

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. E. Le Quesne (WASOT-UK and Jersey Oxfam)

Also Present:

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

Senator J.L. Perchard (Chairman):

Welcome. Thank you again for your 2 submissions. I would just like to draw your attention, Ed, in front of you to your right there is just a little note there. It is really just offering you a bit of immunity on things you say, but if you want to familiarise yourself with it before we proceed that is fine. The proceedings are being recorded and you will have the opportunity to correct any errors but not to necessarily to restate your view before anything goes into the public domain. As I say, you have given us 2 submissions. I wonder if we could perhaps start with one? Is that what you would prefer to do?

Mr. E. Le Quesne (WASOT-UK and Jersey Oxfam):

Yes. I would like to just make a short statement then.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Super, all right.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Just to explain my background. I taught physics in Thika High School in Kenya for 5 years, from 1967 to 1972, so that was a long experience there. I have been back to Kenya with 2 Overseas Aid trips in 1975 as a member of a team and as a leader in 1993. I have also had 2 other trips back to Kenya in the last 5 years to do with Hezron's projects, so I have been back several times. Also I have been Chairman of the Oxfam Group for about 20 years in Jersey. When I came back I joined the Oxfam Group and I

became Chairman, so I have been very involved with it over 20 years. I have been involved with Hezron's charity for 5 years, just by a fortunate accident really, because through others in Jersey he came to Jersey and was in my former school, in my house, a tutor, and taught him physics. So, again, that has evolved over time to be a very close link with him. I thought it good to put down 2 different things because the Oxfam official aid is one thing and the personal one is another area, so I thought I would put 2 different ones. I think it is very good to have a panel meeting like this to scrutinise overseas aid and look at the whole ideas behind it. There are lots of good points about Jersey's aid. I think Jersey has done very well over the years in giving aid. I think there are 2 main points. We should get more bangs for the buck, if you like; we also need more bucks. I think that is the issue, summary points. I think the aid is good, but we could do a lot more with it and also we could do a bigger aid thing. So, look at the Oxfam submission. I did write to our Oxfam contacts, and people who deal with Jersey Overseas Aid from Oxfam wrote this submission here. It is very, very positive. I mean, they appreciate the commitment Jersey has given to Oxfam over the years, year by year. They think the criteria are very clear for funding. They like meeting the commission in London every year to discuss the next year's projects. They are particularly glad about a rolling programme that is not just year on year, but you can say: "We would like this one for this year and second and third year" and have a bit more than just one year of it. Because up until 10 years ago it was only one year, every year a fresh start, one year, and it is much more ongoing than that. So having a 3-year programme, they like that. They are also very happy with Jersey, how it rates for disasters. They have a fund in the budget and they can give £25,000. They go to Mr. Ian Black and he will write a cheque and it is there the next morning. It is often the first money that arrives when there is a disaster, so they are very pleased with that. Also, they say it is very good that Jersey remembers small emergencies that have not hit the headlines, but they are the only ones to fund some of the smaller disasters. It is a disaster for the people there but it has not hit great headlines, but they have done that. So, they are very happy with the way that the commission goes about its business. Then, also, they are very happy with the reporting requirements. They are not too onerous. They just want a report that comes back to say that the project has been done and how it has been completed.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just to clarify, when you say "they", the commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, Oxfam, Oxfam people who deal with Jersey.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just a little area that the panel has some concern about, can you just expand on exactly what you mean by: "They are very happy with the reporting requirements"?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, they are not too onerous, I think. They do not require a very long report. I mean, Oxfam itself monitors every project it deals with and its own monitoring is adequate for Jersey as well so it does not have to do a lot extra for Jersey. Jersey do not want more and more detail. If Oxfam says it has been achieved, the objective of the school or whatever it has done has been done on time and completed, then I think that they do not want any more. The transaction costs for administering of Jersey grants are minimal for Oxfam staff in the UK (United Kingdom) and the country where the project is based. So they find they do not have to do a lot of extra work because it is Jersey. I went through the booklet -- I had the last 5 years' booklets up to 2005. Just to give you an idea of how much money Jersey gives, it is averaging out to something like £400,000 a year for all the different projects. That is generally between 4 and 7 projects each year of general ones and usually 2 or 3 emergencies. So Oxfam is well known for its water supply. It gets water into emergencies and that, so they again support about 3 a year. It is also interesting to find out how much Jersey gives to Oxfam privately, and I am quite amazed, really. There are over 1,175 people in Jersey who give to Oxfam directly. We try and get them to give it to our local group; we can claim tax back. Because if they give it through a national appeal nationally -- we only have a few in Jersey who give to the Jersey group to claim tax. That is a thing for our group, to try and encourage these people who give to Oxfam nationally to give through the Jersey group, but they are not really part of the commissions.

Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:

Can I just come in here? Surely I would have thought that that was a problem between the UK group and the Jersey group to sort out?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oh, yes, not here.

The Connétable of Grouville:

You know, it is easy, we say we give it to Oxfam, fine, okay. They could say: "Right, book that to Oxfam Jersey and then we will try and get the tax back situation." Could that be done?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oh, yes. That is what we are trying to -- I mean, there is sort of data protection. They cannot even tell us who the people are, so that is the problem. I mean, that is a small thing. Also, our local shop, roughly £100,000 a year, so that is ... Oxfam is well supported by Jersey, really, both publicly and privately. That is the point, really.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What information does Oxfam UK feed back to Jersey about the success or otherwise of the monies that

have been granted by the commission to them?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. I do not know. That goes to the commission. It does not come to me. That is one of my points, that we do not hear anything about what is done.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Well, there again, I am coming back to my original point, and that is surely your head office - for want of a better word - should be keeping you updated with what is happening with Jersey money? I would have thought they would have copied you in on everything that goes to the commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, we have not had any copies...

The Connétable of Grouville:

Is that impossible to arrange or is it a problem?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oh, it could be done that way round, yes.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes. I would have thought that was the obvious way to do it. It is better that the commission here are dealing with Oxfam as an entity rather than Oxfam here and Oxfam there.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oh, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Would you agree that perhaps the commission should make available all the pluses and minuses, the positives and the negatives, of all aid it receives publicly?

The Connétable of Grouville:

Well, you have got data protection again, have you not?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

No.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. I do not think so. I am not sure.

Connétable J.L.S. Gallichan of Trinity:

Do you get reports, say, after the initial 3 years are over? It is fine to say they like the idea of having 3 years of money, but do you still get reports hopefully saying that for the 3 years that you have sent them money that it is wonderful; 7 years down the line things are still working --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, we do not. That is one of the points I make later on, yes, that we do not -- there is no follow-up in that way.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Because, you know, whilst the money is going there, everything could be fine, but as soon as the money stops you could find that what you have put 3 years of funding in --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

That is the point I made under (c), you know, the point about it is satisfactory as far as you can say: "Well, that project has been done. That project has been built" but in 3 years' time are there teachers still in the school? Is their pump still running? You know, we do not know.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Would the Overseas Aid Commission know?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. I do not know.

Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin:

Mr. Le Quesne, you made a comment in that the UK Oxfam were pleased or happy with the way that the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission's reports were required. Would you say, in fact, that perhaps the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission should inquire further into the efficiency of the work done? Is it a question that the Overseas Aid Commission gives the money but does not take sufficient interest on the actual --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oh, no, I think they do. I think the main worry is that by going to different places each year they do not come back to that area. You know, if they go -- I mean, I think that is the striking thing reading through the *Overseas Aid Report*. They give to about 50 agencies every year, £5 million between 50 agencies, you know, from Oxfam to Action Aid to Tearfund to Sight Savers to ORBIS to all sorts of places, and

they go to all sorts of countries, and you come back and there is nowhere a summary, you know, over 5 years of what happened to the £50,000 we gave to whatever. That was my main point, really, is I think we should get more targeted and say: "Let us give our money more to a country or a few countries" and I think picking out countries we have good links with. There is a good case for linking with Madagascar; the zoo goes there, people from the zoo go there. They can see a -- and, you know, you would save the animals a bit more if the people were better developed.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can I pull you back, Ed, to try and sort of take this in bite-sized chunks? Let us talk about Oxfam UK, the relationship with the commission, the relationship between Oxfam UK and Oxfam Jersey and just try and nail this before we move on. You say in your submission, your exact words: "Despite the amount of money Jersey Overseas Aid Commission has given to Oxfam Limited, information has not been passed back to the group by the commission." What further information would be of benefit to the Jersey group? What do you want to know and is it the commission that should be passing that information?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, just to say that when we gave this -- just perhaps to publicise what Oxfam told them about their projects. You know: "We gave money to a water project in Zambia. It cost £50,000. It has helped this much" and just to publish the reports as they were given by Oxfam.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You think this stuff should be in the public domain?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think so, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

On their website?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, on the website or somewhere accessible where you can see. I think we are trying to develop a Jersey One World Group in Jersey to publicise in schools and places what Jersey is doing, and this would be useful for teachers. You know, teachers -- because every school now has to pick a developing country to work on. I have given talks on Kenya to 4 or 5 primary schools, to the year 4 pupils. They need to know about a developing country and there is raw material there which would be useful for teachers to have to explain to pupils, you know, Jersey money is given to this. Because I think it says somewhere that a lot of people think Jersey gives money for work parties and they do not realise that is

only 3 per cent of our budget. A lot more is done and a lot more needs to be known, I think, by the public that Jersey gives a terrific amount of money to different things and really I think it should be publicly known.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So Oxfam UK are very happy with the relationship with the commission, and your submission and what you have told us this morning confirms that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Oxfam Jersey, what about the relationship with the commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think taking your 4 objectives, the first one I think I said Jersey's aid is shiny coppers rather than silver. I think we could do -- we are doing very well, but we could do more. I think, you know, the Make Poverty History said more and better aid was one of its aims, and it is well supported in Jersey. We are a fair trade island. We are a wealthy island and we should, I think, have some long-term aim to get up towards the UN target. So that is, I think, just to set a target. But that is a political -- I mean, Oxfam would not comment on that and it is really a politicians' decision. I think it would be more easy for you to make that point if people knew how much good Jersey aid was doing.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Do you think the commission are not ambitious enough in their demands from the States of Jersey in --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think it could be more ambitious, yes. I think we cannot suddenly jump to -- I think it would be something like £16 million if you went to the target figure. We cannot jump that in one year, but you could say: "Right, we are going to do it in 10 years." I mean, the Isle of Man have said they will do it by 2012; they made that target to do it by 2012.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I just want to really go back to strengthen the point, and that is that if in our report we were to say that we think that the Oxfam situation should be regularised between Oxfam UK and Oxfam Jersey in that we are dealing with one group rather than 2 groups, would you approve of that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think --

The Connétable of Grouville:

In order to target particularly what you are saying? You know, you have got the various contacts, Jersey contacts, going. You could then steer Oxfam UK into doing really what -- the Jersey money could be targeted to what you then choose.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, I think the Jersey Commission have to tell Oxfam: "We are particularly looking at this country this year. We want projects in this country." It is up to Jersey --

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, but surely they have got to rely --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

It is up to Jersey to say: "We would like" -- you know, when they give -- rather than say: "Anywhere in the world, any HIV (Human Immunodeficiency Virus) project or any water project or any education project." They have got very wide aims in their booklet. They want to say: "Look, please give us ones in this area because we --"

The Connétable of Grouville:

But I am thinking more along the lines of chicken and hen situation, and that is that the Jersey -- the commission should be approached by you as the Jersey end to say: "Look, this is what we have got going this year through Oxfam and this is what we would like to see the Jersey monies targeted on" and then you could tell the commission what you want, which would be Jersey money targeted towards Jersey projects. I mean, I do not know if you --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, we do not have Jersey projects as such. We have areas where Jersey has got links. I think, you know, we have got links with the Caribbean, we have got links with several African countries, and that is why I say we get more bangs for the buck. If everybody knows that Jersey is looking this year at particular areas, people going out on business, you know, could also go and have a look. Also we get to know the people there. Because if you look back over 20 years of Jersey's giving aid, you cannot think of a headline: "What has Jersey done?" You cannot think -- there is a, you know: "We have done this." The tsunami, you can say we have done -- you know this is a big thing and you know there are villages and people and -- but the Oxfam money goes to some people somewhere we do not know about; we do not know any more about them; we do not know who they are; we do not have a name or a face to put to it.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Well, that is precisely what I am getting at, that the Jersey group should be in a position to influence Oxfam in the UK and you should be able to say to them: "Look, you know, we have these situations, give them influence."

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, except that we do not have -- we in Jersey do not know the situation in -- we do not have -- Oxfam has people on the ground in each country. They have an Oxfam -- so Oxfam has people on the ground in a country. So if you said: "Give us some project in Uganda because that is our target this year," Oxfam man on the ground in Uganda would say: "Well, there is this among the Acholi or there is this among the Baganda. What about this one?" He would just say: "The Acholi people, the chap in charge is Mr. Bwana," you know, and we could then link with him. But we cannot find these people ourselves.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Does Oxfam Jersey do anything more than raise money?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, we also campaign. I think we are one of the -- we put our effort last year into getting Jersey as a fair trade island. You know, we promote fair trade. We promoted the Cut Conflict Campaign, which is trying to cut down the number of guns, get a UN resolution on that. We produced 300 photographs through the campaign, and the shop itself is a fund of money raising.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Your main function in Jersey is fundraising and campaigning?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Does all your fundraising get sent to the UK?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of Trinity:

So that is where you get a problem, really. If you were handling your own money and you were keeping it here, you could then maybe get this idea which a lot of people are bringing forward, that pound for

pound you would have an idea that the Overseas Aid -- if you could raise, say, £50,000 for a project and the Overseas Aid would then say: "Right, well, that is a Jersey project. We will give you pound for pound on that sort of thing." Because when you send it all to the UK, you then do not control where your money goes, do you?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, we do not mind. Oxfam has got much wider -- we do not want to control it because Oxfam has got a wide view. In fact, we do not want to --

The Connétable of Trinity:

So really what you are saying is you are happy with the way it is now, that the Overseas Aid is targeted by the Oxfam UK, not Jersey?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. I am happy with that and I think it would be nice, though, for us to tell people that we have helped in this particular project.

The Connétable of Trinity:

I agree. You should have feedback. If you are raising money to be sent to the UK, you should have all - - if you want to raise more money, you need good reporting back to tell people what you have sent your money for.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So, just to wrap up on the Oxfam relationship with the commission and Jersey, Oxfam UK has a very good relationship with Jersey, the Overseas Aid Commission. Oxfam Jersey, how would you describe your relationship with the commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

None. We do not have a relationship. I read their reports but we do not have any relationship with them.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You do not get asked, you do not get invited to ...?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What are your views on the commission? What is Oxfam Jersey's view? Have you got a view on the commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, as I say, they could make -- for the money they are spending, I think they should be targeting a bit more and have a bit more clearer -- rather than spreading it around all over the place they should have a bit clearer target. I think I contrast it with the zoo, with the Durrell Trust. They target highlands and islands for their programme, and also they target people as well. Jersey is very keen to have a building with the name of Jersey on it and not enough about people, and we could, you know, bring people to Jersey to have 6 months in a hospital or 6 months in a school or send people out for 6 months. That is a very valuable form of aid. You know, a person cannot replace the building, and just to have money spent on buildings -- and they say it has to be done within a year. Every project that Jersey supports has to be done within a year and finished, wrapped up, but things do not happen in a year. It takes a while to get things going and it needs sustained input over time.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So you have some concerns as to how the commission is allocating some of the funds?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think they are all spent on worthwhile projects, but I think we want -- as I say, we want to get more bang -- we want to get -- you know, say our £5 million has really gone somewhere and we can say: "That is a real achievement for Jersey" rather than it has gone to this --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It is not a criticism of the people on the commission, I know it is not.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is it a criticism of the structure? Is the commission sensitive enough to the sort of requests being made by people like yourself for perhaps more focused, more targeted, more Jersey-linked --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. Like I say, they support in particular areas, but they do not seem to have any overall

goal. You know, I do not know why they choose -- I mean, I am not sure whether when they go to London -- they go to London every November to meet the agencies and they have all these agencies come and parade for half an hour with their projects, but I have no idea how they decide. I think it is almost the wrong way around to say: "We have got the money. You come and please us with your submission and we will choose you or not choose you because we like your style." I think we have got to be much more humble and say: "Look, we want to help you and we will help you. You tell us what sort of thing you would like us to help you with" or at least give -- you know, make it a partnership, not: "We are the wealthy ones with all the money to give out and if you please us we will give you money." "We want to have a partnership. We want a relationship with you because you are our -- we appreciate your people who happen to be born in a country which is low in resources. We have got the resources to help you to build up your --"

Senator J.L. Perchard:

We can explore this in a minute.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes. I was just sort of formulating a gut feeling. Would it be correct if the question was asked do the Jersey people or Jersey States get value for money from the donation of the Overseas Aid Commission to Oxfam UK, do they get value for money, would it be correct to say the answer is no?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, I do not think so. They do get value. The money is --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

There seemed to be a yawning gap between the time when they give £296,000 last year plus -- no, that is 2005, sorry. Plus £75,000. You cannot tell us or the Oxfam UK cannot tell us what has happened to that money inasmuch as there has been no feedback, no celebration --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I am sure it is known what has happened to it.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

No celebration, no -- the Jersey public, do they know -- do they have anything to celebrate?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

We do not know.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Do not know? So perhaps it is correct that the answer is - in inverted commas - value for money is probably not being achieved?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think people are being helped.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am talking about the actual feedback to Jersey, not the people in Africa. Would you agree with that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, yes, we are not getting as much out as we could do, yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, all right.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The Jersey Overseas Aid Commission obviously knows?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What do they do with that information?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, they publish a report each year which has all the money given and it headlines 3 or 4 projects. I do not know if you have seen their booklet. They have 3 or 4 examples, so out of the 50 agencies and the 4 or 5 grants per agency, there is 3 or 4 examples of, you know, this is what -- this was a successful project in country A, country B, country C, and this is a work party that went to A and went to B. Just giving examples, but I do not know anywhere else where the rest of the information is kept. I do not know where it is.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Just to follow on that line of questioning, is it possible that we are wasting money by sending a complete team out there to do these jobs? For instance, let us say you want to build a new school. Would it be

more efficient money-wise and for the recipients if we just sent out 2 specialist builders to organise them into building their own school? You know, we are sending 10 or 12 at a time, I think. I know the costs are split and everything but --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I know, but I think it is not a big proportion of Jersey's budget. It is only 3 per cent, which they are wise to keep it to a small amount. But I think the benefit to people is very great. I mean, the person I took out to Kenya with me in 1993, Jim Corfield, he has gone back a dozen times since. He has built schools and raised money and it inspired --

The Connétable of Grouville:

So there is an ongoing benefit?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

So I think we do not pretend that they could not do it themselves. If you sent them money they would do it themselves, but I think the benefit to the people who go is great. I am taking a team to Kenya this summer. Again, a lot of people who have never been there will see and meet and I think it will be great. So as long as you are not, you know -- but the perception has been that that is all Jersey does is send people out for a holiday.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

As you say, it is a fraction of the budget and it would be very difficult to justify not continuing that.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of Trinity:

The other thing that it does do is the feedback that the people tell the Islanders of their experience down there. If 25 go, there are 25 people saying: "You cannot believe what -- you do not realise how lucky you are over here." I think that is another way.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, and they start networking for fundraising.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Absolutely.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Let us move on to some of the criteria laid down by the commission for applicants who are requesting aid. Are you completely au fait with the criteria laid down by the commission when applying for aid, either through WASOT (Wanangwe School and Orphanage Trust) or through any aid agency? Are you familiar with it? Are you satisfied with the criteria? Should it be changed? Would you like to comment on it generally?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, they are very wide really, are they not? You know, you cannot dispute -- I mean, it says: "... is committed to joining with others in reducing poverty in poorer countries by making sustained contribution in proportion to Jersey's means." So I think that means they join with other countries probably, and "sustained contribution," I think that is where clearly if we are dotting around it is not quite sustained. "Working closely with the private and voluntary sector, encouraging, supporting recognised local bodies engaged in overseas aid." Well, I do not know that they are doing that very much. They are not working closely with the private and voluntary sector. They are not encouraging, supporting recognised local bodies.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So, to sum up that, you are a bit uneasy that the criteria is not clear?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, no, not being followed.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Not being followed?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

It says they are working closely with the private and voluntary sector. Well, I suppose in one way they are working with a group of overseas aid projects.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So you are happy with the criteria but you suggest that the criteria is not necessarily being followed at all times?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I mean, it is early days for the commission but I think they could engage more with the voluntary

sector, with more than just the small group who do the Overseas Aid projects.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay. So that is the criteria. What about the mechanisms the commission use in assessing an applicant? You are aware or are you not aware that they use a points system?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know -- I mean, we have only had experience -- I mean, Oxfam has not -- it is the -- we have applied for grants for our WASOT -- our Wanangwe charity. We are not aware what points system they use there. But, I mean, there, we are tied up by the fact they only give one grant to one project. They do not allow you to go back for a second grant and they have limited money.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That is part of the criteria that we were referring to just a moment ago?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, that is under 7 and 8: "Only one material grant in each year up to £20,000. Any further funding has to be for a different village community." Again, we are not sure how big "village" stretches. I mean, Hezron's project is for 25,000 people with lots of little communities. Is that one community or is that several? You know, can you go just for one school building somewhere or can you go for a school building here -- there are 10 primary schools in the area, can you go for each of the 10 primary schools? Not quite clear what they mean by -- or even why they are saying you must only go to each area once. They only give it at the start, I think.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I can imagine how difficult it is for you, Ed, but it is quite important that we get the facts on this clear. If the commission -- if there are some grey areas as to how they are assessing the validity of applications and making a judgment between one and another application, we need to know about it. If you are in any doubt that there is a grey area and this needs sharpening up, it is now that we have got to put this on record and we will deal with it. If you are not --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know how they assess applications.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You do not know how they do it?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Have you asked them how they do it?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, because, I mean, Oxfam UK are submitting the applications and they go back to Oxfam UK with their response. They say: "This year we are going to support A, B, C, D, but not E and F" and I do not know what they -- whether they say: "E and F are too big, too ..." I do not know what they say.

The Connétable of Grouville:

This is again where we get the lack of co-ordination on the recipient side.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Possibly with Oxfam I think you are right, but the submission that we are referring to, which Ed signed, that I am asking him to put on record, is quite clear that there is some frustration as far as WASOT are concerned.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. Well, I come on to that separately, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay. Do you think there is perhaps time to do that? We have done half an hour on Oxfam.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, okay.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Do you want to move on to the second half of your submission?

The Connétable of Trinity:

Just before we do, on the Oxfam, it sounds really as if the Overseas Aid Commission says: "Well, look, there is about £400,000 for Oxfam every year." We can judge from the figures that to about half a million, and I would have thought it is almost a fait accompli they are going to get half a million when they go over next November. It is just a matter of sorting out who is going to get it.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Oxfam is a big charity and it can absorb -- you know, if it does not get it from Jersey, it will get it from

somewhere else. I think for smaller charities it is quite critical having it very lumpy that this year they get A, a big sum, next they get nothing and next they -- you know, Oxfam copes with the administrative costs and if Jersey only gives them building rights then they have also got to fund the person who is going to run the building, you know, from other resources. But if it is a small charity - some of the 50 are quite small ones - they get a big grant one year, they get going, and then the next year they do not like the submission so they do not get a grant. It is very --

The Connétable of Trinity:

I would say that if I was doing -- going with the money, if you know Oxfam are coming to see you, you trust them and you assume, well, look, we give about £500,000 every year anyway, so they are going to get £500,000 for whatever project they like. It saves the commission an awful lot of time sorting out how you give the other -- that half a million maybe to 10 other smaller charities which you have got to really sort out. I would think it is far easier to say: "Well, we know Oxfam who are --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

We know and trust them.

The Connétable of Trinity:

-- and trust them. There is half a million, we are giving you half a million." It has always been looked after.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think there is nothing wrong with that. I think, you know, Jersey cannot go and look at these countries directly. It has got to trust and we have got a trusting relationship with people, so I think it is quite sensible.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Yes, I agree. I agree.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

We were going to move off Oxfam, but it does motivate me to ask you a question which you touched on in your submission about the sort of block votes of revenue. That is to say, not just the annual vote but knowing that there is something coming next year, and you mentioned 3 years, and the Oxfam UK relationship with the Jersey Commission is now going down that road?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. Well, I mean, as they say in their booklet, they ask up to 10 agencies to give 3-year projects. They do not want anybody -- because it is expensive to prepare an application. It is quite an expense to

prepare the application so they do not want to waste their time if they are not going to support everyone.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Your opinion of that as a principle?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Good. I mean, I think that is a good step forward. It was put forward 10 years ago and they are doing it and I think it is good.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, great. Well, let us move on to the second part of your submission, if we can. Do you want to just give us a bit of a rundown, 5-minute rundown, bearing in mind the time?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. Well, it is a thing that has just arisen from a particular person. I mean, this chap Hezron was supported -- he comes from a village outside Kisumu. He was sent to a secondary school in Nairobi because he looked as if he was bright, outstanding. Paid for by a Jersey person through Save the Children Fund in his studies. Brought to Jersey. Then it was before my time, I do not know how it happened, but a trust was formed in Jersey to support him through his sixth form education with Peter Crill as the Chairman and Bob Le Sueur as one of the main people. Then he got into medical school. While at college he got the science gold medal and he got into Nottingham Medical School. The trust went on to support him through his training, so he has been supported by about probably £100,000 of money from Jersey people to train and he has always been dedicated to helping his home area. When he went back there in 2000 to do an elective project for his medical school, he went and studied AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome), the impact of AIDS on his home area. He found that a lot of people there were orphaned and just scrabbling round with no one to look after them. He took in 24 to start with and he came back to Jersey and set up a little group called Wanangwe School and Orphanage Trust to take care of the orphans. It has grown from there. He now has 1,000 on his books and he formed an NGO (non-governmental organisation) in Kenya called OGRA who administer the money in Kenya, who decide which orphans to look after. They have never formed an orphanage as such; that is a bit of a misnomer. They foster the orphans with other families, so they support them with a bit of food. They call them counsellors who go round and check each week that the kids are okay, are going to school and so on, so that they are caring for quite -- I mean, it is quite an unprecedented disaster, really, for that area. It is the area of Kenya with the heaviest amount of AIDS and, you know, it is mostly the active parents who are dying from Aids. Over the years we have had an initial grant from the Overseas Aid for £2,000, then a grant of £3,300 to build a clinic. Because once the school was built there is also health, and Hezron being a doctor, again it has made sense to have a clinic. Then also there were heavy rains in 2003 and we had a grant of £3,000 from Overseas Aid to help rebuild. They have built -- 50

houses destroyed and it is £200 a house to rebuild it, so £10,000 will build you 50 houses. So we had a grant, so --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

A very proud track record thus far.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

So that is it. You know, we have got a lot of Jersey supporters who give regular standing orders or donations and we have raised quite a lot of money over the course of time. As I have always said, we have got to get a nucleus. To get into the big AIDS system you have got to show you have started. I mean, Kenya works on the Harambee system - that is the national motto: "Let us all pull together" - and parents built little primary schools and when they have got a school built the government gives a teacher. So you have got to get some done yourself and then they put in. Again, same with the hospital. We have just started now to get drugs from AMREF (African Medical and Research Foundation), African Medical Relief. Their local Kenya charity are supplying us with drugs because we now have the viable building and running unit, but we had to get to that stage to get -- draw in --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I think it might be sensible of me just to put on public record that my family has connections with the trust that raises money for this particular charity. I am not directly involved but I have helped facilitate fundraising, as I have with other charities. But I do notice in the submission from Dr. Mc'Obewa --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

He apologises. He is working today. He is in Derby.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is this on our website? So this is in the public domain and I will quote from it then, that there is an air of frustration that he --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. I share the frustration, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

He goes on to say that: "For example, the commission refused to fund WASOT in our last 3 proposals simply because we had been successful in obtaining funding from other agencies to do other work. This success to the commission meant that our organisation was told categorically in writing that we no longer needed to apply. I think to punish charities for being resourceful beggars belief." Would you like to expand on that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think, yes, I mean, it was my main -- the summary of my first part was, you know, why stop? We are very much a Jersey charity supported by a lot of Jersey people but we have run foul of the fact that they only support one project once in one area and they want to go on to somewhere else. I do not think they -- I think they could be -- perhaps there is some area in their budget where they support local charities doing local -- or well supported locally. That is where I think we get more bangs for the buck because a lot of people know about Hezron and know about what he is doing. There is a lot of support for fundraising. When there were floods this time they had -- I mean, they have been suffering terribly from climate change. They had 9 months' drought up until last March --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay, I do not want to get into the detail. I want to look at the sort of bigger picture, Ed, if you do not mind because I am worried about the time. There is a criticism. The Commission, you are saying, have their hands tied by the terms of reference that they have?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, almost.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that right?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, I think so.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So the commission are not acting outside their powers. They have got a limited --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No. Well, I went to speak to them submitting a project for -- we put it to Guernsey in the end as well, a project for girls -- no, that was not it, it was one for a feeding centre. What they found is a lot of orphans do not stay in school because they have got to go and find food for their lunchtime. If you build a feeding centre in the school and feed them at lunchtime, then they stay in school. So Hezron prepared a PowerPoint presentation for how to build a feeding centre. We have done it; it has been done once. A group of Nottingham students built it in one part of the area and that has worked out very well. In another part of the area --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I want to pull you back again because if Jersey wants to facilitate or be able to offer assistance on a regular basis to somebody like WASOT or, say, an African school, Jersey initiatives, what is it we need to do? What is it the commission needs to do?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

It needs to say perhaps say a proportion of our budget will go to ongoing support of Jersey charities, not just one --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Any idea of what percentage? You know, should we be more prescriptive?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. I mean, they have set aside this £100,000 for ... they have got somewhere they have set aside a proportion for supporting -- they have set out £50,000, I think, for supporting pound-for-pound projects. Make it slightly bigger, perhaps double it to £100,000.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Double it for pound-for-pound projects is the suggestion or would you want to consider this before making a submission? I am looking for some meat.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. Well, I mean, you could certainly double it and not have a limit. I would think there is a subcommittee which looks at work parties and they find a place to go for a work party, they do the interviewing and so on. I think there is a place for a subcommittee to look at continuing support for Jersey charities and they would look at it and say: "This is still viable. There are still lots of things to do" and you could have a group to look at that, because there are not just ourselves; there is Kevin Daly's project, there are half a dozen.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

There may be others that if the structure was such there may be others that will emerge. You also mentioned earlier, and I want you to comment again in this context, that the funds available apparently are for one-off and not ongoing.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Do you consider Jersey-related projects in the third world, is that acceptable or does that need to be

revisited as a policy?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think it needs to be revisited. I think you cannot solve a community development project in one one-off item. I mean, there is a whole community there. It is going to take years. We are working towards being self-sufficient. I mean, we are trying to get a workshop which trains people to earn their own living, and by having a workshop built the government will put the teachers in and we have people who can afford to pay will pay and the orphans be trained at a lower price. We got a secondary school built which the government put the teachers in, orphans get charged half-price or we pay half the price, and others who can afford to pay, pay in full. So we are trying to get a viable system but it will not happen just in the one one-off grant. We are working in the same area and we then see what is happening.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Can I ask a question? I am getting a feel for the situation because I am totally naïve about the social situations in Africa, but I am getting a feeling that you are frustrated because the Overseas Aid Commission will not fund ongoing projects.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Is it a criticism of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission that they should be thinking about projects that can demonstrate economic development? Is that something we should be putting to the Overseas Aid Commission as a deficiency in their terms of reference? Because I think it is very important that if you start a project off there must be a target to say that people who are receiving aid should be able to develop their ability for self-caring.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. Oh, yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Then, in a way, you could say, well, there is a target there and there will be a time when the thing should be rolling along by itself. Now, as a scrutiny panel or a scrutiny sub-panel talking about the Overseas Aid Commission, is that the sort of point we should be making as a panel?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think certainly you should say you want to -- you know, the restriction on just being one project once is

very, very limiting, very unrealistic.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

So what you are saying is yes?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

In fact, in any opinion I might put to the Overseas Aid Commission they should be looking at an economic development quota section?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Okay, thank you.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think it also brings in lots of other -- we have sent out a container last year and we are going to send out a container this year because we are working with the one particular place. You know, we are helping in other ways as well. Lots of things pile in and the Overseas Aid funding is not the only thing but it certainly would help us develop faster if we had a regular input from the Overseas Aid Commission as well.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Thank you. You have answered my question.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I am getting a feeling now as well that there is the -- I am acknowledging now that there is obviously a 2-tier system working here as well in that whereas Oxfam UK are getting a criteria set up for them to go in and hassle with, that you at WASOT, you do not know which way to approach them, really. You are not sure what they need and you have the same problem with --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, they want us, as I say --

The Connétable of Grouville:

Well, you know, I just do not understand this because -- well, I think it looks to me as if there is a sort of 2-tier system where criteria are laid down specifically and clearly for people like Oxfam and yet your little group -- I am sorry, I do not mean to be derogatory about that. Your small group are not even being given the criteria to aim for in order to get on that list, which I know you have in your submission.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, the criteria are one project of £3,500 matched pound for pound once and one project materials in any one year £20,000, but it has got to be a different community each year. We are not quite sure which --

The Connétable of Trinity:

This is the major problem, is it not? You cannot keep on going to the same community, and this is what I think a lot of people like to do, is earmark an area and support that area, like you are doing, but with different sort of aid every year to increase the improvement.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes. I mean, this is what we -- I mentioned this feeding project. We are going to build accommodation for the hospital. The staff at the moment are living in pretty poor conditions. We want accommodation for the staff so they can get decent staff at the hospital. That is what we are going to do as our project this summer. This one was for restocking animals and poultry. I mean, they lost most of their stock in that drought so just -- it is buying back bullocks and a whole range of things. There is 6 bullock for each women's group, a zebu cow for 30 clans, each clan on a pastoral heifer restocking scheme. It is the sort of thing Oxfam put forward as well, you know, they will do that, but why do it through Oxfam when we can say -- and we can tell people in Jersey: "That is what your money is going for."

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can I ask you about, then, accountability? If the commission started to devolve a policy where they accepted or started to support people like WASOT, Jersey initiatives, how does the commission then cope with the problem of ensuring value for money and accountability?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, we publish a report each year. Our trust publishes an annual report and accounts.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The Commission will have a problem, will they not? It is relying on Oxfam's infrastructure to ensure that all the doors are shut and the money is going where it is ... However wonderful a cause may seem, how does the commission know it is achieving best value for money if it starts to back the smaller, probably slightly higher risk projects with a Jersey logo on, if you like? Is that a problem for the

commission?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, yes. It is a matter of trust almost, is it not? You back the people you know. I mean, I have been out there twice. I go out again this year. We can see, you know, money was given. I mean, in 2005 we were given £17,000 by Guernsey for a secondary school.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But we have got to do better than say: "Ed Le Quesne said it is all right."

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I mean, what do you want --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Well, I do not know. I am asking you.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Do you want Charles Awour to sign it, the OGRA chairman, you know?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But, Ed, with taxpayers' money we have got to do better. We have to have an infrastructure in place to ensure value for money.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can we do that if we start supporting Jersey initiatives?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, you know, there will be -- there is a school. I mean, 2005, money taken from Guernsey to build a secondary school. It was given in January. I saw it in June built, and I have a picture. There it is. So you could say there is the physical thing. We can say feeding centre, £15,000 for a feeding centre, there it is. There are the kids being served in the feeding centre.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So, not a problem? We can do it?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think we can do it, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Because it is important that we -- there is a method. Will it mean that we start to spend more on administration? As part of Jersey's Overseas Aid budget, a bigger part will be spent on admin?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Only a very small part because we are doing it anyway. It will not cost them anything. We will be going anyway.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sort of taking up again on my previous question, but economic development - and this is my comment to you, Chairman - is much easily measured than just putting money into certain projects. But if you can devise a measure of how well a community is doing on the economic development, which I think you have got something concrete to work on because you have got statistics that will come back every 2, 3, 5 years of how that -- and that would be the measure for the commission, I would have thought.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, okay.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I mean, I brought in these 2. The Elton John Foundation have been funding us to some extent, and they have done this report on our income generating activities. They have gone over and they listed all the things that have been done under income generating and made suggestions. It suggested, for instance, that they cut down on the chicken farming because of the danger of disease and bird flu, but build up on sheep and goats, and then also they have done a report on the hospital and all it needs is resources. The plan is there; just need a bit more resources to ... Hezron at the moment is speaking to people in Comic Relief. He has got through 2 stages. He now has a 4-hour face-to-face meeting with Comic Relief to say will they back us for 3 years with funding for staff. So, you know, we are getting to the stage almost where we are drawing the bigger agencies.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay. I am mindful of the time. Have you got a copy of the submission in front of you, Ed?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just on page 4 -- it is signed by both of you, is it not?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Suggestions, and I will read it out loud: "There is a need to have an independent executive body to run the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission, possibly headed by a director and made up of people who understand international development and are in tune with the basic knowledge such as the UN Millennium Goals. All our projects refused funding by the commission have been ones that tackle poverty, education, health and social exclusion, yet every one of these vignettes the commission told us fell outside the criteria. What do their criteria cover if they are out of the UN Millennium Goals?" Now, that is quite a powerful paragraph which you have put your name to. Do you want to expand on that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Well, I think the criteria is their limiting on one project per -- that is really the --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that really --

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

That is really the point. There is just a limit on amount of time they support one particular place.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

"The Commission possibly should be headed by a directorate made up of people who understand international development." Is there an innuendo that the commission does not understand international development there?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I do not know. I think a little bit of a feeling that, as I said before, we have got the money, we will look and see -- if you please us we will give you money. I think there is a little bit of rather where there is a partnership between people who relate to each other and trust each other. We have the financial resources but we have to rely on them to see what is the most that they need. I think these projects are not put forward by me as the chairman of the local group; they are put forward by Hezron and his committee. He has got the chief and he has got the bishop and the area people who say: "This is what we need in our area." So he puts it forward and eventually we supply him the funds.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The Commission as it is currently constituted with politicians and local people who have put their names forward because they genuinely have a passion to do good, is it the best way to constitute a panel that sits in judgment and makes decisions on away funding? Could we do better? Your submission suggests perhaps we could.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

They asked the commissioners to be a banker, a lawyer and an accountant but did not say anything about their actual overseas experience. I think certainly it does help to have people who have been overseas and worked overseas and know what is going on over there.

The Connétable of Trinity:

But the end thing is they have got to change the structure. I would say it is fine to change to have a director but you are still going to only be allowed one bite of the cherry. It is not going to make any difference whether you have got a director or you have got a panel though because you have got to change that criteria really to get what you want. It is frustration this, is it not?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, I mean it is very frustrating.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Gentlemen, is there anything else you want to add to Ed and have any questions?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

It has taken 3 or 4 years. The first accounts they did were ridiculously naïve in the way they did it. But Hezron's wife is an accountant and it is now done properly. You know it looks like a proper set of accounts. It is all accounted for what they have done.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can we have a copy of that? Not now but could you arrange it with Sandy? Would that be possible?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Yes, do you want it photocopied?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

That is the hospital one and that is the income-generating activity that they have been doing.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, if that is possible.

Mr.. E. Le Quesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I will arrange it with you. Is there anything else you would like to add? I think it has been very interesting. It is difficult but I think it is best that we are enlightened.

The Connétable of Trinity:

Would you like to see more support given to the local charities who raise small amounts of money to try and do good to some of these places and then the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission say: "Look, they are just 4 or 5 people. We have raised £5,000 to go on this trip. We are short of money. Can you give us pound for pound to go there because we think it is ...?" Do you think there should be more encouragement for that?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

Encouragement? Yes, I mean most countries have a development education budget. The UK since Labour came to power have released booklets to explain to people what money is used for. You know you have to educate the whole population about what is happening because people in Jersey tend to think you know: "Only Jersey for Jersey people" and that is it. They do not look outside. But I think you have got to raise people's understanding. You have to advocate what you are doing. I think they do not spend anything on advocacy. They do not have to spend much. They just have to release the information and if people are enthusiastic. I mean, there is Tony here, there is myself, there are lots of people who would be enthusiastic if they have the information to go with it. You know it is just using voluntary people so we do not have to spend a lot of money but it is just the vision really I think and say: "Let us go there."

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just a final point that I have just thought of and I do not think you covered it in your submission. If you did, I apologise. It is about the total sum voted by the States of Jersey to the Overseas Aid Commission. Have you got an opinion on the levels currently being voted? Have you got an opinion how it should be measured in the future and on the amounts that get given?

Mr. E. LeQuesne:

I think Jersey wants to have an international profile. I think we are judged by international standards. The universal target is 0.7 per cent of GNI (gross national Income). That is the one.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

As you said earlier in this hearing you said you do not expect that to happen next year. When would be a reasonable timescale to reach 0.7 per cent?

Mr. E. LeQuesne:

Ten years, I think.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

2016?

Mr. E. LeQuesne:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

2017?

Mr. E. LeQuesne:

We can do better but that would be reasonable.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You would like to be there in 10 years?

Mr. E. LeQuesne:

This is quite a big change in our budgeting system really because it is quite a lot of money in the actual money in that the GNI is really a slippery concept. Money that comes into the States through tax is not anywhere near what it says as a percent of GNI. So it means you are going to tax a bit more, because we are quite lightly taxed in Jersey, but tax a bit more to have a bigger amount in your budget to give out more. So it is a tricky concept.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That has answered Constable Gallichan's question because he was about to ask you how we are going to pay for it.

The Connétable of Trinity:

No, I was not. I was going to ask you, you were a schoolmaster in your former life. I personally think it is the people who are in senior school should be encouraged to go on these trips. They could be sponsored by Overseas Aid to go. They would be great ambassadors who come back, those who have got the inclination to go, do not force somebody. I am sure you know at your school there are people that have that idea that: "I would like to do that sort of thing." Now Overseas Aid could sponsor people to go out with a trip because at the end of the day they are good ambassadors, is it not?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

We need to sponsor kids in all sorts of fields. It is a very good use of Overseas Aid money I think sending somebody out for 6 months to work. We had a teacher in the Seychelles about 20 years ago. We sent one there and they sent one here. That is the only time it has ever happened. It has never happened since then. The people exchange is very, very good. Some people going to see what is happening there and they come and see what is here. I think it is a very good use of money.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Not wanting to give evidence but of course if Jersey did have stronger links it may be an opportunity not only for students from Jersey to go but to bring students from there back here.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I think Hezron added a lot to Victoria College. I think we have lost a lot since we lost our boarding house. We have now just people from wealthy families. We do not even have our scholarship boys now. We gained a lot by having scholarship boys.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

When we were at college there were about 40.

The Connétable of Grouville:

When did they stop scholarship boys? Does that mean only one or 2 scholarship boys now?

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No more boarding. There is no boarding. There is only one or 2 scholarship boys.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Gentlemen, it looks like we are petering out. Thank you both very much for your submission and your frankness this morning. I will declare our little session closed and we will look forward to a continued dialogue with you while we are producing the report.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

I will copy these for you.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It will not be a shock report. We will be asking you to comment on your submission so hopefully there will be nothing in it that surprises you.

Mr. E. Le Quesne:

No, okay, thank you.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you very much indeed. We are just going to adjourn now for 10 minutes.