

# **CORPORATE SERVICES SCRUTINY**

## **SUB-PANEL**

### **Overseas Aid Review**

**TUESDAY, 6th FEBRUARY 2007**

**Panel:**

Senator J.L. Perchard (Chairman)  
Connétable J.L.S. Gallichan of Trinity  
Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville  
Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin

**Witnesses:**

Mr. J. Gosselin

**Also Present:**

Mrs A. Thomson (Adviser - Oxford Policy Management)  
Miss S. Power (Scrutiny Officer)

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Welcome, Mr. Gosselin. It is indeed a pleasure to welcome you to the Corporate Services Panel looking at Jersey's overseas aid contributions. Thank you for your submission which we have read and, on the back of that, decided to invite you here this afternoon and thanks for coming. I will just introduce the panel. There is Constable John Gallichan from Trinity, this is Sam Power who you may have had some communication with, the scrutiny officer, Constable Murphy of Grouville and myself, Jim Perchard, Anne Thomson from the Oxford Policy Management, and Constable Silva Yates from St. Martin.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Okay.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

You have seen that note in front of you. It is really just a formality. I wonder if you wanted to perhaps use your three-quarters of an hour - rather than us starting to ask you questions on your written statement which we would like to do a bit later - to give us an overview, a background of where you are coming from and why you have taken the line you have with regard to your submission and, obviously, you are welcome to add to it. The way we will be conducting these hearings is that if, at any point, we feel we want to ask for clarification, I will invite members to butt in, if that is okay.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Okay, yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Please fire away.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I have no vested interests, as it were, because I find a lot of the people that have written submissions that I have seen have some sort of interest, be they representing a charity or, perhaps not directly representing a charity, but have some interest in getting aid for various projects that they have an interest in. Myself, it was literally something that happened last year. I saw what was going on in Lebanon with the bombing by Israel. I do not have any prior established links with any charity whatever, it was just that I was appalled by what I saw and I decided to try and influence the commission to make even a token donation for the emergency appeal in Lebanon, also, for the Palestinian refugees which I have had a growing interest in for several years from the historical point of view.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

So you approached the commission?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes, by email, I think it was 31st July last year. It was as a result of the response I received from the commission that I became aware that they had already turned down 2 applications by Christian Aid, and I think UNICEF might have been the second one, for funding for Lebanon for the Lebanese crisis. I think it was that weekend that there was particularly awful bombing of civilians in Lebanon in which more than 30 children were killed and I think that made it a bit more newsworthy locally. So I sent a copy of the email I had received from the commission to the *Jersey Evening Post* and BBC and surprisingly they took it up as a news story during that first week in August. Basically, it related to the fact that the commission refused to give emergency funding for Lebanon based on the fact, as they said it, that they felt Lebanon was too developed.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Emergency funding but then you do make the point in your submission that had there been a disaster it was not too developed, the country was not deemed to be too developed. Is that right?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

What I did was, I had compiled statistics during that week. It did not really come out in the press report or on the television report but I looked at the commission's report for 2005 and found 11 countries which, on the face of it, were more developed or at least as developed as Lebanon and Palestinian territories and yet were receiving quite a lot of funding from Jersey Overseas Aid Commission during that year, to the tune of more than half a million, I believe. That was grant aid, that was like

development aid, and it was only as a result of the BBC interview - I think it was 2nd August - on which the chairman of the commission, Jacqui Huet, was interviewed and in which she appeared to say that there was no restriction on Lebanon or any other country from receiving grant aid from the commission, all that had to happen was the agencies had to put in a request. That was for grant aid, development aid, but they could not give Lebanon emergency aid because it was too developed. I thought that just did not make sense to me and I had never heard of this rule before, because surely it should be the other way round with 80 per cent plus of your budget going to development aid. Surely, if you are going to have criteria about countries which are too developed to receive aid, it should be applied on the development side, the grant aid side, representing 80 per cent of your budget, not the emergency side so much which only represents 10 per cent of the budget.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

If I could ask a couple of questions. Having done some investigation, made a representation, made an application for overseas aid and getting a negative answer, did that leave you with the impression that the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission had a policy which was flawed or was it a policy which just could not cope with what may have been construed as an act of war, natural disaster?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

As I saw it, they just did not want to give money to Lebanon and they were using so-called rules of the commission, policies and procedures, if you will, to give themselves an excuse for not giving emergency aid and I think they could have done. So, naturally, when this scrutiny panel decided to look at overseas aid policy and procedures, it seemed natural that I should follow it up.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

The scrutiny sub-panel are trying to investigate the workings of the Overseas Aid Commission and I suppose one of the things we should be criticising or appraising is their policymaking or their lack of policymaking, it would be a subject to criticise, and I am rather interested to try and dig deeper into your ... You are coming before us now because you are saying in one way or another that the Overseas Aid Commission has a policy which is perhaps flawed; leaving aside acts of war and natural disaster, but it does not take into account this particular situation.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

To me, I see hypocrisy because most of the people who have responded to this scrutiny panel are saying: "Look, we are not living up to our international obligations as regards this figure of 0.7 per cent of GNI" and yet there is me looking at just this one example from last summer which involved me where there were separate United Nations emergency appeals for both Lebanon and Palestinian occupied territories, major appeals, and basically the commission could not even find it in their hearts for a token donation, yet other countries were and still are increasing their donations. Just last week, Ireland announced it was

stepping up its aid for the Palestinian territories because the situation is still worsening. Yet, as far as I am aware, and bearing in mind there are some reports of the last 6 years missing, since Jacqui Huet took over I am not aware of the committee or the commission having donated any funds directly to Palestinian refugees. This is a major problem in the world.

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

The impression you are obviously under is that you are talking about obligations and commitments. Well, the States of Jersey do not have obligations and commitments to overseas aid. The 0.7 per cent or the 2.4 per cent are hope value, I am afraid, they are not actual commitments. We have been corrected on that this morning so ...

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

What we want to avoid is a dead end route. If we go down it, it is getting involved in one good cause against another. There are people far more skilled, whether they be the Overseas Aid Commission or others, to make a judgment, with limited resources, on where the money can make best impact. What we are interested in is in the procedures that were in place for you to make an application, the criteria that you were expected to work to or made aware of or were not made aware of; we would like you to take us through the experience - you have touched on it - and the ultimate disappointment that you received and the reasons for that. Take us through that experience so that when we do talk to the commission, if there is a weakness in their policy or in their planning or in the way, to put it simply, they choose one against another, we know why they are doing it because we would take them to account; they must know why they are picking Africa as opposed to India. So, if you could take us through your experience from July, you contacted them by letter, just follow it through.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes. First of all, I have to correct you, I have made no application myself. As I said, I do not represent any group so what you could say I was, was a lobbyist, I suppose.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Right, okay.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Literally, that is open to anyone to do. If they have seen a cause they particularly feel should be funded, they are at liberty to contact the commission. That is all I did so there is no applications procedure for me; it was purely a matter of contacting the commission. I thought it would go further to the actual commission themselves but, literally, the first reply I got from the commission clerk more or less ruled out any aid for Lebanon straight away and that is when my involvement with the commission ended. So, I was disappointed that they were not even --

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Did they give you reasons?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

No. Admittedly they never had my address but they had my email address and they could have followed it up later but, literally, it was all done through the media and the press with the commission chairman responding to my accusations, as it were.

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

Do you think that could have been because you were not a registered charity or a registered recipient?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I do not think that had much to do with it. I think they had already made a decision, prior to me contacting them, that they were not going to fund the Lebanon emergency and that was it. They were just trying to excuse themselves after that.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

I think it would be interesting to dig a bit deeper into this initial communication between yourself and the commission's clerk. Could one ask, for instance, whether you addressed your application or suggestion to the president or whoever it is, the head person in the commission, or to the clerk?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I think I sent the email to the clerk.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

The question I am asking is: was there any debate or any discussion between the clerk and the commission about your suggestion or your application or were you dismissed out of hand for whatever reason? I am looking for ammunition, if you like, which I can make a submission on the results of this sub-panel, on the performance of the Overseas Aid Commission. That would be of interest to me.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I would not criticise the clerk. She was just doing her job I think. Literally, I contacted her; either she made contact with the commission or probably looked at her minutes and realised that the commissioner had recently made a decision about Lebanon and had rejected 2 charities for funding. She then contacted me back with that news, so ...

**The Connétable St. Martin:**

Did she say: "I am instructed by the overseas expedition to reject your application"?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

She just informed me of the fact that Christian Aid and UNICEF had recently been turned down for funding for projects in Lebanon, and the reasons why the commission felt they could not fund Lebanon because they considered it a developed country.

**The Connétable of Trinity:**

Do you think they should review this policy of developed countries or underdeveloped countries?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

As I showed in the statistics and I sent them to you as well, my grumble is really that they were funding during 2005 - okay, not for emergency aid but for grant aid - 11 countries I found that really were wealthier and more developed than Lebanon. So I am just pointing out discrepancies really.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

When you say wealthier is that by what standard?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Using the human development index with one of the --

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Is it a recognised UN (United Nations) standard and not your own assessment?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

You said that UNICEF and Christian Aid have been turned down in their application to the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

As I understand it, yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

How did you find that out?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

From their email reply to me.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

So they had applied for grant aids for Lebanon?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes. I do not know the full details of their applications, but that was the first time I became aware that they had already turned down 2 charities for funding for Lebanon.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Have you got any thoughts as to why? Is it political?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

They said Lebanon is not the poorest country in the world. That is true, but basically from your point of view I wanted to point out that there are discrepancies in their funding of countries and this has been going on for years. Perhaps it is the right time to say this is not the first time I have studied Jersey's overseas aid payments. I wrote to what was then the committee president in early 1991 and on that occasion it was more an appeal for Cambodia which was a major issue at that time in the late 1980s. I had just come back from Vietnam in late 1990 and had seen a lot of poverty in that country. Obviously Vietnam neighbours Cambodia and they have very similar levels of poverty. When I came back I felt I wanted to do something and I compiled statistics for the whole of the 1980s just to compare what levels of funding certain countries were getting from Jersey. I immediately discovered that, in particular, Kenya was getting a vastly inflated amount from the Overseas Aid Committee. I think during the 1980s the Overseas Aid Committee had budgets worth about £7.5 million during the whole decade of 1980 to 1989.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

For a decade?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes. Kenya was getting consistently about 10 per cent of that budget every year with a population of about 23 million and ranked by UNICEF not to be in the very highest category for under age 5 mortality. It did have a high rate but it was not the highest and yet I compared this to Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos which are 3 neighbouring countries sometimes referred to as Indochina. At the time, they had a population of about 75 million; were war-torn countries; there were aid blockades because the West was not agreeing to fund -- you know, the major development agency could not fund projects in Vietnam and Cambodia for political reasons and yet they got one per cent of the budget during the 1980s from Jersey despite the huge need.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

We are on the verge of slipping you back into the trench I did not want to go into. So you have a big issue and it seems very reasonable, but we need to take this up with the commissioner and question him in detail as to the difference in their opinion between grant or emergency aid for countries like Lebanon.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes, that is the major issue.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

We will nail that issue. We will try and seek some clarity as to the policy on that and why the differential, and take on board fully what you have said. If there was going to be a differential perhaps it should be revoked. Having said that, and you have explained that both just now and in your submission, what else do you have a problem with in regard to Jersey Overseas Aid? In the first line of your submission, maybe tongue in cheek, you say: "No more money for overseas aid." Can you explain that one?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Well, I think if you compare it to all the other States departments' committees, when you look at the very strict standards of expenditure that they have to live up to, I do not think the commission has to live up to the same standards. As I said, I have already pointed out --

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

So it was not tongue in cheek; you mean that?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

How can we fund Lebanon? Perhaps we could fund Africa and Lebanon if you had more money for overseas aid.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

My view is do not concentrate on the amount of aid; look at how it is being spent and that is, I think, the big difference between me and most of the other people that you are going to interview because, let us face it, if you are representing a charity then, all things being equal, if the States agree to increase overseas aid budgets, your charity is probably going to get more as long as they do not change their policies and procedures. Whereas I am saying it is not that important and there are some people who



would disagree with major increases in overseas aid. My reason is not based on bigotry or anything like this. It is the fact that I can see that certain countries are getting more than their fair share. Giving the example of Lebanon this time - in the 1980s it was Cambodia, Vietnam et cetera - it seems to be based on -- I think the various religious organisations in Jersey seem to have too much of a say in where that money goes because it cannot be a coincidence that a lot of it is going to those countries like Kenya and the surrounding countries, where there seems to be a great missionary presence, you know, a lot of evangelising and ...

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

That is interesting. You suspect the commission of being influenced on religious grounds, political grounds possibly, or am I putting words into your mouth?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Not so much political, but my accusation is that they have not moved with the times in Jersey. Jersey like everywhere else is getting more secular and this is taxpayers; money and yet I believe various religious groups still have too much of an influence over the overseas aid budget because they tend to be the main people in Jersey who, you know, have their projects ...

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

So you have spoken and wrote of quality and not necessarily quantity of aid.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Tell me, if you were running the Overseas Aid Commission, how would you measure quality of aid at the time of a request for it? Or having the opportunities to provide quality, how would you measure one project against the other? So you have 5 applicants, you can only manage 3 of them; what criteria would you use?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Well, it is hard, I will say that. I should also say I would not want to see a really strict system if I was running the commission where you could not give to a certain country because it was just a little bit overdeveloped by, you know, the various indicators. I would like to have the leeway to give money to a certain country even if strictly it did not qualify. My "get out", you know, if a protestor like myself contacted the commission and said: "Why have you given money to this or that?" is to say: "Look, over the whole period of my chairmanship or whatever things even out" and you can say that generally the countries that need it are getting it. I would not want too strict rules but the problem is I think that there are no strict rules at the moment and it is not working in any one State.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Could I put it to you that your policies seem to be coming across to me as one where you would put more focus on emergency aid than grant aid?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Not necessarily but, as I have pointed out, the Overseas Aid Commission seems happy to ignore major appeals by the United Nations for aid, whether it is Lebanon or anyone else, so they are quite happy to ignore international opinion if it suits them. I think they should take a bit more notice of the United Nations because as I have said, not a single donation to Palestinian refugees. I am trying not to put forward various causes, but there are plenty of cases where they ...

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

As far as I see it then, one of your main complaints against it is the misdirection of aid which you really should be channelling in other directions.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes, but I point out I am not accusing them of waste and they seem to be very strict to always look at whether a project has been fulfilled and, you know, whether that money is being spent wisely. However, to me they should be looking at the wider picture and saying: "Well, why did we give so much over such a period of time to one particular country when there are other countries equally suitable that just were not getting anything?"

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

Yes, but then again would you argue the fact that perhaps they are targeting resources that are in need, i.e. water might be one resource which obviously other countries would not qualify for; or hospitals might be targeted for countries that need hospitals? The targeting might be from need rather than availability.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I do not know, but I do not see any real policy the way they run it, although as I said certain countries do seem to keep getting funding but there are other countries where there are major agencies working and appealing for funding. I am not just talking about any one country. They are not high up on the agenda, whereas they are higher up on the agenda of other countries like Sweden and Ireland. So I think we need to think more international, you know, to try and see what is going on in the outside world and realise that it is not just Christians, dare I say it, who are poor; there are Muslims and Buddhists in Cambodia, you know, places like that. They need our help as well even if they were never part of the Commonwealth or anything like this, even if it is a token grant, you know.

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

Yes, I take your point of view. So it might be that their aid is misdirected in order to deal with Commonwealth-type countries rather than ...

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

There is definitely a bias in my 1991 statistics to Commonwealth countries.

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

Okay, that is a fair point. Now, the other thing I have to ask you is you seem very critical of the lack of information from the commission on their accounts and things like that. I mean, is this correct that you cannot get their accounts on the website, that you had to pick it up from our website?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes. Bear in mind I have not looked at their website for a few weeks but when I was doing my research last summer there were no, sort of, annual reports on that website and it is very difficult to navigate.

**The Connétable of Grouville:**

I would have thought that was very much a cause for criticism for no accounts on the website, would you not agree?

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Yes, I think you are not the first submission that we have had, and not only for the historical information but the information that would motivate someone like you to get involved with an application, albeit through an NGO, because you go on in your submission here to say that there is a void of an actual policy. You have tried to find the policy on the website, through literature, and I think you say that Jersey would benefit from an official aid policy or something to that effect, or it does not have an official aid policy now and you have not been able to find out what it is.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

That is right. On the occasion last summer when I dealt with them, they appeared to be making up the policy as they went along to get out of the little conundrum that I had created for them about, you know, why they were funding these 11 countries in 2005 that were more developed than Lebanon, yet they could not give to Lebanon. Then they created this excuse, you know, about the division between development aid and emergency aid. I have never heard of that. To this day, I do not know where they got it from. You will have to ask them.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Yes, we will. You are not the first submission, as I said. Unless you are one of the big 5 or 6, I think even 10 big NGOs, it is always a battle to get the Overseas Aid Commission to endorse seriously a grant aid application or an impact and emergency application. So that is an area we must take up with them and ask them to clarify. I will press you again though: how would you, if you were in their position, distinguish between one application and another? What system? You cannot give everybody everything they want; there has to be a system in place. What system would you suggest they use? A points scoring system?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

As I already indicated, I would not want to see too strict a system whereby, you know, ultimately the poorest country in the world should automatically receive the most funding from Jersey. That is not credible really or practical. So you should pay attention to the various human development indices but not be dominated by them. So it should be flexible.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

A scatter gun? We will have people sitting in that chair saying that is going to be a scatter gun approach to aid rather than a focused, targeted, measured approach to building a sustainable aid program in an area, and those are 2 very contrasting arguments. What do you say if somebody said to you that you are proposing a scatter gun approach to aid?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Well, they might have a point but if it was me who was running the commission more countries that need the aid would at least get something as long as the project submitted by the agencies were worthy. So, literally, it is a case of too much to some and not enough to another.

**The Connétable of Trinity:**

It is amazing. We have had a few submissions this morning and they would go the other way. They would like targeted rather than a scatter gun approach. You see, it just proves the point that you have 2 different people who have come to see us and you have got totally different ideas. This is where the commission has to sit there. It is no different to anybody giving charity. Do you give, say, like an ordinary parish church, £200 to a charity because you want to give them something or do you say: "Well, what can they do with £200? We had better drop them and give the other one which we think is a good case £1,000" Do you know what I mean? So you would say of your £5.5 million you would like to help maybe 500 people rather than targeted to 10?

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I admit there are no easy solutions and some applicants are always going to be disappointed. I feel the money could be more widely, equitably split and spread around the globe.

**The Connétable of Trinity:**

That is fine. I have no problem with that, but the thing is you do get another person saying: “Well, now we should be going back every year helping that same area so they get the infrastructure there so they can eventually run themselves.”

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Well, hopefully, yes.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

What is humanitarian aid about? Is it about fighting fires or is it about building sustainable economies one at a time?

**The Connétable of Trinity:**

I can see where the Overseas Aid had a problem - maybe it was yours - but if you watch the television every night there could be somebody every day phoning the Overseas Aid saying: “Did you see that on television last night? I think we should send a cheque there.”

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes.

**The Connétable of Trinity:**

I have sympathy with you. I think it is atrocious what is going there, but on the other hand I can see exactly where the commission now -- if it had been like Somalia or something like that which is a natural disaster, I think you will find they have got a fund. It is a tricky one, is it not? You know, you sit there and you say: “Well, where is the guideline? Which side of that one is the guideline? Is that natural causes or is it the other side?” Maybe in your case it might have been just the other side of the stream, you know, but I can see where you had a grievance because you definitely thought it was a genuine case that there should have been aid sent there; they just happened to disagree. You have come up with a representation that you thought they were helping countries just as rich, if not richer or poorer.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Could I possibly at this point just mention another grumble because we were almost going to cover it? One other grumble I have is with the structure of the commission. I did not agree that it needed to change and from the point of view of someone like myself who from time-to-time might see a cause and contact the committee, this new structure or commission lessens the power of individuals like myself to have any say in the way the money is spread. For example, there used to be what I believe a 7-person committee, all of them being elected States’ Members, and now it is 3 elected States’ Members I believe

and 3, if I am right, non-elected States' members who are effectively appointed by the commission chairman.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Nominated by the Chairman and appointed by the States.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes. There is no financial savings to the States for that because, effectively, it just means the 4 politicians who are no longer members of the Overseas Aid Committee are doing something else. For me there is a major problem of democratic accountability there. The fact that these 3 non-elected members appear on the face of it to have the same voting powers at commission level --

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

Well, they would have.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes, but when you look at it --

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

I am surprised to hear that. I have to interject here. If politicians are asked to make decisions on every matter without advice, many wrong decisions will be made. I put it to you that the commission may be better having people who have worked in the humanitarian field understanding the demand of humanitarian aid, the massive demand as you describe, and advising politicians as to which way to go may be better than having a lawyer, an accountant, a banker and 2 politicians who may not always understand what the full consequences of the decisions they are making are. Certainly, someone in my position, if I was on that commission I would want the most honest advice from professionals in the field rather than just backing a hunch.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Yes.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

Mr. Gosselin, I would like you to finish your comments please.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

When I heard this commission was being created, my concern was that the 3 non-elected members who would be appointed would end up being -- well, sure they would be honest local people but they would probably be persons who had had previous interest with a particular charity locally. That does not mean

they are wrong, that they should not be on that commission, but what I feared would happen is a certain individual who for many years, perhaps, had represented a certain charity which did work in a certain country would be appointed to the commission. Then, yes, he would resign from his charity commitments so it would all look above board but, of course, then you would find that his charity which he formally represented would be getting regular grants from the committee. In other words, it is like petty corruption. I did not want it to happen that various aid professionals, as it were, got on to the commission. It seems that did not happen. You mentioned a lawyer and a banker; I believe that is the 3 they did chose: a lawyer, a banker and a trust industry professional. So my concerns were not initially borne out, but I can also criticise it because to me they do not really have an interest in overseas aid. Have they ever read an edition of the New Internationalist?

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

You want it both ways. I do not think they volunteered for the job if they had not had any interest in it.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

I just think it is bad for Jersey and the taxpayer the way it has been set up because I think the tendency is.. let us say I was applying for one of those non-elected posts. Even though I have strong views on certain things, there would be a tendency at the interview to put forward your role as an advisor really. If I was the commission chairman I think I would be looking for 3 people who would not give me any trouble, whereas under the old system the States decided on 7 States' Members and inevitably with 7 Members you will get one who is a rebel, you know, like a Phil Rondel character if you know what I mean, so the interest of the minority whoever the minority are, would always..

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

There would always be healthy difference.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

But is our minority interests and, you know, opposition causes.. who on that Commission at the moment would take up such a cause because my argument is those 3 who have been appointed they, kind of, have a loyalty to the chairman because the chairman appointed them, you know. So they are not really politicians as it were, so that is going to restrict the way they view their role. They are not going to rebel, I would suggest, you know. They are going to be compliant and more like advisors and I do not think that is good. So really you have got a commission being run by 3 politicians with 3 compliant helpers giving advice. That is the way I see it and I do not think it is good.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

That is interesting.

**The Connétable of St. Martin:**

I have found this has been very interesting and very useful. Thank you very much for your comments.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Thank you. It is an experience I have never had and just wanted to see how it goes.

**The Connétable St. Martin:**

Can I perhaps ask you what is the, sort of, background to your interest in charity and overseas aid? I mean, you say you are not supporting any charities.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

No. I think it is just that if I see a cause which is unjust I try and respond and it does not matter if it is overseas aid or something else locally, you know, such as a housing issue or something like that. If I had said at the moment my interest is in the Palestinian refugees because I feel they are being denied justice, it is just literally that. If I see any sort of cause which I feel nobody else is taking up locally then sometimes if I get the time I will try and do my little piece to help. So it is about justice really; fairness and equity.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

I congratulate you for those principles because I think they are very sound.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Thank you.

**Senator J.L. Perchard:**

I thank you for coming and for your submission. The transcript will be made available to you to check over that it is accurate. It is not there to be amended other than its accuracy before it is made public. As I say, thank you for coming and for your submission. Please watch this space. If we need to clarify anything or ask you any further questions we will get back to you through the office.

**Mr. J. Gosselin:**

Okay, thank you very much.