

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

THURSDAY, 15th JUNE 2023

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	2
1. The Grindadrap Festival in the Faroe Islands – condemnation of the hunting of sea mammals (P.35/2023) - as amended (P.35/2023. Amd.) - resumption	2
1.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	2
1.1.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:	3
1.1.2 Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	3
1.1.3 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	5
1.1.4 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:.....	5
1.1.5 Deputy P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:.....	5
Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	6
Mr. M. Jowitt., H.M. Solicitor General:.....	6
1.1.6 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	7
1.1.7 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	7
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	12
2. The Connétable of St. Martin (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):.....	12
ADJOURNMENT.....	12

[9:30]

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

1. The Grindadrap Festival in the Faroe Islands – condemnation of the hunting of sea mammals (P.35/2023) - as amended (P.35/2023. Amd.) - resumption

The Bailiff:

We now proceed with the debate on P.35 and ask does any Member wish to speak on the proposition?

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

Seeing as I got a clean shirt I might as well use it. Briefly, I think we have to be really careful when we make judgments. The cruelty that is demonstrated in this practice, although if you read the Faroe Islands' government website on this it is talked about as being ... it is an interesting read because there is a definition there, as any Government would want, to define their practices as a sustainable process, the process of which has improved over time, and its high cultural importance and the food is sustainable for people and the food is eaten. One of the huge concerns from it, is if you look closely, is that the blubber that comes from whales, which is common to a number of cultures around the world, is not given to pregnant women or young children because of the level of pollutants in it. That is an issue that we need to be looking at as a planet. That we are getting to a stage where animals that roam freely in the sea are so polluted by our actions that they are not edible anymore. There are wider issues here. Before we condemn this, we have to look at our own practices of factory farming. The widespread meat consumption often in excess and the wastage of it is outrageous. The meat consumption from some process, which are hugely distressing, hugely cruel, and we have to think about that before we start to condemn other people. It is easy to do this. Some of the arguments surround we have to be careful about lecturing other jurisdictions. I get that, however, I think what we failed to do as an Assembly, a small island that can lead the way, as it has done, as other small islands have on issues like climate change, for example, on issues such as rights and voting age, things like that, and we can lead the way, I think it is important that we do say something. I will say there is an irony that one of the biggest threats to animal life on this planet and ecosystems is our use of fossil fuels and global warming. It is producing ecocide. When there is finally, and very soon there will be international laws on ecocide, I think we have to be very careful about the investments that are supported from this Island which support that ecocide. But we - well, you - some in here, not me, if I am honest, did not vote to divest in fossil fuels. That was virtue signalling, I think it was called. What are we are going to do now? Are we going to virtue signal or are we not? There is no consistency here. I think when there is an inconsistency like that it is very easy to say to small jurisdictions: "This is terrible what you do, you really should not be doing this and learn from us." But at the same time we will slaughter animals in a barbaric way so that food can be as cheap as possible and on a mass scale, hyper-process so it makes our own population ill and makes young children ill, because if they are in poverty that is where they head for, the cheapest food, and we do nothing about that. We do not support them in that because what we do is we demonise poverty, which I think is morally corrupt. At the same time we enable - and that is the word - ecocide. The destructions of mass habitats. Indeed it could be said in the quest for us to continue to burn fossil fuels and offset we are destroying other areas and producing monoculture in order that we might try and lock up some carbon and creating even more damage to animals who are being caught in wildfires and experiencing horrific deaths. I think we have to be very careful before we moralise. That is what occurred to me when I was having my morning coffee this morning.

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

First of all, I would like to raise the défaut on Deputy Doublet please.

The Bailiff:

Yes, the défaut is raised on Deputy Doublet..

1.1.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am grateful for Deputy Ward and I am pleased to follow Deputy Ward's speech, and I am grateful for Deputy Farnham to bring in this. This debate provokes me and during my coffee in the morning I started to read and think about it. As Deputy Tadier mentioned yesterday, and I also thank him for bringing how you have done your research, because my first ... the moment that I have seen this proposition, and I am sure like any other Members every summer we see these photographs in the newspapers and have these very strong words "massacre"; it is awful to see the photographs. It is disturbing me. When I see this in the press every summer, because it does come every summer, it really shakes me. At the same time, it does raise lots of questions about the hunting, about the whaling generally, but when I started to look into this as well, I realised I need to understand what is the practice, what type of sustainable practice, where it is going, it is going south and back. This is what ... apparently this food is distributed within the community. It is not just killing, it is part of their day-to-day diet. Yes, they put some restrictions. There is a conversation apparently within the Government. They did put some legislation and regulations in place about what is allowed fishing, what is not allowed fishing, what methods should be used. So there is a conversation going there and we are thinking about goods, they are thinking about goods, we have ... I mean follow the Minister for the Environment ...

The Bailiff:

Excuse me, Deputy Gardiner, could we switch that off please? Could we switch it off now? No, that is quite all right. Your apology is met with a warmly accepted fine of £10, Deputy. Please continue, Deputy Gardiner.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I initially wanted to get an understanding is this practice sustainable, what is this practice. Like Deputy Ward sought, is this practice worse than our practices. The only thing that happened that we do not see it but we do eat meat. I mean I eat meat. I am thinking if there are some religious diet basically looking at the cow as a sacred cow, do they need to send us objection that we stop eating beef. I do not know. But what I do know, and this is why I am coming, that I realise it is complex. It is really challenging. It has raised more questions than I have answers today. I do not feel that I am in the position currently to say that my practices around meat that we eat is better than their practices around their meat they eat. I am grateful to have this debate. I am not sure what I am doing with the vote because I feel really conflicted inside, and this is where I am.

1.1.2 Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Sir, you sit in the chair presiding over this Assembly and like, some Members, you listen to debates which struggle with that description.

[9:45]

But yesterday and again this morning, the debate that we have had on this issue, as is often the case when there is morality involved, this Assembly shows itself to be thoughtful, to be informed and to be understanding of nuance. It makes me, once again, realise what a privilege it is to be surrounded by such colleagues, particularly when politics in today's age certainly elsewhere in the world, and it is creeping into Jersey a swell, becomes very black and white, very right and wrong, very divided. Yet speaker after speaker, probably the tone was set by Deputy Tadier's opening speech where he argued eloquently probably for both sides of this debate, and I always think as politicians it serves us well if we can argue both sides, understand the evidence on both sides, and then come to a careful conclusion on the balance of matters. As I see it, there are 2 issues that Deputy Farnham - I nearly

called him Senator Farnham - is really raising this morning. One is the issue of the hunt that the Faroe Islands undertake and he very movingly described why to our eyes and our way of thinking and to our minds they are unacceptable. We could just stay there and say that that is unacceptable and therefore make our decision simply based on that. That, from an emotional response, is quite appealing. There is the other issue which many Members have spoken about and that is if we feel the way that we do about those hunts what should our response be as an Assembly, as a Government, as an Island. Is what Deputy Farnham is asking us or how he is asking us to respond is that the appropriate way for this Assembly to respond? It is difficult to get that balance right. Let us be clear. I think I, and certainly the Minister has heard those concerns, and I know the Chief Minister has heard those concerns as well because she is the one that will be asked to take action. Is this the appropriate mechanism to relay our feelings about the hunts? If it is not then what maybe is the appropriate mechanism? This particularly is difficult for me because when I was Jersey's chief diplomat I did write to the Faroe Islands on this very matter. I wrote a diplomatic letter and I received a diplomatic letter back, as one would expect. That is how Government to Government functions. We have, in Jersey, long taken the view that having relationships and having those conversations at an appropriate level is an appropriate way to deal with our differences. Differences of culture, differences of how we respect one another, differences of constitution, as Deputy Tadier said. He dug back into his own personal history, which is always fascinating for Members to listen to other Members' history and their journey. He spoke about the plank in one's eyes, that famous biblical text. I perhaps look to another one, which is: "Let he that is without sin cast the first stone." Yet at the same time I can see that what is happening is wrong. Some would say, of course, and maybe Deputy Farnham will say this and he is right, that Denmark has been a long-time critic of Jersey and of our low tax approach to business and to trade, and that is quite right. They have. We have responded, we have engaged appropriately, and I have got no doubt that the Minister will continue to do that engagement, and the Deputy Minister, in their engagement in Brussels and in capitals around Europe as well. I think from a Government perspective, these issues are raised and they will continue to be raised and that is the right thing for Jersey's Government to do. They are raised in an appropriate way without creating other unintended consequences. I do want to pick up on one of the points that Deputy Stephenson raised in her role as Minister for Sports, because I think that is quite important. It is right to say that the Faroe Islands have a similar constitutional position to us. They have a very high degree and level of autonomy like we do, and previous Ministers for External Relations will no doubt recall their conversations with ambassadors in London talking about the differences and the involvement of the sovereign state in the affairs. Therefore we can learn a lot in partnership with the Faroese people and Government. The reason I raised Deputy Stephenson's point is because I do also worry that, depending on how we vote today, that may then create further difficulties for our sister island in Guernsey because I do know that there are other moves afoot to continue not only to lobby the Island Games Association but to actually lobby at the Island Games themselves. It is, for my part, very important that we continue to support our sister island in all of our actions because we have no choice but to continue to work together. Those Members that may have heard or read about the Deputy Chief Minister's speech to Chamber was focusing on the challenges that we face as an Island, and those challenges are identical to our sister Island and we must work together with them. I would not want this or any decision today to be seen to challenge that joint working which needs to take place. I think whatever the outcome today, I think all Members are united in their feeling and desire that Jersey's Government continues to make representation to the Faroe Islands Government, as other Governments are doing, about the hunts. For my part, the other element of this proposition is slightly more challenging. I do understand why some Members, the overriding desire to make a statement from Jersey's Parliament about the hunts will be that they vote pour. I would not want to preach. I do not - here is an irony - I do not think preaching to others about their sins in the full knowledge that I also am a sinner is very useful time spent, but that is my particular view on things. Much better always to convince through relationships but for some Members the juxtaposition of those 2 issues will mean that they want to abstain. And for other

Members, also I believe a perfectly legitimate position to take, because the Government has already and will continue to make representations is to vote against this proposal. That is not voting against the hunts, although Deputy Farnham will no doubt passionately and emotionally say that it is later, but it is voting against the mechanism by which Government will relay that message to the Faroe Islands Government. I am not sure that I have added one iota of clarity and I have spoken for 10 minutes so I will sit down now.

1.1.3 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

This is indeed an ethical dilemma and I feel really uncomfortable that this has been brought to the Assembly. I gave up eating meat aged 10 to protect animals and so I have been vegetarian for over 50 years, so it is not a fad. The killing of these sentient trusting mammals upsets me deeply and, on a personal level, I roundly condemn it. Yes, it is rooted in history. But historically there was a great need for food and the early fisherman did not have G.P.S. (global positioning system) or speedboats to help them round up these trusting creatures. The fear and suffering these creatures go through is incomprehensible but is it right and is it appropriate for us to be asked to vote on this? With a heavy heart I will vote for this proposition but I wish that we could have found another way because this proposition has placed us all in a very deep dilemma.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the proposition? If no other Member wishes to speak then I ... Connétable, I am going to speak faster the next time I do that.

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

I was busy looking at my phone because I would like to quote to Members from some words that were sent to us earlier this week: "The Government of Jersey believe that wherever possible the best way to promote progress is through constructive and positive engagement with our partners. Jersey has a longstanding relationship with the Faroe Islands and the Kingdom of Denmark. Jersey and the Faroe Islands are both small island jurisdictions and democracies with significant autonomy, sharing much in common and facing mutual challenges." As we have just heard from Deputy Gorst. "All jurisdictions disagree on some topics and the Grindadrap is one issue on which we hold different views. As an island nation, Jersey has a special relationship with the sea and our marine environment and we recognise the importance of protecting and nurturing our marine species. From the information we have available, it appears that the Grindadrap is contrary to our values." But we have heard different views on that. "The Government of Jersey will continue to engage with Faroe Islands' colleagues and the United Kingdom Government to ensure the views of the States Assembly are communicated appropriately." And that is what we have just heard, I believe, from Deputy Gorst. The final paragraph of this email that was sent to us all on Monday from Deputy Philip Ozouf, Minister for External Relations, tells us that: "Accordingly the Chief Minister, myself and our colleagues see no reason not to support this proposition, as amended." I will just repeat that final paragraph sent to us from Deputy Philip Ozouf, Minister for External Relations: "Accordingly the Chief Minister, myself and our colleagues see no reason not to support this proposition as amended."

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

I am sorry that I have missed the early part of this debate and I am therefore going to be extremely brief, but I would just like to explain why I am not going to support this proposition of Deputy Farnham.

[10:00]

I am not going to support it because I do not think that it is an appropriate thing for a legislative assembly, like the States of Jersey, to do. I personally disapprove of lots of things that happen in foreign countries. I disapprove of bullfighting in Spain. I disapprove of the way in which women are treated in certain Middle Eastern countries. I disapprove most of all about the treatment of

Ukrainians by the Russian state today. But if the Assembly starts passing resolutions to deal with each of the things which each of us individually might disapprove us we will spend our entire time passing resolutions which are probably going to be, at the end of the day, otiose. These are matters for individuals not matters for parliamentary assemblies. How much more effective would it not be if 20 Members of this Assembly who felt very strongly about the issue which Deputy Farnham has put before us were to write to the Government of the Faroe Islands expressing their views? It is a matter for individual conscience and not for a parliamentary assembly such as ours. I also am not in favour of involving the United Kingdom Government in this process. The Chief Minister is requested to request the U.K. (United Kingdom) Government to relay our views. Why should the U.K. Government do that? We do not know what the United Kingdom Government thinks about this issue. It is a matter for the U.K. and, frankly, I think it demeans this Assembly to make a request to the United Kingdom Government which, in all likelihood, will go in the wastepaper basket.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Sir, could I ask a question of the Solicitor General to consider?

The Bailiff:

You could ask a question of the Solicitor General, yes, if it is related to this debate.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It is directly on that point about ... it is a constitutional question, which I think is therefore legal to a certain extent. I understand if the Solicitor General would like some time. But from what we have just heard there, it is true that the wording of the proposition does request the Chief Minister, who we have not heard from yet, to go away to the U.K. ... just write to the U.K., to represent us and express our views to the Faroese Government. Constitutionally is that the appropriate mechanism to do that? Is that the only way to do it and does that pose a problem? I do not want to pose hypotheticals because I know we are not in a situation where we ... it has not been amended but I am presuming that the mover of the proposition would have worded it this way after careful deliberation and talk with the Greffe. I would like to know the constitutional position.

The Bailiff:

I bet your pardon, Deputy Tadier. Can someone identify where that sound is coming from please? Whose machine is doing that? Clearly it is somewhere over there. I suppose I could fine everybody. I am going to work on the assumption that it was not a Member's fault or failure, simply on the basis that something happened in the system that caused that noise. I think that is probably the fairest way to proceed. Have you finished formulating your question, Deputy Tadier?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I think so, Sir. I hope Members did not get distracted too much by the beeping. It is just to know about the ... it has been worded in this way I presume for a reason and what the constitutional position is or is there a constitutional problem with doing it this way?

Mr. M. Jowitt., H.M. Solicitor General:

I do not think I can comment on whether it is constitutionally appropriate. That is not a matter for me. I take the constitution law to be this. Jersey is not a sovereign jurisdiction any more than I think the Faroe Islands is a sovereign jurisdiction. Neither jurisdiction is capable in its own right of conducting international relations properly, so called. International relations are, for our part, conducted on our behalf by the United Kingdom. I anticipate that it is the Government of Denmark which conducts international relations on behalf of the Faroe Islands, although I do not purport to be qualified to speak about the constitutional position of the Faroe Islands. The relationship that we have with the United Kingdom is not international relations, it is domestic relations. There is nothing in proper constitution in the Chief Minister here writing to the Government in the United Kingdom

to express the views of this Assembly. Equally, because this Island is not a sovereign jurisdiction and the Faroe Islands is not a sovereign jurisdiction, Island speaking to Island is not, in my view, a matter of international relations. It would be a matter of international relations for Jersey to purport to address its concerns directly to the Government of Denmark. But that is not, I think, what is proposed here. It is a long non-answer probably. Whether or not this is the appropriate way to do it is really not a matter for me, it is a matter for this Assembly.

The Bailiff:

Your light went on Deputy Porée. Was that in connection with something you wish to participate in, in these?

Deputy B. Porée of St. Helier South:

You have already gave away, so it is fine.

The Bailiff:

All right, very well.

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

This has indeed been a very interesting debate and there have been a great number of thoughtful speeches, which I believe have taken Members' minds from one direction to another as they are drawn to the various arguments that have been put forward. I am grateful to the Constable of St. Lawrence for drawing our attention to the initial thoughts that were produced on my behalf. She is always a very keen ... has a great keen eye and attention to detail, for which I personally have been very grateful to when we worked together as Minister and Assistant Minister at Home Affairs. I continue to be grateful to her for her keen interest in all matters that come to the Assembly. I think today, whatever is the view and the wish of the Assembly, of course it will be a matter for my office to do that. Therefore, on balance, having listened to all of the arguments that have been put forward in such a compelling and engaging way, despite my own personal view with regards the actions of the Faroe Islands, personally I cannot even bear to look at the photographs that Deputy Farnham has included in this proposition. I think we are all united in that view. But having listened to the Assembly and taken on board the actions of a previous Minister for External Relations and what happened following that, also the petition that was conducted in the United Kingdom and the ensuing debate that was held in the House of Commons last year as a result of that petition, which over 100,000 people signed condemning the actions of the Faroe Islands, it is for me to abstain I believe on this matter because I will reflect whatever is the wish of this Assembly. I fully recognise that it is an extremely difficult place for Members to be in and I have a great deal of respect for all of the views that have been articulated so well. I shall therefore leave Members with the difficult decision now of voting, once they have heard Deputy Farnham making his summing up speech.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the proposition? If no other Member wishes to speak on the proposition then I close the debate and call upon Deputy Farnham to respond.

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

Thank you to all who have spoken. A most thought-provoking and probably a necessary debate. We tend to be inward looking when we are in this Assembly and rightly focus on what we need to do to look after our own Island and our own Islanders, but sometimes I think we do need to look out. I thought long and hard about bringing this proposition because it is right to think carefully before judging others, but this is not about judging the people of the Faroe Islands. It is about judging the method of slaughter. It is not about taking the moral high ground, it is about taking the rational argument, a representation of views and asking the Chief Minister, through diplomatic channels to convey those objections in the right way. Also, sometimes we come across practices that are so bad

by our standards that we feel compelled to act. I agree with Deputy Bailhache insofar as we look around the world and we see so many wrongs, so many injustices, human rights and animal rights, and we cannot solve every problem. But there again we cannot take a solve all or solve none approach. We cannot stop all of the wrongs but if we can help to stop some of the wrongs or we can help to stop one or one at a time then it has to be worth it. Deputy Feltham's point I think was very important and well made in relation to condemning the action rather than a place or the people. That is quite right. I would add to the list any other jurisdiction that did this sort of thing. But I believe more research is to be carried out. The Faroe Islands are the only place on this planet that slaughter mammals in the way and the extent that they do. I found no other country that does that. Yes, regrettably there is still whaling and there are still huge animal welfare issues related to that but there is nothing quite like this. Deputy Stephenson's point about sport was also well made, and that is why I omitted sport and trade and other bigger perhaps political issues from my proposition because I did not want to get embroiled in that. I think those are different issues. I have my own personal views on it but I am simply asking the Assembly today to get to a method of slaughter carried out by fellow Islanders, shall we say. The point about asking the U.K. to intervene takes us into the realms of trade, and I have a briefing pack provided by the U.K. Parliament, a debate pack relating to a petition debate held last year. The U.K. are one of the Faroe Islands' largest trading partners. I think 20 per cent of Faroe Islands' exports are exported to the U.K. and the U.K. have expressed, and do continue to express, serious concerns to the Faroese Government when they discuss trade about these issues. But they do trade with the Faroe Islanders as part of a positive relationship, and as we do with other nations that we perceive not always to live by the standards we live to, in the interests of helping develop other countries and helping to see improvements. I think, as Deputy Bailhache said, our letter might well end up in the wastepaper basket of the relevant Minister or the Chief Minister of the Faroe Islands. I think asking the U.K. to bring up our objections, which I think are the same as the U.K.'s objections, carries a lot more weight. That is the reason why I have asked the States Assembly to ask the Chief Minister to mention this to the U.K. Government. I was not going to mention this but States Members might be interested to know that the Faroe Islands still trade with Russia. They have an active fisheries trading agreement with Russia.

[10:15]

They export fish to Russia right now and Russia exports goods to the Faroe Islands. But I wanted to keep that out of it but, as Members mentioned it, I felt it was important to bring it to Members' attention. I am not asking to condemn that at this stage. The proposition, in this instance, aims to, on behalf of Islanders, on behalf of the people of Jersey, and do not forget we are here to represent the views of the people of Jersey, we are not here just to run the government and make new laws and amend laws. We are here to represent the views and feelings of the people of Jersey. Sometimes I think we forget that. In this case, it is to object to the mass slaughter of whales and dolphins and the unacceptable brutal method of killing that I described in my opening speech yesterday. As we were debating yesterday, I have since learnt that a further approximately 100 pilot whales were slaughtered on the beaches of the Faroe Islands yesterday. We are an outward-looking Island. We trade goods and services around the world, of course our leading financial services industry, we are a world-class tourism destination and we have, I think, 2 of the best agricultural brands in the world. Hopefully that will soon be 3 if our medicinal cannabis industry continues to move forward in the way it is, as the Constable of St. Clement mentioned and other Members I think mentioned. We are a global player. We trade globally. We benefit from trade globally. In recent years, thanks to Deputy Bailhache and then Senator Gorst and now Deputy Ozouf, we have developed our own international identity through our relatively new external relation functions. At our own insistence, we now have an enhanced presence and a voice on the international stage. Members will know of course that the majority of our international relations used to be carried out through the U.K. Some Members expressed concern that we would be criticised in return for using that voice, for speaking out for a rational objection to a practice that is abhorrent to most people. If we carried out such atrocities here

in Jersey, in the Channel Islands, we would rightly be criticised, but we do not because we are a community who cares deeply about what we do and how we are perceived both at home and overseas. When we have been criticised by countries such as Denmark and pressured to change in the past, we have. And we have reacted positively and sensibly to those challenges. We improve our laws and we improve how we regulate ourselves. We have strong animal welfare laws and follow better practices. Having said that, there is no easy or kind way to slaughter an animal but we do it in a humane way and we do it to provide food staples for our community. As Deputy Rob Ward said, if you research into whale meat, a lot of it is not fit for human consumption and the Faroe Islands certainly do not need it as a food staple. They have a mature and established food supply chain and well-stocked supermarkets and a strong fisheries sector. They do not need to kill whales and dolphins and chop them up and distribute them for food. They simply do not need to do it. So we have those good laws and good practices here and we are always seeking to improve. We are always seeking to better ourselves. We are always seeking to evolve our community, our economy, for the better. That is why we are here in this place. That is why we all sit in this Assembly, to improve the lives of Islanders. We live in an Island community surrounded by the sea and we all have a great deal of respect for our rare and valuable marine environment. We must protect and preserve our oceans and not allow them to be plundered. All those living in close proximity to the seas and ocean should, in my opinion, be championing conservation on the international stage, not turning a blind eye to such needless slaughter. The Minister for the Environment will know better than anyone else that the future of this planet relies on the way we treat the environment, especially the way we respect our seas and oceans. Neither should we feel intimidated or ashamed for raising our reasonable and legitimate concerns in the appropriate way, which is what this proposition sets out to do. It sets to raise those objections in the appropriate way. I amended the proposition on the advice of Deputy Ozouf, through officials, and agreed what we thought was a good wording, was a wording that was appropriate that allowed the Chief Minister, on behalf of the Government and the people of Jersey, to object in the right way. That is why I amended the proposition. I thank them for their guidance on that. Original talks with the Greffe had, perhaps, suggested we might ask you, Sir, to write on behalf of the Assembly. But again, after discussion with the Government, we thought it would be more appropriate for the Chief Minister to take that up on our behalf. As a civilised small island nation ourselves, what example do we set to the rest of the world if we do nothing, if we say nothing? What example are we setting? Not a very good one, as far as I am concerned. We must therefore let our fellow Islanders in the Faroe Islands know that we want to maintain and even improve our relationship with them but this gruesome and barbaric practice can no longer be excused simply because it is a tradition. The days of the Grind must be brought to an end and this small island must do what it can in its own small way to make that happen. I ask Members today to do the right thing because a vote against this is a vote to allow the Grind to continue. I ask Members on behalf of the people of Jersey, who we represent in this Assembly, to support this rationale proposition.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Can I ask the Member to give way?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

No, Sir.

The Bailiff:

For a point of clarification was that?

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

It is a point of clarification just to ... it is a point of clarification.

The Bailiff:

But the Deputy has said that he will not.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Okay, Sir.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I am quite happy to take a point of clarification.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

I just wanted to make it very clear that the engagement with the External Relations Department was simply ...

The Bailiff:

Is this a point of clarification?

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Clarification on the point that he made about the engagement with External Relations.

The Bailiff:

Sorry, a point of clarification can work in one of 2 ways. Either it is a point of clarification of something the Deputy said, asking him to clarify it. Or it is a point of clarification of a speech you have made that you think has been misunderstood, in which case you can then clarify it. But those are the 2 bases of the point of clarification but you cannot add a point to the speech.

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

They are both and it is just to clarify what the Deputy seemed to ... gave the ...

The Bailiff:

In which case, if you want the Deputy to clarify his speech would you ask him to clarify the point that you want?

Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf:

Could the Deputy kindly clarify that the engagement that he had with External Relations was simply to ensure that the proposition was in a form that would, subject to the States approving it, be acceptable but that did not give any indication as to whether or not the Council of Ministers or the External Relations Department agreed with it? It simply was a clarification on the wording that was constitutionally possible.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I am happy to do that. It was my understanding that the Ministers, if I amended ... my clear understanding from officials was that if my proposition was amended it would receive support. That indeed was confirmed to all Members in his email, as reported by the Constable of St. Lawrence.

The Bailiff:

That is the clarification.

Deputy M. Tadier:

We cannot ask Deputy Ozouf for clarification, can we?

The Bailiff:

No, I am afraid not.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It would help to know what the Government's position is on this.

The Bailiff:

A point of clarification can arise only during the course of a Member's speech, if they give way to receive it. By tradition we now tend to stack those up to the end so that there is no interruption of the speech as it goes. But there is nothing wrong, in principle, with interrupting a speech during it, if it is really appropriate to do so.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I just wonder, if we are finished, I was going to ask for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel is called for. I invite Members to return to their seats. The vote is on P.35 as amended. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and Members to vote. If Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been adopted: 22 votes pour, 12 votes contre, 12 abstentions.

POUR: 22		CONTRE: 12		ABSTAIN: 12
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. John		Connétable of Trinity
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy K.F. Morel		Connétable of St. Peter
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy P.F.C. Ozouf		Connétable of St. Mary
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		Deputy C.F. Labey
Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy H.M. Miles		Deputy I. Gardiner
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy R.E. Binet		Deputy I.J. Gorst
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy A. Howell		Deputy K.L. Moore
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		Deputy D.J. Warr
Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy M.R. Ferey		Deputy J. Renouf
Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy A.F. Curtis		Deputy M.E. Millar
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		Deputy B. Ward
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		Deputy M.B. Andrews		Deputy K.M. Wilson
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy B.B.de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				

The Greffier of the States:

Those voting pour: the Connétables of St. Helier, St. Lawrence, St. Brelade, St. Martin, St. Clement, Grouville, St. Ouen and St. Saviour, Deputies Tadier, Luce, Doublet, Le Hegarat, Ahier, Rob Ward, Farnham, Mézec, Porée, Scott, Catherine Curtis, Feltham, Jeune, Kovacs. Those abstaining: the Connétables of Trinity, St. Peter, St. Mary, Deputies Labey, Gardiner, Gorst, Moore, Warr, Renouf, Millar, Barbara Ward and Wilson. Those voting contre: the Connétable of St. John and Deputies Morel, Ozouf, Bailhache, Miles, Rose Binet, Howell, Tom Binet, Ferey, Alex Curtis, Stephenson and Andrews.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business. I call upon the chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose the arrangement for public business for future meetings.

2. The Connétable of St. Martin (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

At the moment we have 5 items listed on the Consolidated Order Paper for the next sitting on 4th July: Draft Taxation, P.28; Draft Income Tax, P.29; Amendment to Standing Orders, P.30; Removal of compulsory independent taxation, P.32; Jersey Police Complaints Authority, P.37, appointment of member. Since the Consolidated Order Paper was published 2 more items have been lodged for the next sitting: Taxation of High Value Residents, P.44, and the Appointment of non-elected Members on Scrutiny Panels, P.45. Therefore we will be sitting for at least 2 days, 4th July and 5th July, and please bear in mind that 6th and 7th July are continuation days.

The Bailiff:

Do you propose that as the arrangement for future business?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, Sir, I propose that as the arrangement for public business.

The Bailiff:

Do Members agree? Very well, in which case the business of the Assembly is concluded and the Assembly stands adjourned until the 4th July.

ADJOURNMENT

[10:27]