial approaches to service provision, including but not limited to outsourcing where appropriate. What a way to motivate your public sector. What a way to deliver. This is an agenda, as I have said before, which is very clear and belongs in the ark where it should have been lost below the waters of Thatcherism. Now, we will do this by ensuring sustainable public finances. We will not raise taxes. We will not - because it was rejected - address the issue of supplementation. What does that mean? That means that we will have cuts. We will avoid new taxes, so what shall we do? We shall institute a set of charges. I do not know where those charges will be but there will be charges. Charges for sewage tax? I do not know. Sewage charges? Charges for X-rays? I do not know. All in the aim of ensuring sustainable public finances. Oh, hang on, I have forgotten one tax: G.S.T. (Goods and Services Tax). Now, I will take a bet today. I will go down to Honest Nev's and I will see what odds I can get on raising G.S.T. within 2 years. In 2 years' time, raising G.S.T. substantially in order to even protect anything, that is what we shall see. Finally, where else do I go to look at what population ... we will, of course, grow the population sustainably, whatever that might mean. No, we will not. We will limit population growth to 100,000 some time down the road and it only means 150 heads of household with their families coming, on average, every year for the next 2 or 3 years when we will review it, by which time, of course, that target, which may be do-able while we are in recession, may have been done. It may not have been done if we come out of the recession any earlier, but we will then review that and we will reset the marker. Again, I am

tempted to go back down to Honest Nev's and say: "What odds will you offer me in 3 years' time when this is reviewed that we see a figure of 250 heads of household or above?" It may have been hidden for the moment, but the time will come and it will not be very far down the line when we will see that 250 or more reappear and be told that with the growth in the economy it is now perfectly sustainable and still we do not need to build on any greenfields because we can stick people in St. Helier. We can stack them high and build them cheap, and that is what we will see. We are told that, of course, we will be able to strictly control and monitor this mechanism by our new migration policy, a migration policy that we have accepted in principle some years back but we have not seen hide nor hair of since. A names and addresses register which we do not know how it is going to work, how the names are going to be got, and a series of categories of workers who will have permission to live or work in certain categories, whose names will have been changed to "entitled", "registered" and ... what is the other one? Entitled, oh, yes. But the controls as to who will be in those categories will depend - like (j) cats. - on the employer. We will have no control. Finally, I suggest that the focus of the type of society which we are carrying on promoting as one of low spend, low tax, and with a commitment to not increasing taxes and not increasing new taxes, that will be maintained. The lowest spend in Europe will be maintained at 26 per cent or thereabouts compared to a 44 per cent average spend in the rest of Europe. What does that mean for my voters? I suggest that means an increased dose of poverty and a lack of support and an increase in alienation and a decrease in such fluffy-sounding things as trust. I notice that Senator Perchard has come back in, so I presume he feels that he has avoided both of the long speeches which might have been given in the Strategic Plan. As he avoided the Deputy of St. Mary's before lunch, he has now managed to avoid mine as well. So I congratulate him on successfully manoeuvring that. I shall be voting against this Strategic Plan. I do not think it contains the right way forward. It contains despair for many of my voters. I would encourage everyone who has doubts about this plan - and there are many - equally to vote against it. Abstention is not an option on a matter like this. Either vote for or against. I shall be voting against and I encourage as many Members as possible to do likewise.

8.15 Deputy J.M. Maçon:

There are some good points in this plan. There are some good chapters. There are some things which are very desirable and things we should be aiming towards. However, there are some other points which are more concerning. In the amended version, if Members will turn to page 14, which is Section 3, reform the public service and improve efficiency, we have already been made aware of the other issues that we will have to pass in order to support this Strategic Plan. This particularly became clear when Deputy Paul Le Claire talked about ratifying the U.N. (United Nations) Convention on the Rights of the Child and other things which are hidden within this plan which we need to do in order to support this. On page 14 at the top: "Rationalise property and promote modern office working environments which maximise productivity and minimise property requirements." Sounds very good, does it not? However, what would we do to achieve this? What plans are there that we already have to create lots of office space in one particular area? Is that not the Waterfront development? Are we binding ourselves to voting for this by supporting this? I have grave concerns with many of the "what will we do" points because I feel that we are binding our hands to vote for things which we may not support. Senator Perchard - or was it Senator Shenton - said: "It is not a problem because we can talk about these later in the Strategic Plan," but the problem is the money that will go into supporting these things, to developing these ideas within the department, if we have a problem with that now then we are wasting taxpayers' money and I would ask Members to contemplate that.

8.16 Deputy M. Tadier:

How is everyone doing? Are we hanging in there? It is nice to see ... just trying a bit of zeal here to get everyone re-motivated for the last hour or so. I hope that is not unacceptable. I just want to start with perhaps the points that I am most likely to forget because when I give a speech, perhaps it

is because I am a new Member, there is always something I sit down and think: “Drat, I forgot to say that and I really wanted to.” What I really want to do is focus on who put us here in the first place and just to remind everyone that we are elected. There has been lots of talk about consensus and every one of us, no matter what our constituency is, we have been elected here to represent people and that is what we should always bear in mind. Now, this plan essentially, although it is only valid for 3 years, some might say, is really to do with the next 30 or even 60 years. As a young Member in the States - I believe I am one of the 3 youngest Members in the House - I take a particular interest because when we talk about things like the ageing population, this is invariably something that myself and my 2 colleagues here, also other people on the outside, in the real world, will have to deal with the motives because there will be very real consequences about what we decide here today. So, I was imagining if a member of the public, perhaps a young person, let us say somebody under 30, was speaking directly to a States Member, he or she might say: “Who do you think you are? Why is it that you think you can pontificate about the future and make decisions which, in fact, I am going to have to pick up?” Members talk as if they have some kind of authority, but in reality we must remember it is these people who are going to have to live with the consequences. I would suggest that it would be very interesting to note how the 3 youngest Members, all under 30, vote in this particular Strategic Plan. I know for my part I will be rejecting the plan and I will outline the grounds on which I do that. I cannot speak for the other 2 colleagues; I suspect that they will also vote against it, from what I have heard. That is surely indicative of the outward mood of young people and many who may not even vote, it has to be said, in the Island. There has also been talk about the political divide in here, and while the actual merits of having a Strategic Plan at all and having such a long debate has been brought into question, certainly one of the side effects and unintended consequences which I believe can be seen as a benefit is that it does give a chance to have some good in-depth, philosophical, ideological discussion here. It is quite obvious that there is a rift and that is quite normal, I guess. It is to be expected. But I am very surprised when we do hear speeches like the one made by the Deputy of St. Ouen, always about why is it that you do not work with us. Well, I would put the question right back: why is it that the Council of Ministers do not work with us? Why is it they do not work with the public? Why is it that there constantly seems to be this conflict where public opinion must always be wrong? There is an argument that tough decisions now and again may need to fly in the face of public opinion, but that should be very exceptional. There is also an argument to say that governments should do exactly what the people want, but that is an argument for another day. So I would say why is it that most of the amendments have been rejected, or many of them, when they could have quite easily been accepted? This is because we are told about consensus politics, but in reality it is consensus on the Council of Ministers’ terms: you either toe the line or you do not, and if you do not you are a bad boy, you are some kind of troublemaker, but there is never any kind of meeting in the middle. I think something needs to change there. So, let us look at the main reasons why I and perhaps others will be voting against this Strategic Plan. It has been said that the plan is “fluffy”. That is not necessarily my reason for rejecting it because by its very nature in some ways the plan does have to be a fairly anodyne, nondescript document so that it can be quite accommodating and provide us with a general direction. But I would suggest that it is not fluffy; it is, in fact, flawed. It is not “woolly” as some have said; it is wily. It is not simply incomplete; it is insidious, which is worse than that. The document lacks imagination. Now, we know that we are faced with a changing world. I think everyone has acknowledged that, certainly economically, socially. There has been this hope - which I think is a false hope - that somehow the economy is going to get back to normal, that this is a blip on the radar and that, in fact, we want to be back to business as usual. In fact, this is what this document in front of us tells us. It is just basically business as usual. We may have to tighten our belts a little bit and that means efficiency savings, which actually means cuts. We are going to have to cut the public services even though we were told earlier today by Senator Ozouf - I think I have the words here - that the public want us to improve facilities and services and this document is going to help us do that. Presumably, the way we are going to improve services is by cutting services which, again, we have heard other Members talking about

doublethink and mutually contradictory ideas. This document is rife with these kinds of glib statements. Obviously the doublespeak is indicative of the doublethink which goes on in the background, the ability, I believe as George Orwell said, to hold 2 mutually exclusive ideas at the same time without seeing any kind of problem with that. So I would suggest that anyone with any kind of intellectual integrity needs to reject this document, and anyone with any real social conscience also needs to reject this document. Now let us look at some of the reasons. Let us turn to page 8, so header. Sorry, let us start a bit earlier than that, the second part which talks about the sustainable economy. I just want to draw out what I see as the disingenuous nature of certain parts of this document. We are told on one of the bullet points - and you do not have to turn to it because I will read it out - on page 12: "Jersey's reputation will be enhanced and its economy assisted if it invests in a range of environmental policies, particularly in the energy sector." Can anyone see the problem there, the flaw? It is obviously a good thing to do, to invest in environmental policies, but I suspect that is the motivation here which is flawed, because we are told that why do we want to pursue these environmental policies? Oh, it is because Jersey's reputation will be enhanced. Is that the real reason that we need to start taking care of the environment? I suspect the reason we need to do that is because globally CO2 emissions need to be reduced; also if it has an impact on our local environment then it is a good thing to pursue environmental policies, which should be ring-fenced, incidentally, it should not be seen as a way to raise revenue. So, there are other examples of that. We have seen the whole education part being criticised on the basis that it talks about economy, economy, economy, and insofar as the kids, the children, schoolchildren, teenagers, they are basically just seen as fodder for the economy because education in itself does not have any inherent worth, they have just got to come back to Jersey and work in a job, probably in finance but maybe not. I picked up a flaw, which may have been picked up by other Members, where it says that we need a population that can sustain our economy. It is not the other way round; it is quite clear what the central theme is here. The economy is central and everything else is subservient to the economy, including the people. So, let us get back to the original quote, I think, is that we are here to serve. Well, ultimately we are all here to serve the people of Jersey, and I think the overarching philosophy is working together to meet the needs of our community. Now, we are told that due to economic uncertainty or the fact that there is no money around, that we have to consider what the level of services are. Surely we are putting the cart before the horse here. This quote says: "We are working together to meet the needs of the community," but I get the impression that if we do not have the resources to meet the needs of the community we will just tweak the needs and say: "Well, the community does not need this. They do not need doctors. They do not need X, Y and Z so we will just cut this a little bit here, a little bit there." It is being seen already. I have friends who work in the Health Service - the Mental Health Service it must be said - and beds are already being cut. Although there is more demand for beds in the sense that there are numerous people in Jersey with mental health problems, the actual supply of beds is going down. I do not know where they are being housed, maybe in the prison, but this is an issue already. The whole issue about the population, which I think is the key thing and I will speak on it in just a moment because I think it is worthwhile, it has been said that the whole population debate has been tagged on to the Strategic Plan. To a large extent this is true. I have certainly never had a chance to debate the population issue. There does not seem to be any consensus either with the public ... sorry, there is consensus with the public because the public do not want the population to increase. They do not want it to increase significantly, that is for sure. There is no consensus in the House. Some people have bought into the lie that we need to increase the population significantly in order to deal with the ageing population rather than just facing up to the problem and dealing with it now and dealing with the problems of infrastructure. We are told: "No, we need to increase the population and then when Tadier is older he can deal with it because I will be gone, I will be on a nice pension and it will not be my problem anymore." That is the reality of it, that it will be my problem. It will be a problem for Deputy Vallois, Deputy Maçon and lots of other young people in the Island, but at least you can wash your hands of it. **[Laughter]** I will be happy to visit and play my accordion, but with the proviso that it may be cap in hand because I am not sure to have a pension by that time. It

will go into a special fund. But more seriously, I think the population issue is key here because clearly the actual population in terms of the inhabitants who live here currently, we know there is no great appetite for it. We have put the cart before the horse yet again. We should not be talking about what numbers Jersey could sustain; we should be deciding what level of services we want now, what the inadequacies are now, how we are going to solve the housing issues now. We have also commissioned a population report which has been issued on 1st June, which some Members I guess will still need to digest, but meanwhile it is like we are running that parallel and we are disregarding that, because we have agreed now to increase the population to 100,000 effectively. We have done that as a House, and I hope that the *J.E.P.* and BBC have noted that. I believe they probably already reported that. So, this seems the height of sophistry and deception to me. If I can give an example, I think it may be my Christian upbringing, but I like to work by analogy and parables. Imagine as a Deputy for St. Brelade that people are complaining about the traffic at Les Quennevais Park, and it is not a hypothetical example, it is a true one, as Deputy Power will also be able to testify. There is an issue with speeding in the estate, so imagine for some crazy reason I want to increase the speed limit in Les Quennevais Park from 20 miles an hour to 30 miles an hour. Then there is a public outcry and all the feedback says: "No, you cannot increase the speed limit because there is not the infrastructure within the estate to handle all the speeding cars and the extra traffic. In fact, at the moment traffic is already a problem, we cannot be dealing with that. If you increase the speed limit, let us say, to 30, we cannot deal with that." So I will come back to them and say: "Look, I have taken your complaints into account so what we have decided to do is just increase the speed limit to 25 miles an hour because we know it is an issue. We have listened, we have had consultation with you, so we will just increase it to 25 miles an hour." Now, if I come back to them or I stand for re-election in 2½ years' time, do you think they are going to vote for me on that basis? No, because I simply have not listened to what they are saying. There is an underlying problem that you cannot increase the speed on it if there is already an issue. This is basically where we are in Jersey. There is already an issue with population. There is already an issue with the infrastructure and being able to maintain the level of services that we are providing, and yet we have kind of just tagged-on to a debate, as Deputy Martin has said, and it has been done very underhandedly and I think this needs to be brought to attention. I will just highlight again the fact that we have been told earlier by Senator Ozouf we will improve services. We are told that we cannot have any discussion because, again, the same old argument about the current economic climate, which I find strange because there is always a current economic climate. It does not matter at which point in history you are, there is always a current economic climate. Presumably, what we are talking about is the uncertain forecast, but this is always trotted out as an excuse for inaction. The point is we are told we cannot debate any new kind of taxes, apart from G.S.T., and certainly we cannot debate any progressive taxes because this might chase people away. So there is no flexibility at that end, but on the other hand there is flexibility when it comes to the level of services that we want to carry out. So, in fact, it is quite all right to debate, well, we used to do this at the hospital, we used to run the bus service every half an hour but it is not really viable anymore so we are going to have to cut the bus service to every hour. We are going to have to take this nurse away. We are going to have to take these beds away. Currently, we are going to have to put more of an onus on individual responsibility, which is effectively another word for the government abdicating its responsibility, which I know some people - some Members - think that is a good thing. For me it is not. Sorry, this is slightly going to be a stream of consciousness purely by the way I work, but I would like to try to get the main points out if I can. There has been lots of talk about supporting the most vulnerable in our society, about the need for a social net, and I do not think anybody disagrees with that. The point is that it is almost like we are saying as long as we do the bare minimum, as long as we look after the most vulnerable, as long as we give a grant to certain people so that they can go to university, as long as we house certain people who are very poor, that is fine, we will do the very minimum. I believe that from my analysis I know that is a very good reason to do that. We look after the very poorest in our society basically so they do not revolt, so we shut them up and then everyone else, they can make do. There really is a whole

swathe of society at the moment that we are completely forgetting about called middle Jersey, and they are not necessarily tangible even. It is very difficult to define them, but who feel that they are not being looked after. They are not being listened to. They pay lots of taxes. They may be affected by '20 means 20.' They are not getting any benefit, but they are getting hit, facing a bigger tax bill included with G.S.T. and they are not getting the benefit. Another reason that I have to reject the document is there are these sweeping statements in it such as, on page 20: "We have lost much of the community spirit and personal responsibility of previous generations." That is arguable. It is probably true, but then it goes on to say: "People need to take more responsibility for their own lives and wellbeing." This is a paradox if you look at it very carefully, because what we are saying on the one hand is we have lost our community spirit, we have lost the fact that families do not live together for as long, people are forced out when they are 20 to pursue their own lives, so everyone has to have their own unit of accommodation as opposed to pooling. So if their needs mean that they cannot afford the houses they live together before, and although that posed problems that obviously contributed to community spirit. But on the other hand we are saying people need to take more responsibility for their own lives and wellbeing. So which is it? Are we saying that we want to be more community based, that we need to have camaraderie, or are we saying just go and take care of yourself, mate, society does not matter, community is not important? Although I guess if you wanted to you could probably come up with some kind of sophisticated argument to reconcile those 2, I suspect that at face value that is just complete nonsense. I will also talk briefly about the cultural identity. I do not want to labour the point, but this part is complete nonsense. It talks about the improved sense of self-confidence. Really, rather than this, what we need to be talking about is having an honest debate about whether we value people who come to Jersey. What is a Jersey person? I believe that anyone who lives in Jersey is Jersey in that respect. Anyone who contributes, whether it be through tax, through working in the little corner shop, through doing some cleaning or anything like that, they are all contributing. It is not necessarily something which can be measured in economic terms always, but they are to all intents and purposes a resident of Jersey. I believe our very good Bailiff made a very good speech on Liberation Day talking about inclusivity, and I believe that is the way that we need to be going forward. We cannot be putting people in boxes, and I welcome the fact that hopefully the migration policy will address these issues. Because at the moment we have different bars. Similar to the fact that we have different bars for the age of what you can do different things at, which I know is also confusing for people, you come to Jersey; after 2 years you are given the right to vote; after 5 years you can get a proper job; after 11 years you can start renting your own property without being a lodger, but only after 11 years, so you have had to pay your potential deposit saving up for a house, which could be going back into the market, all that time you have been paying it to a landlord. So, these things need to be really debated. I would also question the fact that we tax people for the first 2 years that they come here, but we do not let them vote. So, basically, we do not have representation but we do have taxation, and that surely is a flaw and that is something I would imagine will be brought back to the House again. We either should say: "We are not going to tax these people for the first 2 years because they are not real Jersey people" ... that is effectively what we are saying to them: "If you are not allowed to vote, you are not a real Jersey person." That is fine, but just let them keep their tax money. Two years later, if they still want to live in Jersey, you can start taxing them and give them the vote. It has to be one or the other. So, I believe I have probably digressed, but then it is a Strategic Plan and we are allowed to talk, within reason, about what we want to. So, I would just emphasise the last point - and I have no doubt missed quite a lot of this - but before I do that I was told by a Member before we started the Strategic Plan: "Even if I agree with 75 per cent of it, I will vote for it." Okay, that is one way to think of it, but it does beg the question why it is - and it was mentioned earlier - that amendments can be rejected simply on the basis of one word, and that has been the case. When they have been adopted, it is because it has been done begrudgingly and it has been done by a margin of one or 2, often. That was the case with the Deputy Higgins amendment about the genuinely diverse economy. Well, was it the word "genuine" or was it the fact that we are already doing it? Also with Deputy Southern, it was the "single overarching policy of

equality.” I do not know if it was the “overarching” part or if it was the “single”, and perhaps if it had said: “An overarching commitment to equality” it would have got through. But it is completely one rule for one and one rule for the other. We are told to accept this whole document, even though it has flaws and we may agree with only 50 per cent, 75 per cent, but as long as we agree with the general direction it is going in we have to support it. But on the other hand we are told that the Council of Ministers ... if they disagree with one word which by their interpretation could be interpreted to mean that there is going to be some kind of communist revolution in Jersey, as Members have said before - obviously that is not the case - but if they say that they do not agree with that one word for whatever reason, we are told that we have to accept that. So that is not fair, is it? Just to draw to an end now, I would just re-emphasise the fact and I would make a small personal statement. When I hear statements to do with housing and we are told: “We need to do X, Y and Z for our young people because they cannot get on the housing ladder”, I am not interested in a housing ladder. It is not any use to me. I cannot sleep or work or eat my breakfast on a ladder. I know that is not what is meant by it. The point is I think I and lots of people like me are not interested in climbing a ladder when it comes to property. We just want affordable housing. I just want to be able to go somewhere that I do not have to pay something like a third of my salary, which is probably more than most people’s salaries out there at my age, but nonetheless if I am having to pay roughly a third, and that is without bills included, without food and the rest of it, what kind of chance do people have? We need to get past this mentality of seeing housing as some kind of commodity which can be traded, similar to tax, in fact. It is there. Housing basically should be a right. We should have a right to adequate housing. On the one part, when it cannot be provided by the individual, then the government does certainly have a duty to provide that. But that is the point and I think we need to get away from this mentality of wanting to get on to the ladder because that is part of the problem. I look forward to future debates on housing because there really are some what might appear on the surface to be quite radical ideas to do with housing but they need to really be looked at, whether we need to start regulating more as to who can let properties. At the moment, if you want to open up a business you have to apply to Regulation of Undertakings. That is quite correct to make sure that everything is above board. But one of the biggest businesses in Jersey is property renting. We have branches over here who make lots of money doing that and, of course, they provide a service to people, but that is completely unregulated. So we need to look at whether licences should be issued so that people can rent property out and if there is a fee that can be put into a central fund by which a body can be set up to look at these places and make sure they are adequate. So I am simply going to leave it there, but I will reiterate the points as to why I am rejecting this. I believe that first of all it is based on 3 fallacies. The first one is population growth. There has been no consensus, no detailed debate about this, and I believe because it is so central ... and it is also flawed because I do not believe the public want population growth and also I do not think population growth solves the problem, even if it is just one part of the solution to solving the ageing population. I think it distracts from the real issue which sooner or later we will need to address. The second fallacy is to do with efficiency. I have pointed that out. Efficiency is just another word for cuts. We have to decide whether we want good services and if we do we have to pay for them. Then the third fallacy that we are being sold is about low taxation, high services. I brought that out last time, so I am not going to labour it too much, but we were given this quote which says the public expect low taxation and high services. I made the point that no, they do not. They do not expect that at all. The public are not stupid. We must really stop treating them as if they were stupid. The public do not expect low taxation and high services any more, I said, than we would expect to buy a Ferrari for the price of a Mini. They just want good value for money. It is these kinds of flaws that just grate and which make me unable to accept it because it is based on those 3 fallacies. It lacks imagination. It does not really deal with any of the key issues that we are facing globally but also as an Island. In fact, many of the problems are only heightened by the fact we are an Island because in some ways we have limited ways of dealing with these issues. So, that is the reason that I will be rejecting the Strategic Plan. I do not believe the week has been in vain because I think we have all had a really good

debate and some of the amendments provided a good opportunity of some dialectical politics. I would ask Members to robustly, if they want to ... do not feel obliged to vote for this Strategic Plan simply because we have been here for 5 days. Like in poker, you would not throw good money after bad. Just because you have wasted 5 days, if that is what you think you have been doing - I do not - then do not feel that you have to vote for it on that basis. You are independent in theory and you can vote with your conscience.

8.17 Deputy A.K.F. Green:

I would like, first of all, to speak about the process of this debate over the last 5 days and how we got where we are and then talk about one or 2 of the points in the Strategic Plan. Nightmare and tortuous has been mentioned by several speakers of the process, and I just wonder, really, as a new Member, there must be a better way of doing this. On one hand, though, if the Council of Ministers present us with their Strategic Plan it might be argued by some Members they are dictating to us what they are going to do. On the other hand, if they ask for our opinions, they fail to lead us. As I say, it has been a nightmare route. Maybe it might have been helpful if all the Members that brought a lot of the amendments attended the workshops and had input into the draft plan. **[Approbation]** Maybe it might have been helpful if the speeches had not been so long on occasions, often containing politics and other things irrelevant, really, to the Strategic Plan. I would suggest that the P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) look at bringing a proposition forward to limit proposition speeches to 15 minutes and response perhaps to 5 minutes because we have ... wasted is a bit strong, but we have taken far too long over this process. It has not been particularly useful. It may also have helped if the Council of Ministers had discussed with the people bringing amendments before bringing out the draft plan that they could have included some of those amendments as part of their draft plan and cut out a lot of the debate over the last 5 days. So it is 6 of one and half a dozen of the other. Like the good Member on my right, I have a mother and I have to say that she would have banged our heads together if we had behaved like that as children. It is not a perfect plan. It is not a perfect plan, but we could suffer from ... what is the saying, analysis by paralysis; or paralysis by analysis I think is the right way round. Forgive me, I am still learning about these things. We could spend all day reading in between lines as to things that might or might not be there. I am not particularly happy with 5, on the limit the population growth, and that is why I supported most of the amendments of Deputy Southern on that one issue. We have a black economy. We are going to spend a long time controlling those few (j) cat. people who will come with their families, but who will make a significant contribution both to the economy in all the diverse sectors hopefully, but also making a significant contribution hopefully to our public sector. What we failed to do is to control the black economy when Tom, Dick and Harry... or to be politically correct should I say Harriet? We failed to control those. We allowed them to feed the black economy, to feed the greed, providing they are prepared to put up with squalid, substandard accommodation. We have to stop that. That is where we should be controlling it and we need to bring in work permits to do it properly. It is about quality of life and fairness and equality for everybody. That said, there are some positives in here as well. If I can take you to priority 8 under "What we will do": "Work together to help people to help themselves by providing real incentives to improve their situation and their standard of living." Could anyone argue with that? "Work together with all agencies to co-ordinate an efficient and effective social and community service as supported and set out in the social policy framework." We know that there is much wrong with our current social services and we do need to do something about that, but that is in there in priority 8. Nobody knows better than I do - I am not saying I am the only one that knows in this House - some of the failings in there, but we are going to do something about it. Under priority 9: "Work together to ensure effective and co-ordinated actions are taken to protect the safety and welfare of vulnerable children." I do not have to say any more about that. I think we all know we have to do that and our track record thus far is not good. Target inclusion: "Intervene to identify underachievement early." One of the reasons I stood for election this time was I do not want to sound negative about those that achieve very good 'A' levels and degrees but something

must tell us that something is wrong when 80 per cent ... and I think it is about 80 per cent - and one report I read the other day was two-thirds - of the people in the criminal justice system have a reading age lower than ... some cannot read or write at all, but they have a significantly lower reading age than they have got. We have to do something about that and when we do it we need to celebrate their successes, not just those that get degrees and 'A' levels. So we need to do that and it is in here, so there are some good things in here. "Improve the health and well-being of our children, including healthy lifestyles," and we could spend the whole afternoon talking about that, but that is about not just promoting those that are excellent at sport but promoting inclusion in sport and diet and preventing obesity and getting children walking safely to school. I was there at lunchtime trying to make it safer for children to access First Tower School. It is a whole lifestyle positive thing again: help parents to understand and meet the children's needs by improving their parenting skills. Those of us that attended that 3D conference - one of the very first things I did as a Member of this House - saw that if we do not intervene ... I would have said when I stood for election that we needed to make sure we intervened at 7. I realise now that is far, far too late. We need to almost be intervening at conception. We need to get in there really early, working with partners like The Bridge to get in there, to break that cycle, because if we do not then those at 15 ... I am not saying all 15 year-olds are bad parents but those at 15 that become parents, their children become parents and the whole cycle continues. We need to break that cycle. We need to get in there and we need to get in early. That is in the plan. There is much that is good about it. Thanks to the Constable of St. Helier we have a much wider inclusive thing around culture and heritage and I really appreciate that as well. So, I will be supporting the plan. What I would urge people to do is support the plan, give the Council of Ministers the responsibility, but hold them accountable to it.

8.18 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

I, like other Members of this Assembly, have been appalled by the process we have had to endure over the last 5 days that we have spent debating this matter and believe, like everyone else, that a better method must be found going forward. However, I will not add to the pain by speaking for more than a few minutes. While there is much that I could sign up to in the amended Strategic Plan there is much that I cannot. Contrary to what the Deputy of St. Ouen says about it being a shared vision of the Assembly, it is anything but a shared view. The Chief Minister describes it in his June newsletter as the Council of Ministers' manifesto and that is exactly what it is: their view of the future of the Island, not mine. Now, I happen to believe that this plan if adopted is going to lead to significant cuts in public services, and I believe those cuts will not just be to remove excess fat but will be deep cuts to the bone and we will be reduced to certain core services. Why do I believe that? Well, first of all, I believe that we have a bigger black hole than we think going forward and I believe that part of the reason for that is what will be the failure of the 'Zero/Ten' policy. Ministers will be coming back to us in the future and saying they cannot recover the money from people outside the Island; we are going to have a shortfall; therefore, we are going to have to either reduce services or raise even more money. That is what I think is going to be the result of this plan. They have ruled out tax rises for the next few years with the exception of environmental taxes, but you can expect that by 2012, 2013, when the undertaking not to adjust G.S.T. comes about, when that period comes we will experience significant rises in G.S.T., the favoured tax of the Council of Ministers. It will be 7.5 or 10 per cent to make up for the shortfall that we are going to experience. The other thing I forecast is lots of user pays charges and we are going to see lots of these things. So, in other words, it is a tax by another name and there will be lots of these coming forward. I believe that the cuts that we are going to experience over the next few years are going to cause great anger and outrage among the population and possibly it will cause them to rethink, but it will only cause them to rethink in the sense that they believe it will condition people in the future to accept higher tax rises. Remember, the only taxes they will consider will be G.S.T. I also believe, too, that this policy that we are going to have, despite what we have been told, will lead to privatisation and outsourcing to a great deal. If anyone thinks that outsourcing is going to be the panacea for our problems, that it will result in more efficient services, cheaper services, *et cetera*,

all we have to do is look to the U.K. example and say: "It just is not true," especially in our economy where we have monopolistic or duopolistic interests. In other words, we have an economy where there is no real competition and, therefore, people will take advantage of the situation we find ourselves in. I also happen to believe despite the acceptance of my amendment that we lay the foundations for a genuine diverse economy that nothing will change whatsoever. I believe we are wedded to finance and that policy will be pursued irrespective and we will see just tinkering at the edges. Now, a consequence of this is quite simply that we will have higher population, despite all the talk about limiting population, controlling the growth and so on. We will have an influx of people over the next few years just simply to feed the requirements of the finance industry. What it will lead to is continued house inflation. We have already got houses that cost half a million pounds to purchase. Large portions of our population cannot afford to buy property, nor can they afford the very, very high rents that private landlords are charging people for accommodation. All we are going to do is perpetuate what I believe is becoming a 2-tier economy: the haves and the have nots. Many of the children that we have who cannot find work in the finance industry or do not want to work in the finance industry will leave this Island. I think it will be a perpetuation of what has gone on before. So, I really fear for what is going on in the future and because of this I cannot support this Strategic Plan.

8.19 Senator S. Syvret:

I have listened with interest to some of the newer Members of the Assembly saying that there has to be a better way than this. There has to be a better way of producing these kind of strategic plans for the community. Having had nearly 20 years of this kind of debate, I can say quite confidently, I think, to those Members that this kind of internal debate is never going to work effectively and it will never produce effective and responsive government on behalf of the community we are here to represent. If you want to know what the correct process is, what the correct process should be, that process is called democracy and it must involve us abandoning the cultural habits of a century or so and embracing party politics. Because it should be the voting public who decide upon the policies of the Island's Government and decide what kind of future they want. They then make that decision during the elections when they decide how to vote. When you have a government, an Executive, with that kind of moral authority, that kind of intellectual backing behind it for its programme and policies, then this kind of nebulous and, frankly, futile exercise that we are engaging in now would become hopefully largely redundant. The governing party or coalition of parties would pursue their policies. If they were successful, if they pleased the public, they would get re-elected; if they did not, the public would get rid of them. That would give the people of Jersey the power that they need and the power that they have not had, frankly, as I say, for over a century. Looking at this document from any kind of intellectual perspective, the word "pathetic" just is not adequate to get even close to describing this. Talk about nebulous, vacuous, motherhood and apple pie clichés. For example, on page 3 it says: "With this in mind, it is essential that this Strategic Plan achieves a balance between (1) dealing with the current economic downturn in order to reduce the impact of the global economic situation on Jersey's residents, communities and businesses; and (2) developing a plan for the long-term future of the Island." Now, that sounds great, does it not? Who could argue with those objectives? But you then have to ask yourself the question: "Does this plan succeed in addressing those 2 overarching objectives? Does it strike the balance between them?" No, of course, it does not. Because, in effect, what we have when we deal with this strategic policy document is simply yet more of the same. As I said in the early stages of this debate during one of the amendments, what we have today here is the politics of failure. We have all of these issues, these problems that our community faces, which have been articulated by many Members in the course of this debate. We have all of these problems which we - I think most of us - agree that we have to address, and what does the Council of Ministers come forward with in order to address these problems that are the consequence of the policies of the past 40 years? More of the same. If it has not worked, if it has not solved some of these problems for the past 40 years, what on earth makes us think it is going to suddenly start solving our problems in the future? It

will not. This policy is weak, it totally lacks true leadership. It tries, and fails, to be all things to all people. It tries to say to us and to the community out there we can have our cake and eat it and, as a result, it lacks the leadership that is needed for this community. Jersey is facing economic and social issues, a crisis perhaps greater than those we have faced in living memory in the coming couple of years. We are all well-versed in the economic downturn but, believe me, we have not barely even begun to see the beginnings of it yet. Now, to address those kind of problems, a government has to exhibit leadership and that means sometimes saying to people unpleasant things, hard truths. It means saying to the community: "Well, we have to do X, Y and Z" and parts of it will not be popular but that is the responsible thing to do for the long-term interests of the community. Instead of that kind of leadership, in this document we have the kind of absolutely hackneyed slogans that are produced on pages 7 and 8: "Working together to meet the needs of our community to enable everyone to have the opportunity to achieve their full potential." This is a very good example of the absolute mutual exclusivity of the range of the objectives in here. It goes on: "Meet our health, housing and education challenges", "Prepare for the ageing society" and: "Protect our countryside and our environment." Now, we cannot protect our countryside and our environment if we are going to carry on growing the population, as this document is going to do. It is more of the same and it is mutually exclusive and it is cowardly and it is weak. If you want to grow the population, if you believe that is the correct priority for Jersey, fine, say so. If, on the other hand, you believe protecting the Island's environment, its culture, its heritage, is important, fine, say that as well. What is hypocritical - and frankly dishonest - is to say that you can do both. We cannot do both. We know this is what the States has been trying to do for the last 40 years and it just does not do it. Looking at the priorities on page 8, again: "Support the Island community through the economic downturn", that is number one: "(2) Maintain a strong, sustainable and diverse economy" and it goes on and on: "(5) Promote sustainable population levels; (6) Provide for the ageing population," and quite how those 2 are supposed to fit together I do not know. Again: "Protect the public and keep our community safe; increase social inclusion; maintain and develop the Island's infrastructure; maintain high quality education; protect and enhance our natural inbuilt environment," and then immediately afterwards: "Adequately house the population and protect our unique culture and identity." I certainly could agree to priorities which are: "(13) Protect and enhance our natural inbuilt environment" and: "(14) Adequately house the population." Those are 2 objectives I have no difficulty at all being completely committed to, but the problem is that all we have in this document are precisely the same policies that we have had for the 40-odd years that have failed to achieve either of those objectives, not even one of them. Deputy Green touched upon some of these issues when he spoke and referred to work permits and so on, things of that nature. We can protect and enhance our natural built environment and we can adequately house our population in decent and affordable accommodation but in order to do so we have to get a handle on population growth and that is precisely the very thing, of course, that the powers that be - the Jersey Establishment Party - does not want to do. The problems we face as a society are of the same kind that we have faced for many years but there are also some qualitative differences to the challenges we face in the community, and I have already mentioned the economic downturn which the world is going through now. Like a lot of commentators, frankly, I do not see it merely as a blip, I see it as the end of an era and, as much as we may not like it, a whole different mode of life and way of living and keeping body and soul together in the future. Unpleasant and as negative a message that might be to face up to, I believe that stating clearly those problems is one of the qualities of leadership. There is a reason why clichés become clichés; it is usually because they are quite accurate and effective in encapsulating a certain set of circumstances. So here goes with the cliché that most springs to my mind when reading this document and that cliché is this: this plan is merely like shuffling the deck chairs around on the deck of the Titanic. We have an ageing population, environmental destruction, economic vulnerability, Ponzi scheme economics and population growth as well. All of the same kind of things we have done time and time again in the past and it just does not work. I try not to read it unless I really have to but I happened to glance at a copy of today's *Jersey Evening Post* and there was a most fascinating little piece I noticed in the

business section where an expert giving a talk said quite bluntly and plainly that the finance industry will never return to the levels of prosperity that we have grown used to in the last couple of years. That is not me; that is not some left-wing doomsayer saying that, this is an expert in the finance industry and it is a statement of reality. Yet we are in the position we are in today, economic vulnerability, a mono-culture economy and totally inadequate reserves to even begin to properly address the challenges we face because of our absolute addiction to the offshore finance industry. Against that background we have to consider other looming global crises, although I am glad to say there are now several Members in this Assembly who do understand this issue and articulate it in here - certainly I do not think it has particularly caught hold in the public consciousness yet and certainly I do not think the majority of States Members fully appreciate the nature of it - and that, of course, is peak oil. The world's economy is utterly dependent on oil for all kinds of reasons, so is our agriculture, our food production, our manufacturing, everything we do is dependent upon oil and, globally, all liquid oil production has peaked. Now, if by some chance we were to return back to a growing boom-time economy, as mainstream economists and commentators would have us believe can happen in a year or 2's time and we get back to those kind of levels of growth, such as that in India and China and so on, that is a massive increase in the demand for oil product against a supply that has peaked and is now in terminal and, frankly, starkly plunging decline. Can we realistically look to the future and imagine the economy of the world of Europe, of this nation, of this Island, is going to remain the same and is going to succeed? No, we cannot. Perhaps it is a very extreme example in Jersey, but it is merely, perhaps, a more intense example of the problems that the Western world has - countries like the United Kingdom and the United States of America and the European Union. In effect, we have a Ponzi scheme economy that is wedded to more and more and more growth; effectively it is that you have to keep on growing the system. But you cannot carry on growing the system because mathematically and inevitably it is doomed to collapse one day. So people just hope that they make their cut out of it during the good times and they are off the scene and their investments and so on are out of the way when the scheme invariably collapses. It is a kind of pyramid selling scheme, economic bubbles: South Sea Bubble, Tulipmania, East India Company, it is all well documented. When Deputy Green spoke he mentioned that what we needed was work permits, and I very much agree with him. As I have remarked previously, I am working on a proposition to ask the Council of Ministers to make the necessary arrangements to begin having a workable work permit scheme in place and ready to go when (and I say "when" not "if") it becomes necessary because, believe me, if Members in this Assembly imagine that we can carry on resisting the notion of work permits when we have 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 5,000 unemployed people out there, then they are living in a dream world. But when that proposition to set up the structure and gets ready to press the button on work permits and implement them comes along, will Deputy Green and will other States Members who might pay lip service to these things - like protecting employment opportunities for local people - stick to their guns when you consider the dramatic change in market power that is going to result from that massive switch in market power to employees and to tenants and property purchasers, away from the traditional entrenched *rentier* and business elite of the Island? How many Members are going to have the backbone to deal with that immense titanic political struggle when it emerges? That remains to be seen because that struggle is there, it is not often spoken about, we tend to ignore it, but it is there. I think one of the things that we have to conclude, when we honestly look at such issues, is that if we are being honest we cannot pretend that the vast majority of people in Jersey have the same interests and the same objectives, as though most of our community all unite on a common set of aims and we could all be happy, because that is not the truth. The truth is you have the *rentier* elite; you have those who want to keep a shortage of supply and an over-demand for their product accommodation and you have the great majority of ordinary people who want to be adequately and reasonably and affordably housed. Those are 2 irreconcilable, conflicting sets of interests and unless and until this Assembly starts exhibiting enough backbone to make those kinds of decisions, to start being honest about it, we are never going to address the issues. The plan itself - frankly, even if it were any good - on the population

policy issue alone I would have to vote against it even if there were things I felt very, very strongly in support of in the remainder of the document. The population issue is simply so fundamental to the issues that we have to face as a community and they are not just issues for us as politicians, let us be clear about this, it comes back to leadership: these are issues for every person out there in our community. We have an ageing population: it is a structural phenomenon, it is an historical phenomenon, and the same as all developed countries now have ageing populations. Dealing with that, learning to cope with it, is going to have some unpleasant and unavoidable side effects: possibly people having to work for longer; possibly people when they are in their working years having to set more aside by way of more social security; having to have a government that properly invests in the future via sovereign wealth funds or something of that nature; being prepared to go back more to the times when families were more extended and looked after each other more effectively. Those are some of the realities we have to face. But more people, of course, do not like to talk about hard truths like that when we are speaking to the voting public. So, on the population policy basis alone, I would have to vote against this because it is simply innumerate to come to this Assembly and hold out this notion that replacement labour by inward migration is going to solve our problems. It has not done in the last 40 years; it will not do in the future. In fact, you could do the calculation on ... I will not say the back of a fag packet because I do not like smoking, but you could do it very, very easily to show just mathematically how it does not work. To conclude, I know that what always happens at this stage is that you then get Jersey Establishment Party members jumping up and down and saying: "Well, this is what we have brought forward, what is the alternative? You are not bringing forward any alternatives, *et cetera*." Well, this is the kind of mantra that always gets rolled out at these stages and it is usually untrue because there have been often, over the years in the past, many serious attempts to come forward with proper research projects, exploring new policies, different ideas, a different way of doing things, but they virtually always get voted out, so alternatives have been tabled in the past. But on this particular occasion people may remember that a few of us States Members - a kind of very loose and broad grouping - said before Christmas publicly that we would work on an alternative Strategic Plan and, indeed, that is going to happen. Now that this debate has occurred and this piece of woefully inadequate nonsense is going to be approved by this Assembly, those of us who are ready and willing to exhibit some leadership, to start facing harsh reality and to start addressing the real medium and long-term interests of our community, are going to sit down together, work together, co-operate, and come up with a better vision for our Island. I say reject this 40 years of rubbish, we have heard it all before, it is time for something new.

8.20 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

I am almost afraid to follow Senator Syvret. I can see that the House's appetite for further speeches is probably limited so I will be brief. I feel that I need to explain to the Council of Ministers why I will be voting against this Strategic Plan. Deputy Higgins has already referred to the very timely message from the Chief Minister's desk and if I may be allowed to quote from that: "The Strategic Plan is designed to be a blueprint for the future political direction of the States. It is, effectively, the manifesto of the Council of Ministers and should give a firm indication to the community and the wider world of the way in which the Island should be moving over the next few years." Frankly, I do not agree with that statement because I do not agree that this Strategic Plan is the direction in which the Island should be moving over the next few years. I base that statement really on the population issue alone. We have been told in the written comments from the Scrutiny Chairman's Committee that if the Strategic Plan is approved it will, in fact, be set in stone and Senator Breckon spoke to that, really, during his speech. If we limit the population by growing it, as Deputy Southern said, to 100,000, it is not the way in which Jersey should be moving in the next few years. I am fearful that I am repeating other Members but without us having full information, without us having a full and open debate on the population issue, if we approve this plan we will indeed be setting in stone what I see as the Council of Ministers' policy of population growth by strategic stealth. As Government we should be introducing a proper mechanism to control inward

migration and I know I am repeating what other Members have said. I look forward to the debate coming before the House that will give us a proper mechanism to control inward migration. In the meantime - and I look to the Chief Minister, who I see is looking at me intently - I cannot support, on the population issue alone, the Council of Ministers' manifesto in which they indicate that the way forward for Jersey over the next few years is by increasing our population to a ceiling of 100,000.

8.21 Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville:

I was going to make a long speech because I sat on the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel. I would just say as a result of that much of the information that we worked from was inadequate. The figures that we were originally given were based on 2005 population figures and, as we all know, the population has increased in the years 2006, 2007 and 2008 by approximately 2,000. So the base figure that we started from was woefully out. If anyone can think, 2,000 more people in the Island is quite a number - 2,000 more people to house - and we did not have the correct figures. Strangely, they came out 2 days after our migration report came out. The research that has been done into making this sort of increase, the 150 heads of households which will approximate to 375 people, we could not understand where this figure came from and certainly there was no analysis and no research into what that would do to our infrastructure. The only analysis that has been done is how it will pay for our pensions for the ageing population; that is the only regard increasing population has had. As I said, I did want to speak further but much has been said so I do not want to repeat. I will just read out the concluding recommendation in our report which says: "Further work should be undertaken by the Council of Ministers to stimulate debate on the principles underlying the population policy in order that a starting point and direction for the population policy can be agreed." That is along with other recommendations and yet we are being asked in this Strategic Plan to agree to a figure without any background information. I do not know if many of the new Members have seen what was proposed in the last Assembly with "registered" and "licensed" and what have you. What we need is a migration law and then a population policy. But asking us to agree and sign up to a figure of 150,000 in a Strategic Plan to my mind is very, very wrong. However, there is something I would like the Chief Minister to answer in his summing up speech and that is if this Strategic Plan does not go through do we revert to the old one? If this is the case then that is 500 heads of households. So take your pick, which is the better of the 2 options? Either way, I cannot support increasing the population in this way, given the lack of research and analysis that has been done.

8.22 Deputy J.A. Martin of St. Helier:

Just a quick follow-on from the Deputy of Grouville: is it either or, or is it both? I want this totally clarified. If we adopt this are we throwing out of the window the debate on P.25/2005, which was 1 per cent of working population, as the Deputy has just mentioned, 500 plus, because, as I have mentioned previously in the amendments, I have not had this answered. The last Chief Minister told me they would run concurrently. Now, that is very worrying. Does this one replace ... as this is a Strategic Plan and I was told in the question time that that was our migration policy; will that one be sitting underneath? Now, this has to be answered very carefully and I will be listening very carefully because it depends which way I will probably vote on the overall plan.

The Bailiff:

I call upon the Chief Minister to reply.

8.23 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

I suspect that rather like Deputy Tadier's comments mine might be a little bit disjointed because things have rambled on a little bit over the course of today, in fact, you could say over the course of the last 5 days. I think certainly in the debate on the main proposition there have been 2 main themes that I have picked up. The first is a concern about the process of discussing and debating a

strategic plan and the second is a concern about population. I understand and appreciate both those concerns. If I take, first of all, the process: the process allows that any Member can bring forward an amendment to the Strategic Plan lodged by the Council of Ministers. I think I can go back a stage earlier because the Council of Ministers in putting this plan together did try to involve other States Members, Scrutiny Panels, members of the public, in order to try to deliver what we say is the aim of the Strategic Plan to work together to meet the needs of our community. I for one welcome the chance. We have had 70 amendments to debate and to discuss and to accept or reject. As Members know, many of those amendments were accepted from the start by the Council of Ministers as being reasonable, realistic, adding value to the Strategic Plan. There were other amendments which we as the Council of Ministers felt we could not accept but as is the democratic right of every States Member those amendments were put before them and they were debated and they were either accepted or, in many cases, rejected. But the opportunity for debate was there, that is part of our process in achieving a plan which, at the end of the day, ought to be that which we take forward. Part of the difficulty, if you like, about democracy is that not everyone agrees with every aspect of every debate and, at the end of the day, some people's point of view differs from others, some will be a majority and some will be in a minority. During the course of this last week we have had 2 debates on 2 amendments about population. Feelings ran quite high in both of those debates and a lot of Members felt passionately that the Council of Ministers had got it wrong but when the vote came, at the end of the day, the democratic vote was to reject those amendments. There have been other amendments; there have been amendments about income support, there have been amendments about this, that and the other, so it is natural that some people will be disappointed with the outcome of some of those debates, but we have to move forward and we have to work together to meet the needs of our community. If I do not go through every Member's comments in detail it is because many of them, I think, had those 2 common themes. I think what we have to do now is to see how, as Deputy Le Claire said, having listened to Members: "We need to all get behind the plan, recognising that life is never 100 percent the way we might like it." I think we owe it to the community to have a blueprint to go forward. I think I should maybe add that Senator Ozouf cannot be here this afternoon. I was supposed to be in London this afternoon trying to get a Tax Information Exchange Agreement with Australia, but because I felt that my place today was here with the Strategic Plan debate I asked the Deputy Chief Minister to attend that in my absence. So that is the only reason that he is not here this afternoon for this important debate and I thank him for covering for me. Senator Ozouf did indicate quite freely that the last Strategic Plan has delivered many of its objectives and that the future is going to be challenging, but the plan is indeed transparent and, in his words, exciting. I think other people might have a different view of what is meant by "exciting" but I think certainly it is challenging and it is a clear sense of direction that we now have. I remind Members that the words of the proposition are to approve the aims on page 7 and the subsequent priorities. We have reviewed those priorities and we have refined those priorities and now, I think, the majority of Members agree with the majority of those priorities. I think I repeat and endorse maybe the words of Senator Perchard when he said it is now up to us to deliver on those priorities. They have been set not by the Council of Ministers, they have been set by the whole States Assembly and it is for the Council of Ministers to deliver on that. Deputy De Sousa does not like to sign a document that she cannot accept the entire part of and she cannot accept the population part. I know some people find it hard to accept the population part and I suppose in that respect the Strategic Plan for some people is something like the curate's egg with bits of it which they find a little unpalatable. Nonetheless, we have to have a plan and this is the plan that we have before us today. The Deputy of St. John thinks that this plan is a bit of a wish list and that things will change, perhaps, over the next couple of years. I have no doubt that things will change, not just over the next couple of years but over the next 20 years and the next 50 years. If this plan had been too specific there could be a danger of that happening. I believe that this plan is sufficiently focussed in the general direction; that it can be quite capable of dealing with the next few years and adjusted in the light of those changed circumstances without amending the priorities that we have before us. The priorities that we have before us really are priorities for the Island,

whether the economy is strong or weak, whether we have peak oil declining, whether we have different demands and different pressures on us, whether we have pandemic flu, whatever the situation may be, they are priorities which need to be adhered to, come what may. He is one of those who think that we ought to have a better process for debating this plan and I am happy to talk to the Scrutiny Panel and to the Privileges and Procedures Committee to see whether that process can be improved, but I would not want to take away the democratic right of States Members to discuss and challenge the direction of this plan in some way or another. Deputy Wimberley spoke at length and I acknowledge that his contribution and that of Deputy Southern are perhaps the 2 most important things we have heard over the past 5 days. I acknowledge the dedication and commitment and fervour of his comments. But while he agrees with our vision of working together to meet the needs of the community he has some question about whether we are able to put that into practice. In particular, I think he quotes the needs of the community as being life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Well, that may not coincide exactly with what our aims are but I think if one looks at the aims of this Strategic Plan they are not inconsistent with that. It may just be that we are coming from different directions and that maybe he is just pursuing a slightly different wish list because he clearly has, and indeed Senator Syvret has, a keen interest in matters like peak oil and climate change. I point out to him that those amendments to the Strategic Plan to reflect peak oil and climate change have been accepted by the Council of Ministers so there is no argument in that respect between us. Senator Breckon spoke of a variety of comments or criticisms of the Strategic Plan and I think the words of Senator Breckon probably exemplify the way a lot of us feel that we are much happier talking about a hands-on approach, what we should be doing and how should we get on with it rather than a strategic view. I think there is a good place for that sort of approach but not so much within that of a strategic plan which has to be at a strategic level. I think some of his comments, in fact, may be slightly off the mark but I am not going to go into them in detail, partly because he is not here, but partly because I think they are more of detail of business plan activities rather than strategic direction. Deputy Trevor Pitman made, I think, the important point that this is the Council of Ministers' plan and we should stand or fall on the strength of this plan. Well, certainly from my point of view I believe that it is important that that is correct, that this plan is the direction which the Council of Ministers believes the Island should be going, and if we did not believe it should be going in that direction we would not have proposed this plan in the first place. If that plan has been amended and improved so it gets in an even better situation, well, to me, so much to the good. That is where, again, I welcome the chance we have had to have an alternative approach. I did wonder, and Senator Syvret referred to it in his speech, what had happened to the alternative plan that I read about in the *Evening Post* a while ago. I think the nearest we got to that was, in fact, the series of amendments from Deputy Southern because I think they really did put an alternative approach as a package which could be regarded as akin to an alternative plan, maybe not a complete alternative but a step towards that, and that plan was debated and those amendments, by and large, were rejected. But it was there. Now I think we have to do as the Deputy of St. Ouen says, and that is to work together, not for our own good but for the good of the community. That responsibility to work together rests very much on the shoulders of all of us, not just the Council of Ministers, but all Members of the States. Deputy Southern talks about the Strategic Plan as being something like Nightmare on Hope Street. He seems to think that Hope Street is next to Cyril Le Marquand House. Well, if that is his sense of geography then I hope his sense of strategic direction is rather better. He seems to criticise the fact that we have ended up with a priority which says to limit population growth. I am sorry if he feels offended by that but I would point out that that was an amendment which he put forward and which we accepted. So, there we are, sometimes you cannot win. He has a suggestion, I think shared by somebody else, that G.S.T. might go up in a couple of years' time and I think that is perhaps indicative of the approach of some people, such as the Deputy, of greater willingness for taxation spending. If we want to have a 'tax and spend' policy as an alternative approach so be it, but I do not think it is one which, for myself, I want to encourage. Deputy Tadier, again, I think, had some very reasonable comments about the plan but he again felt it lacked imagination. I would say perhaps he is right, perhaps the plan does lack

imagination, perhaps, in fact, it is rooted not in the imagination but this plan is rooted in reality. Maybe that is where he needs to be starting from, not from the imagination. I think what I have sensed in many speeches this afternoon is using this Strategic Plan debate to, I think, belittle the States Chamber and turning it from a debating chamber into something more of a soapbox for people to air their own particular points of view. I think that is a bit of a shame because I think we as a States Assembly ought to take this as the one chance that we have to have mature, responsible debates but, on balance, I think we are going the right way. I thank Deputy Green for his comments. I agree with him, it is not a perfect plan but it is, I think, a good step forward, a good way ahead and a way ahead in which we have had 5 days to discuss and to refine. I think Deputy Higgins was another one who has followed the same sort of line of thinking as Deputy Southern. Senator Syvret gave a speech which I have come to expect from him. He says that this is only going to be solved by a party political system. Well, you may have solved one problem in that direction, you may create certain others, and I suspect that the creation, or otherwise, of a party political system would not be dictated by Members in this House, it would be dictated by the will of the public and they would decide whether they want a party political system or not. At the moment what you might say we have is a coalition of 53 party members each with a different party manifesto and maybe there is not the sort of uniformity which would make some decision making easier but not necessarily better. The Senator seems to think that we are going on this continuing downhill path towards a precipice and that the past 40 years, to the Senator, have been 40 years of failure. Well, he is entitled to his view but I think if you ask many people outside the Island as well as inside the Island they would say that they challenge the notion that Jersey has been a failure in the last couple of decades, and certainly I challenge the notion that Jersey has been a failure in the last couple of decades. In my view Jersey has been successful by following the policies it has and this plan builds on those policies and improves them still further. He talks about the cliché of shuffling the deck chairs in the Titanic. The Titanic, I think, was moving towards an iceberg. If it has taken 40 years and we still have not hit the iceberg I suspect that maybe what we are doing is enjoying a smooth cruise on calm waters, but that is another cliché. Anyway, I think, enough of those. Slightly odd comments from the Senator that once this debate has been concluded an alternative plan will come forward soon. I think that is probably about 6 weeks too late. If we are going to have an alternative plan it should have been at the time we were discussing which way forward. So I am not quite sure how we are going to achieve that sort of objective. I am sorry that the Constable of St. Lawrence because of her antipathy towards the result of the population debate feels disinclined to vote for this plan. I would say to her: “Really think about what voting in this Chamber means.” We have voted on 2 amendments and we have had a democratic decision on those amendments. I know it may not please everybody but that is where we have come from. To conclude, when I took office in December I said I wanted to have more involvement of States Members in the creation of this plan and I believe that I can say I have achieved that and the Council of Ministers has achieved that. It may not have achieved the outcome which everyone would like but I think, on balance, we have at least been prepared to listen; we have been prepared where we can to accept those amendments. I would conclude by taking the comments forward to the Strategic Plan where it says, to summarise it: “The Strategic Plan sets the long-term direction for the Island taking as a starting point the current position in terms of issues to be addressed and challenges to be prepared for. As recommended by P.P.C. the focus is deliberately on long-term direction, on policies set within the constraints that exists and does not include the detail which will come forward in the appropriate policy documents brought forward to a debate later. A strategic plan is inevitably a matter of setting priorities and trying to get a balance between different priorities, and one person’s balance may be another person’s imbalance. I believe we have got the balance about right. I hope other Members believe that we have got the balance, after 5 days of discussion, about right. I hope, therefore, that Members will agree to support this plan as the way forward. I propose the plan, and I call for the appel.

8.24 Deputy J.A. Martin:

Could I just ask the Chief Minister ... I did ask him one specific question and he conveniently ... it is a very, very important question. Does the 150 replace the migration policy figure of 500 plus? It is a simple question but I would like it answered, please.

8.25 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

I think the simple answer is yes, but if I want to give a more detailed explanation, the previous migration policy based on the previous Strategic Plan set a target of - an average of - one per cent growth over the 5-year period. Strategic Plans go for subsequent 5-year periods. We will now amend that migration policy and in the future, going forward, that policy will supersede the 500 to 150 heads of household for the next 3 years and that is, I repeat, a 3-year policy which is only for that 3-year period.

8.26 Deputy G.P. Southern:

May I seek further clarification that the 500 is, in fact, about jobs and that 500 jobs might well be created which might include 125 heads of household?

8.27 Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

The Deputy is quite correct in that there is not a clear link between the number of jobs and heads of household. I suppose, on average, you tend to have 2.25, or whatever it is, people in a household. In many cases there will be a second job so 150 heads of household will mean something between 250 and 300 jobs, probably.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

May I seek a further point of clarification - I think it is a point of clarification - that in 2008 34 per cent of new jobs were taken by those immigrants, which is about the ratio of 150 to 500?

Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

The mathematics may be correct. I am not quite sure that the logic is necessarily correct, but I do not think this is the time to go into that sort of debate. I have made the proposition; I have called for the appel.

The Bailiff:

Very well. I invite any other Members in the precinct who wish to vote to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting, which is for or against the proposition of the Council of Ministers.

POUR: 32		CONTRE: 16		ABSTAIN: 0
Senator T.A. Le Sueur		Senator S. Syvret		
Senator P.F. Routier		Senator A. Breckon		
Senator T.J. Le Main		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Senator F.E. Cohen		Deputy of St. Martin		
Senator J.L. Perchard		Deputy R.G. Le Hérisssier (S)		
Senator S.C. Ferguson		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
Senator A.J.D. Maclean		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
Senator B.I. Le Marquand		Deputy of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy S. Pitman (H)		
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
Connétable of Trinity		Deputy of St. Mary		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy D. De Sousa (H)		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		
Connétable of St. Mary				

Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)				
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)				
Deputy of St. Ouen				
Deputy of St. Peter				
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				
Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)				
Deputy of Trinity				
Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)				
Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)				
Deputy of St. John				
Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)				
Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)				
Deputy E.J. Noel (L)				
Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)				
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)				

The Bailiff:

Now we come to the final matter of public business, the arrangement of public business. Madam Chairman?

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

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

Thank you, Sir. I was wondering when I would get to this. The arrangement of public business has been very helpfully set out in the second Supplementary Order Paper produced this week and is, as per that Order Paper, I believe in its entirety at the moment. I would stress that the business for next week - the next sitting - is likely to take 2 days but possibly 3 and would recommend to Members that they reserve 3 days in their diary for that business. If I might also say at this point that the business lined up for 14th July, which is our last scheduled sitting before the recess, is quite heavy and I would ask that Members now reserve all 5 days of that week and perhaps look to starting on 13th July for that sitting.

The Bailiff:

Very well. Deputy Le Claire.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

First things first. I have a proposition that is before the Assembly on a natural gas pipeline study, and given the fact that the North of Town Master Plan has been delayed by a period of 30 days, I think, from last week, it is going to be necessary for me to withdraw that, with the permission of the Assembly, and re-lodge it so that it can be debated in order for the master plan to be submitted beforehand. So, the first thing I would like to say is may I please withdraw that at this stage to resubmit it in the near future?

The Bailiff:

Greffier, do you know which number that is?

The Greffier of the States:

P.16/2009.

The Bailiff:

Yes. Very well, do you withdraw Projet 16/2009?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Yes, please. I will be resubmitting it and I am not casting it aside. It is just a matter of timing.

The Bailiff:

Very well.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

The second matter, and I do not know if this is the time to be doing it, but I am wondering about the composition proposition. I am surprised to hear the Chairman of P.P.C. saying that we might need to set aside 5 days because of the workload for the last sitting, when part of that last sitting is actually, I believe, the composition debate. I am just wondering if the Assembly has any issues in relation to the composition debate that are time-sensitive in relation to the appointments or non-appointments of elected Members, because if it is not I would argue that perhaps we need to have the summer to have consultation on this. Given that it has just been introduced and to debate it as quickly as this, without proper consultation, I think is not going to do justice to such a significant proposal, such a significant change, Members I think need to have time. I do not believe they have had time yet to consider this so I would propose, if it is not going to be a time issue, the Chairman of P.P.C. considers withdrawing this at this stage to resubmit it for debate after the summer recess.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

If I might speak to that, the same idea had crossed my mind because at the moment I know that the business for the first sitting in September is, I think, still at nil and there is an opportunity to do that. I have circulated it to the P.P.C. and there are concerns that this is a matter that needs to be progressed with some urgency in order that the necessary changes that might arise out of the debate could be implemented in good time. But really, I am in the hands of the Assembly on this.

The Bailiff:

Shall we leave this over until the next meeting and perhaps further consideration can be given in the meantime. Senator Syvret?

Senator S. Syvret:

Thank you, Sir. I note that our P.49/2009 Child Abuse Compensation Claims has been listed again. It still is not ready to progress for debate because, as explained previously, the Council of Ministers had put on a racking amendment to it which effectively negatives the proposition and I am attempting to, in fact, negotiate - because that is what one has to do, apparently - an amendment to the amendment. So, that P.49/2009 should not have been listed for that date.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Any negotiation that may or may not be taking place, Senator, is in your court at the moment, I think, is it not?

Senator S. Syvret:

Indeed, yes. Looking at the other item of business I have down for that date, P.76/2009, the Committee of Inquiry into the death of Mrs. Elizabeth Rourke, I would ask the Assembly if that item could be moved up the Order Paper, perhaps taken as the first item. There are 2 reasons for that. There is a degree of urgency with this matter. I would have tabled it and brought it forward for debate quite some time ago but, again, there were disputes about the proposition and the report. Nevertheless, I think it is important that, for everyone involved, they know whether the Assembly is or is not going to pursue a truly independent Committee of Inquiry. Also, I am due to be in court on Friday, 18th July, where I will be speaking for about 3 hours on my refusal application, so I think it would be a better idea if we got that matter disposed of beforehand, given its urgency.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Could I suggest to the Assembly that P.76/2009 be delayed until the outcome of the inquiry by the independent firm that I appointed when Minister for Health and Social Services? The terms of reference were agreed with Mr. Rourke and myself independently of the executive at Health and Social Services. There is to be a vigorous inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of Nurse Liz Rourke. It is underway and I think it is highly inappropriate that a Committee of Inquiry would be held at this time until this independent inquiry has concluded. I put it to the Assembly that we do not fix a date for P.76/2009 and it be delayed until such time that Verita have reported to the Minister for Health and Social Services.

The Bailiff:

Minister, can you confirm when the Verita organisation is due to complete its inquiry?

The Deputy of Trinity:

Towards the end of September. I have not got an exact date but I am in the hands of ...

The Bailiff

If you want to move a proposition, Senator, it seems to me that you would need to propose that it be moved to a date, say, the first date in October, and then the Assembly can consider that this afternoon.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Sir, not wanting to speak twice on this because ...

The Bailiff:

No. I asked you whether you want to formally move a proposition.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, I do wish to move that. I do not think it is appropriate for this Assembly to be involved in this inquiry at this stage. I remind Members that Mr. Bodwellkick has been included from day one in the terms of reference and the appointment of Verita and I put it to the Assembly to give some dignity to this process. If at the end one is not satisfied, or Members are not satisfied, with the conclusions reached by Verita, then, perhaps, is the time for a Committee of Inquiry, but 2 parallel inquiries ... here we go again, another one of Senator Syvret's wild goose chases and I put it to Members that October at the earliest for ... the first meeting in October would be an appropriate date for this debate to be held.

The Bailiff:

Senator Perchard is proposing that Projet 76/2009 be deferred until 6th October. Is that proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Senator Syvret?

Senator S. Syvret:

I do not think it is procedurally possible, given the nature of the proposition, for the Assembly to do that because it effectively negates the proposition. Part of the proposition asks that the Verita investigation be abandoned for very, very good reasons which need not be elaborated on now because we would end up, effectively, having the debate now and I am sure I would be told to sit down and shut up if we were to do that. I can assure Members that there are a lot of people in this community who are profoundly concerned at what has taken place and what is going on and the conduct of certain internal investigations and quasi-internal investigations and so forth. So, it is not a case of having 2 inquiries. It is a case of this Assembly deciding that we, as the legislature, are going to hold the Executive to account in this matter, that we do not believe that it is appropriate for this quasi-internal investigation that has been set up to continue. We want to stop that and instead we are going to appoint a genuinely empowered, high-level, professional, independent Committee of Inquiry that will look at all of the very, very important issues that flow from this matter. I also

have to say that I think the argument for delaying this put forward by Senator Perchard is plainly sophistry and if Members agree that the Verita proposal is the correct way to go, and that they do not want a Committee of Inquiry at this stage, then surely the honest and principled thing to do, with a little backbone, is to have the debate and vote against it. Argue and vote against the proposition to establish a Committee of Inquiry. That is the responsible, mature thing to do. If the Assembly rejects it, it is rejected. Fine. We know where we stand. Frankly, this kind of prevarication, as advocated by Senator Perchard, would be the worst of all possible worlds.

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Can I just ask, as a matter of order, really, surely this is a matter that should be debated and if, indeed, the House wishes for a reference back or move on to the next item... but I do not think we can just decide on the floor, without a debate, to move something or take something off the Agenda. I would ask that Members, if we do not discuss this now but it is debated on the day as it is down for on the Order and then we discuss whether the merits should be referred back or moved to the next item, but I do not think it is the proper procedure.

The Bailiff:

I think the procedural position is this. The Assembly is master of its own procedure and if it agrees to defer the debate of this proposition until October that is the right of the Assembly. Now, the right of the Member proposing the proposition is to seek a date from the Assembly on each occasion which it is open to him, so that Senator Syvret would be able to ask the Assembly to bring forward the debate at the next meeting of the States. The Greffier will remind me at what stage the provision in Standing Orders kicks in to give the Member proposing the proposition an absolute right to have a date for his proposition, but I think very firmly on the third occasion or something of that kind. Now, this is, as I understand it, the first occasion that Senator Syvret has asked for a date and the proposition of Senator Perchard is, therefore, in order.

The Deputy of St. John:

Having a little knowledge... having put questions to the House and to the Ministers in the last couple of weeks, I have got serious concerns, though, because we have got a doctor, a professional person ...

The Bailiff:

We are not debating the merits now.

The Deputy of St. John:

... who has been under suspension for 2 and a half years.

The Bailiff:

Deputy, we are not debating the merits. We are debating the question of whether or not the debate on Senator Syvret's proposition should be deferred, as proposed by Senator Perchard, until October. We are not going into the merits of the matter.

The Deputy of St. John:

No, Sir.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sir, I would like to, if I may, press you on the negation of the part of the proposition in relation to the abandonment of Verita and an interpretation of how agreeing to put this off until after the ... we have just been told by the Minister for Health and Social Services that the proposal will be completed. At the same time, having put that to you - and I would like it if you could tell us how you can square that circle - I would like to ask Members at what point do they consider the States of Jersey supreme in matters if they are going to put behind a private company's report the process

of a Committee of Inquiry. A Committee of Inquiry is one of the most powerful things available to the States of Jersey to employ. It is totally impartial, it is totally independent and it is all-powerful. Are we seriously suggesting, by acceding to the Senator's request today to put this back to October, that we want to set that precedent? Those are the 2 points I would like to make, please.

The Bailiff:

Perhaps I can repeat for the benefit of Members that the Standing Orders give, as Members will know, every Member a right to lodge a proposition and at the end of the day the Member can insist on that proposition being debated but the rights of a Member only override the rights of the Assembly to refuse to debate the matter once the Assembly has refused 3 times and ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I understand that but I am asking what the application is in respect of the fact that that would negate the proposition and is that not surely ...

The Bailiff:

Well, it is your ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

... taking the Back Benches ...

The Bailiff:

If the suggestion is that a Member can frame a proposition in such a way as to override the rights of the Assembly to decide whether or not the matter should be debated, the answer is that he cannot.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It seems to me that what Senator Perchard is proposing is to override the right of this Assembly to determine whether or not there would be a Committee of Inquiry. **[Approbation]**

The Bailiff:

No, the Senator ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

By negating the proposition, by delaying the debate, it does, effectively, take away our rights to decide upon that today.

The Bailiff:

May I have some order, please. If Members feel that the matter should not be deferred until October they will defeat the proposition of Senator Perchard. It is as simple as that.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sir.

The Deputy of St. John:

Can you just clear something in my mind, Sir? You are saying that the proposition - or am I getting it wrong - could have been put together in such a way as to basically negative the Verita inquiry. Is that basically what you are saying?

The Bailiff:

No. I am saying that a Member cannot frame his proposition in such a way as then to be able to say to the Assembly: "You cannot refuse to debate my proposition on the next occasion because I have framed my proposition in this way." The overriding right is that of the Assembly to decide whether

or not to debate a proposition which a Member has lodged. That right only comes to an end when the Assembly has refused to debate a proposition on 3 occasions.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Point of order, Sir. I ...

The Bailiff:

I do not want to argue with you, Deputy. That is a ruling and that is ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

No, Sir. A point of order, though, I do believe. Could you interpret for us Standing Orders? I do not have the Article in front of me. Does it not say that a Member can propose a date and then that Member can be denied that date and then the proposer could surely propose the next meeting's debates rather than being told 8th October which is not the next meeting's debate?

The Bailiff:

What Standing Order 33 says is: "Standing Order 33(1): This Standing Order applies to a proposition lodged by a Member of the States in his or her own right. (2) If the States have decided on 3 or more occasions not to debate a proposition and the proposer notifies the Greffier of the meeting at which he or she wishes the debate to take place no other Member of the States may propose that the debate shall not take place at that meeting." It is all there in black and white and ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

But is there not a meeting before 1st October?

The Bailiff:

There are meetings before 1st October.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So, surely the Senator should be able to propose a meeting after this proposed date, then.

The Bailiff:

Let us deal with one thing at a time, please. The proposition is in order. Now, can I put the matter to the vote or ...

The Deputy of St. Martin:

Can I be clear that what we are voting for is that we do not vote that we do not debate it next time because that is one thing.

The Bailiff:

We are not ... that is not open to the proposer to ... that is not in conformity with Standing Orders. He must propose another date and Senator Perchard has proposed that the matter be debated, for the reasons that he has explained, on 6th October. Deputy Tadier?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do not know if this is a point of direction or if I could ... the concern that I have, and I believe other Members have, is not so much to do with the negation fact, although that comes into it, but this proposition is time-critical and we are being asked to defer this and this proposition will be redundant.

The Bailiff:

If the majority of Members feel that they will vote it down, Deputy.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Yes, that is right and I hope Members will bear that in mind because it seems like a nonsense to me.

The Bailiff:

An appel?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Sir, do I have the opportunity to respond?

The Bailiff:

Yes, you do have the right to respond.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I just want to remind Members, contrary to the ... as indicated by Senator Syvret, the National Patients Safety Agency, who work throughout the United Kingdom, recommended 3 potential independent persons or companies to conduct an in-depth review as to the circumstances surrounding the death of Nurse Elizabeth Rourke. I chose Verita. I agreed the terms of reference with them and they are, contrary to what this Assembly has been told, completely independent and are working completely independent of the Department for Health and Social Services and if, once they report, Members are dissatisfied with the outcomes in their finding, then is the time for a public inquiry. To run a public inquiry and abandon what we are doing, what Verita are doing, now would be a nonsense. There is no bringing back that nurse and we must learn from the tragedies of that day, but this is a nonsense. This is one of Senator Syvret's wild goose chases and I suggest we continue with the independent ...

Deputy M. Tadier:

Sir, we are not debating the proposition at the moment. This is completely ...

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I make the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Very good.

The Bailiff:

Very well. The vote is for or against the proposition of Senator Perchard that the debate on Projet 76/2009 be deferred until 6th October. Right, the Appel, yes, and I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 12		CONTRE: 29		ABSTAIN: 5
Senator T.A. Le Sueur		Senator S. Syvret		Deputy J.B. Fox (H)
Senator P.F. Routier		Senator F.E. Cohen		Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L)
Senator T.J. Le Main		Senator A. Breckon		Deputy of Trinity
Senator J.L. Perchard		Senator S.C. Ferguson		Deputy A.E. Jeune (B)
Connétable of St. Ouen		Senator A.J.D. Maclean		Deputy A.T. Dupré (C)
Connétable of Trinity		Senator B.I. Le Marquand		
Connétable of Grouville		Connétable of St. Helier		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy of St. Martin		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier (S)		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy J.A. Martin (H)		
		Deputy G.P. Southern (H)		
		Deputy of St. Ouen		

		Deputy of Grouville		
		Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)		
		Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire (H)		
		Deputy S.S.P.A. Power (B)		
		Deputy S. Pitman (H)		
		Deputy K.C. Lewis (S)		
		Deputy of St. John		
		Deputy M. Tadier (B)		
		Deputy of St. Mary		
		Deputy T.M. Pitman (H)		
		Deputy T.A. Vallois (S)		
		Deputy M.R. Higgins (H)		
		Deputy A.K.F. Green (H)		
		Deputy D. De Sousa (H)		
		Deputy J.M. Maçon (S)		

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Sir ...

The Bailiff:

One moment, Deputy, if I may. Are Members prepared to agree the request of Senator Syvret that the matter be debated on 1st October on the Order Paper?

Deputy G.P. Southern:

That is what I wish to address, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Do you? All right.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Yes, just merely to say that I thought I heard the Senator say that he was in court on Friday, which is not the date we are meeting. It is Tuesday and I have been waiting since 4th February, with some concern, to debate Article 39(a) and I would suggest that rather than being placed first, Senator Syvret's proposition be placed second in place of his original P.49/2009, on second place. If the Senator would accept that I would be grateful.

Senator S. Syvret:

If it makes it easier for the Assembly I am perfectly happy with that.

The Bailiff:

Very well, is the Assembly prepared to agree to advance Senator's Syvret's proposition to number 2 on the list? Very well, that change will take place. Senator, you have not indicated which day you would like to defer your debate on the Child Abuse Compensation Claims.

Senator S. Syvret:

Rather than having an argument about it I think the answer to that question is that it remains somewhat up in the air at the moment until certain procedural issues are resolved, drafting issues.

The Bailiff:

Well, it is down for debate on 16th at the moment. Is that where you want it to be?

Senator S. Syvret:

No, because there are one or 2 issues that still need addressing.

The Bailiff:

Well, which date do you want to move it to?

Senator S. Syvret:

You could try the next sitting.

The Bailiff:

30th June, very well. Are there any other matters arising from the arrangement of business that Members want to raise? Madam Chairman, do you have ...?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

I have nothing else. I propose it ...

The Bailiff:

You propose it as amended. Very well. Members will accept that. Those will be the arrangements for the sitting meetings. That completes the business of the day. The meeting is closed.

ADJOURNMENT