

# STATES OF JERSEY



## PROPOSED COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2018–22 (P.110/2018): AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 16th November 2018  
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade

---

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSED COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2018–22 (P.110/2018):  
AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2 –**

After the words “Appendix to this Proposition” insert the words “, except that on page 20 of the Appendix to the Proposed Common Strategic Policy 2018–22 (Section 6: Common themes), in the paragraph headed “We will work in partnership with Parishes, churches, community groups, the third sector, volunteers, businesses and key stakeholders”, to replace the word “churches” with the words “faith groups”, and after the word “businesses” to insert the words “trade unions,”.”.

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

in accordance with Article 18(2)(e) of the States of Jersey Law 2005, to approve the statement of the Common Strategic Policy of the Council of Ministers as set out in the Appendix to this Proposition, except that on page 20 of the Appendix to the Proposed Common Strategic Policy 2018–22 (Section 6: Common themes), in the paragraph headed “We will work in partnership with Parishes, churches, community groups, the third sector, volunteers, businesses and key stakeholders”, to replace the word “churches” with the words “faith groups”, and after the word “businesses” to insert the words “trade unions,”.

**REPORT**

*‘First they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out –  
Because I was not a socialist.*

*Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out –  
Because I was not a trade unionist.*

*Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out –  
Because I was not a Jew.*

*Then they came for me – and there was no one left to speak for me’.*

– Pastor [Martin Niemöller](#) (1892 – 1984)

*‘Vibrant and Inclusive: Islanders enjoy living in a vibrant and inclusive community.’*

**Proposed Common Strategic Policy 2018–22 ([P.110/2018](#))**

<b>1. CSP Strategic Priority: We will put children first</b>	
<b>CSP Interdependencies</b>	<b>Future Jersey Outcomes supported</b>
Improve Islanders’ well-being and mental and physical health.	Learn and Grow: Children enjoy the best start in life.
Reduce income inequality and improve the standard of living.	Vibrant and <b>Inclusive</b> : Islanders enjoy living in a vibrant and <b>inclusive community</b> .
Enable Islanders to lead active lives and benefit from the arts, culture and heritage.	Health and Well-being: Islanders enjoy long, healthy, active lives.
Protect and value our environment.	Affordable Living: Islanders are able to afford a decent standard of living.
Promote and protect Jersey’s interests, profile and reputation internationally.	Safety and Security: Islanders are safe and protected at home, work and in public.
<b>Work in partnership with Parishes, churches, community groups, the third sector, volunteers, businesses and key stakeholders.</b>	

On 20th September 2018, I sent the following e-mail to the Council of Ministers for their consideration –

*“Whilst it is not a major issue, necessarily, the inclusion of word ‘churches’ has the potential to be problematic.*

*At best, it is superfluous, as it is captured already under ‘community groups’ and (for the parish churches) under ‘Parishes’.*

*‘Churches’ risks being exclusive and the obvious corollary is to ask, and why not Mosques and synagogues (there is an active and valued synagogue in my constituency, for example)? So, if Ministers do feel the need to specifically highlight faith groups, perhaps that can be said so change Churches [sic.] to faith groups.*

*If we did this, it might also be wise to add ‘and secular, civic organizations.’ Again, these are already included in ‘Community groups’, so the easiest thing would just be to delete the word ‘churches’.*

*I appreciate this is a foreword from the Ministers only, however, and not from Assistant Ministers like myself, so I leave it to Ministers to consider the potential messages about inclusivity or otherwise that this sends out.*

*As an addendum, Geoff’s suggestion of ‘and trade unions (and employer groups)’ being included, also has merit.”.*

It seems to me that as a Government and a States Assembly, we either want to be inclusive or we do not. We either want to consult meaningfully on important issues, or we do not.

There is nothing wrong with Government wanting to consult with *Churches* per se, but as a consequence of singling out churches, it becomes evident that other faith groups are not worthy of a special mention.

Similarly, it is entirely appropriate that Government would want to consult with businesses (i.e. employers), but it is also important that employees are represented in consultations, and the most obvious way their opinions are to be heard is through the collective voice of the various trade unions that are present in the Island.

This is not a debate about being religious or secular, pro-union or anti-union, but about whether we want to be genuinely inclusive as a community, and consult properly.

I would hope this amendment is non-controversial and can be accepted by the Council of Ministers.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no additional financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this amendment.