

STATES OF JERSEY

YOUTH ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 27th MARCH 2018

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER.....	5
1.1 Welcome to Members of the Youth Assembly	5
QUESTIONS.....	5
2. Oral Questions.....	5
2.1 Miss L. McGarragle of the Minister for the Environment, regarding wind and tidal energy:.....	5
Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):	6
2.2 Mr. B. Baker of the Chairman of the Overseas Aid Commission, regarding the role of the Commission:	6
2.2.1 Mr. L. Marsh:.....	6
2.2.2 Miss I. Howells:	7
2.2.3 Mr. E. Wyatt:	7
2.2.4 Mr. L. Davis:	7
2.3 Mr. B. Ogilvie of the Minister for Health and Social Services, regarding mental health services for young people:.....	8
Senator A.K.F. Green (The Minister for Health and Social Services):	8
2.3.1 Mr. E. Wyatt:	9
2.3.2 Miss I. Helie-Merrony:	9
2.3.3 Mr. L. Davis:	9
2.3.4 Miss I. Howells:	10
2.4 Miss B. Smyrk of the Minister for the Environment, regarding renewable energy policies:.....	11
The Deputy of St. Martin:	11
2.4.1 Miss L. Rumbold:.....	11
2.4.2 Miss I. Howells:	11
2.4.3 Mr. E. Wyatt:	12
2.4.4 Mr. L. Davis:	12
2.5 Miss S. Ammar of The Chief Minister (representing the Minister for Education) regarding financial literacy education:	13
Senator I.J. Gorst (The Chief Minister):.....	14
2.5.1 Miss I. Howells:	14
2.5.2 Mr. E. Wyatt:	14
2.6 Mr. H. Bannister of The Minister for Social Security, regarding the sustainability of Jersey's Social Security fund:	15
Deputy S.J. Pinel of St. Clement (The Minister for Social Security):	15
2.7 Miss T. Parker of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture regarding the sale of Fort Regent:	15
Senator L.J. Farnham (The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture):.....	15

2.7.1 Mr. L. Marsh:	16
2.7.2 Mr. L. Davis:	16
2.8 Mr. J. Evans-Rentsch of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, regarding the sustainability of Jersey's Social Security fund:	17
Senator L.J. Farnham:	17
2.8.1 Miss I. Howells:	18
2.9 Miss C. Keyworth of the Acting Minister for Housing regarding houses for first time buyers:	18
Senator A.F.K. Green:	18
2.9.1 Mr. L. Huelin:	19
2.9.2 Mr. L. Marsh:	19
2.10 Mr. J. Le Conte of the Acting Minister for Housing, regarding the cost of States housing:	20
Senator A.F.K. Green:	20
2.10.1 Mr. L. Marsh:	20
2.11 Miss Z. Johnston of the Minister for Health and Social Services, regarding the new hospital:	20
Senator A.F.K. Green:	21
2.11.1 Miss L. Pitcher:	21
2.11.2 Miss F. Roberts:	21
2.11.3 Miss M. McLaughlin:	22
2.11.4 Miss J. Cullen:	22
2.11.5 Miss L. Peters:	22
2.11.6 Miss S. Ammar:	23
2.12 Miss S. Walker of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, regarding the benefits of high net worth residents in Jersey:	23
Senator L.J. Farnham:	23
3. Questions to Ministers without Notice – The Chief Minister	24
3.1 Mr L. Marsh:	24
Senator I.J. Gorst:	24
3.2 Miss L. Rumbold:	24
3.3 Miss Z. Johnston:	24
3.4 Miss L. Peters:	25
3.5 Mr L. Davis:	25
3.6 Miss L. McGarragle:	26
3.7 Miss I. Howells:	26
3.8 Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:	27
3.9 Miss S. Ammar:	27
3.10 Miss F. Roberts:	28
3.11 Miss E. Bridson:	28
3.12 Miss T. Parker:	29
3.13 Miss Z. Johnston:	29
4. Whether a licence should be required to have a child in the U.K. and Jersey	30
4.1 Miss G. Magalhaes:	30
4.1.1 Miss E. Parris:	31
4.1.2 Miss T. Parker:	31
4.1.3 Miss I. Howells:	32
4.1.4 Miss S. Gomes:	32
4.1.5 Miss F. Roberts:	32
4.1.6 Miss J. Cullen:	32
4.1.7 Miss C. Keyworth:	32

4.1.8	Miss L. Peters:	32
4.1.9	Miss B. Smyrk:	32
4.1.10	Mr B. Ogilvie:	33
4.1.11	Miss L. McGarragle:	33
4.1.12	Miss E. Bridson:	33
4.1.13	Mr E. Wyatt:	33
4.1.14	Mr I. Pike:	34
4.1.15	Mr. L. Davis:	34
4.1.16	Miss L. Rumbold:	34
4.1.17	Miss L. McLaughlin:	34
4.1.18	Mr. L. Marsh:	35
4.1.19	Miss H. Crichard:	35
4.1.20	Miss L. Pitcher:	35
4.1.21	Miss R. Egerton:	35
4.1.22	Miss Z. Johnston:	35
4.1.23	Mr L. Huelin:	36
4.1.24	Miss C. Jegard:	36
4.1.25	Miss F. Robinson:	36
4.1.26	Miss N. Rog:	36
5	Whether Jersey should reduce its contribution to pollution by restricting the number of cars per household	37
5.1	Miss I. Howells:	37
5.1.1	Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:	38
5.1.2	Miss R. Cushing:	38
5.1.3	Mr L. Marsh:	39
5.1.4	Miss L. Pitcher:	39
5.1.5	Miss R. Egerton:	39
5.1.6	Miss T. Parker:	39
5.1.7	Miss I. Pike:	39
5.1.8	Miss I. Helie-Merrony:	39
5.1.9	Mr. L. Huelin:	39
5.1.10	Miss Z. Johnston:	39
5.1.11	Miss E. Bridson:	40
5.1.12	Miss G. Magalhaes:	40
5.1.13	Mr. L. Davis:	40
5.1.14	Miss L. Peters:	40
5.1.15	Miss E. Parris:	40
5.1.16	Miss J. Cullen:	40
5.1.17	Miss L. McGarragle:	40
5.1.18	Mr. B. Ogilvie:	41
5.1.19	Miss S. Gomes:	41
6.	Whether Jersey's planning laws should be relaxed	42
6.1	Mr T. Andrews:	42
6.1.1	Miss I. Howells:	43
6.1.2	Miss B. Smyrk:	43
6.1.3	Miss C. Keyworth:	43
6.1.4	Mr L. Davis:	43
6.1.5	Miss I. Pike:	44
6.1.6	Miss F. Roberts:	44
6.1.7	Miss R. Cushing:	44
6.1.8	Miss H. Crichard:	44
6.1.9	Miss N. Rog:	44

6.1.10	Miss Z. Johnston:	44
6.1.11	Miss E. Bridson:	45
6.1.12	Miss K. Pitcher:	45
6.1.13	Mr. L. Marsh:	45
6.1.14	Miss L. Peters:	45
6.1.15	Miss J. Cullen:	46
6.1.16	Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:	46
6.1.17	Miss G. Magalhaes:	46
6.1.18	Miss C. Jegard:	46
6.1.19	Mr W. Waddington:	46
7	Whether there should be a subsidised fruit and vegetable scheme for morning break in all Jersey primary schools from Reception to Year 3	47
7.1	Miss M. McLaughlin:	47
7.1.1	Miss L. Pitcher:	48
7.1.2	Miss I. Helie-Merrony:	48
7.1.3	Miss L. Peters:	48
7.1.4	Mr L. Davis:	48
7.1.5	Mr E. Wyatt:	49
7.1.6	Miss E. Parris:	49
7.1.7	Miss C. Keyworth:	49
7.1.8	Miss Z. Johnston:	49
7.1.9	Miss I. Pike:	50
7.1.10	Miss E. Bridson:	50
7.1.11	Miss B. Smyrk:	50
7.1.12	Mr L. Marsh:	50
7.1.13	Miss L. Rumbold:	50
7.1.14	Miss T. Parker:	50
7.1.15	Miss S. Ammar:	51
7.1.16	Miss C. Jegard:	51
7.1.17	Miss R. Egerton:	51
7.1.18	Miss H. Crichard:	51

The Roll was called and Miss I. Howells led the Assembly in Prayer.

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

1. The Bailiff:

1.1 Welcome to Members of the Youth Assembly

A very warm welcome to the Youth Assembly. It is a very important gathering for you and for all of us, because you are about to go out and vote in about a month's time. You will be engaging in the political process and today is just part of that. I thought I would give you a few statistics. You probably know them already, but just in case. The number on the electoral role has increased from 46,319 in 1990 to 62,566 in 2014. The turn-out rate over all Parishes in the Senatorial Elections has mostly been between 44 and 46 per cent, although in 1990 it was down to 39 per cent, in 2014 it was near enough 40 per cent. That compares to the U.K. (United Kingdom) turn-out rate of 71 per cent, at least, in all General Elections between 1922 and 1997 and about 65 to 66 per cent in the last 2 General Elections. By Parishes, only Trinity has shown a 50 per cent turn out, or more, every year at elections and senatorials since 1990. Grouville, St. John, St. Mary, St. Martin, St. Ouen hit 50 per cent pretty regularly. If you live in St. Helier, or St. Saviour, the turn out rate is never greater than 40 per cent. It is usually a good deal less. In St. Helier one year it was 29 per cent. In St. Clement, it is usually about 40 per cent. What do you take from all of those statistics? The first message is, obviously, you should all go and live in Trinity. OK, maybe not, but the second message is that it is your duty to vote. The fact that you are here shows that you are interested and I am sure you are going to vote. Voting is important; people have fought and died for the vote, starting with the American War of Independence, probably. No taxation without representation back in 1776. It has happened all over the world since then. The vote is important and you do not get a vote and then just give it up, you vote. The second thing, which is just as important, is that in addition to your vote you have a duty to inform yourselves. You have to read the papers, you have to read stuff online, you have to discuss the major issues among your friends. You get other points of view and it puts you in a better place to form a reasonable view for yourselves. The third message – you can apply that in your questions to ministers and I hope you are going to be absolutely ruthless with them today – is that when people say something to you about politics, you do not just accept it; you do not accept it. It is a fundamental rule, it is the direction I give to juries in criminal cases all the time. They hear evidence and I say: "When you go out into the jury room, you have got to ask yourselves 2 questions: are they telling the truth? Is what they say reliable? Because truthful people are not always reliable." Those 2 questions of truthfulness and reliability are really important in everything. They are particularly important when you decide guilt or innocence in a court, but also when you are listening to what people say in politics. It is exactly the same principle: have they told you everything? Listen to the answers and then ask the questions. I hope you are going to have an absolutely wonderful afternoon. I am sure you will.

QUESTIONS

2. Oral Questions

The Bailiff:

We come to the first item on the Order Paper which is question time. Lily McGarragle, Jersey College for Girls, will ask a question of the Deputy of St. Martin regarding wind and tidal energy.

2.1 Miss L. McGarragle of the Minister for the Environment, regarding wind and tidal energy:

In your answer on the tidal turbine, you stated that Jersey plans to reduce 80 per cent of Co2 emissions by 2050 from what it was in 1990. How do you plan on doing that without a tidal turbine, which we believe would help reduce this drastically?

Deputy S.G. Luce of St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):

There are a number of ways to reduce our carbon emissions in the time between now at 2050. We know that the 2 main ones come from housing and from transport. We are very much on the way to cracking the housing one. Our new by-law regulations insist on additional levels of insulation, which mean you spend less money and carbon emissions on heating and, similarly, less energy on cooling in the summer. However, the one that we really have to crack in the near future is transport. I very much hope that in the next decade we still see a transformation from petrol and diesel engines, the internal combustion engine, to electric and hybrid vehicles.

The Bailiff:

Are there any supplementary questions? No? OK, then we will come to question 2, which Mr. Baker of Victoria College will ask of the Deputy of Grouville, Chairman of the Overseas Aid Commission. Please read out your question completely.

2.2 Mr. B. Baker of the Chairman of the Overseas Aid Commission, regarding the role of the Commission:

Is delivering aid not the role of the citizens and not the States? Surely we should not be able to be forced to pay for it.

Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville (Chairman of the Overseas Aid Commission):

Thank you. This is a fascinating and important question, which goes to the heart not only of Jersey Overseas Aid, but our whole identity as an Island. Therefore, it is a fairly long answer which I can give, or I can answer supplementaries on it. I am not really sure what I am meant to be doing here.

The Bailiff:

The supplementary question. You will follow up on the answer you have got so far. Ask another question of the Chairman. Pin her to the wall.

Mr. B. Baker:

I have no supplementary questions.

2.2.1 Mr. L. Marsh:

I would like to question the statement made by Deputy Labey regarding her statement that individual contributions and donations cannot make such a large effect on global poverty.

The Deputy of Grouville:

Thank you. I would disagree with that. I think our contribution makes a huge effect for all different kinds of reasons. It allows us to play our part on the international stage. It is part of an agreement that we made with the U.N. (United Nations) to give 0.7 per cent. We made 0.25 per cent, but we do have a great impact in these individual countries and in many different ways. You might have seen last week that we have gone into partnership with Comic Relief. We are going to be match funding them in 3 different countries. That is really putting Jersey on the world stage, not only being partnered with Comic Relief but, most importantly, the impact that we are making in those individual countries. Another example I like to give of our projects is with the R.J.A. & H.S. (The Royal Jersey Agricultural and Horticultural Society) in Jersey and the Jersey Cow Project that is in Rwanda. As you can see from my original answer, we have directly affected 60,000 farmers from the poorest families in Rwanda. This cow project has had a huge impact on the milk yields of that country as a whole. It has not only lifted individual families out of poverty and transformed villages, allowed

girls to go to school whereby they would not have been given the opportunity before, but it has also given the whole country a lift with its milk yield.

The Bailiff:

Are there any supplementary questions for the Chairman?

2.2.2 Miss I. Howells:

The Deputy made a statement [inaudible] could be accused of being millionaires from a tax haven. However, you have to admit that Jersey's average wealth is higher than that of other countries and given that [inaudible] than we already are.

The Deputy of Grouville:

That is a very good question and it is a political question. The U.N. aim is to give 0.7 per cent of our G.D.P. (Gross Domestic Product) and we give 0.25 per cent of our G.D.P. Therefore, there is an argument that we could and should give more. I would like to aim to nudge up our giving. In fairness to us, what we do give is based purely on need. We have a scientific formula for working out which countries we find and we pick the poorest on the H.D.I. which is the Human Development Index, so the poorest 50 countries and they are picked for specific reasons. We have gone in with projects that we really know about. But, yes, it is a political argument: "Should we be doing more?" Scandinavian countries give more than 0.7 per cent. We are on a par with Italy, Ireland and Turkey. The U.K. give 0.7 per cent. Therefore, my answer is yes but it is a political call.

The Bailiff:

Mr. Wyatt, do you have a supplementary question?

[13.45]

2.2.3 Mr. E. Wyatt:

Might it also be effective to place some kind of impetus or incentive upon corporations to contribute to these global efforts?

The Deputy of Grouville:

Yes, absolutely. In fact, the world of aid and development is changing. It is no longer the white man turning up in Africa and telling them what we think they need. Development and international aid is changing big time. People are investing in development impact bonds and impact investments. We have philanthropists, because they might want to get a return on their money for example of 8 per cent. However, there are some good people out there and they now want to match fund with organisations and with N.G.Os. (Non-Government Organisations) to, for example, get a 4 per cent return, knowing they are doing global good. Yes, this is definitely the way to go, philanthropy, and I have said it a few times lately, Jersey is a philanthropic Island. We can use our financial expertise over here - which is what we are really good at, an international finance centre - let us use it to do work with philanthropy and be known as a philanthropic Island, yes. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Yes, last supplementary question?

2.2.4 Mr. L. Davis:

Mrs. Labey talks about using finance and being philanthropists through giving to charity. Does not philanthropy include more direct actions, such as individuals going over and being hands-on helping, rather than giving their indirect support through financial means? What can we here in Jersey do to give more direct support, and do you think the direct support is as effective as the indirect support that we can give in Jersey?

The Deputy of Grouville:

Both are good. We put on 3 projects a year, 3 community work projects that allow Islanders to go to various countries. This year we are going to Lebanon, Tanzania and Mongolia. Last year we went to Nepal. Islanders can volunteer – we launch in the autumn usually and we do various projects overseas. Those really are hands-on. We build community centres, clinics. In Lebanon, the project is slightly different, we do one-to-one care with disabled people as part of a respite programme. Yes, Islanders can certainly help out in that way and that is directly. We have also got an intern project going that we launched this year and we will be doing them annually whereby an Islander is given the opportunity to work in partnership with an N.G.O. that we pick. They start off in our office, then go to the London office and then go out in the field. International aid is a very difficult career to break into so, in this way, we are giving Islanders the opportunity. Again, that is very much direct aid.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Now we come to question 3. Mr. Ogilvie will ask Senator Green, the Minister for Health and Social Services. Read out your whole question please.

2.3 Mr. B. Ogilvie of the Minister for Health and Social Services, regarding mental health services for young people:

Given that one in 4 people experience a mental health problem at some point in their lives and new figures released by Jersey's Health Department reveal that one in 10 children aged between 5 and 16 has a mental health problem, what actions are being taken to prevent this epidemic?

Senator A.K.F. Green (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

I hope Members will have read the answer, so I will just summarise it, to leave more time for supplementaries. There is much more awareness of mental health problems in young people. With children and in fact all people, encouraged to talk as much as possible about their personal circumstances, there is more public support for mental health initiatives for young people. Support is delivered principally through the Jersey Child/Adult Mental Health Services. There are 4 tiers of provision. Tier one is universal services such as Early Years. Tier 2, targeted services such as primary mental health workers in education and that includes professionals working as part of a multi-disciplinary team. Tier 3 is the specialist services at C.A.M.H.S. (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service) which again involves a multi-disciplinary team of child and adolescent mental health professionals. Tier 4, highly specialised service such as in-patient services for the small number of children that are deemed at greatest risk and therefore needing input quickly.

The Bailiff:

Any supplementary questions?

Mr. B. Ogilvie:

Surely these tiers are methods of early intervention as opposed to prevention and would they not be necessary if there was more emphasis on preventing the mental health problem in the first place?
[Approbation]

Senator A.K.F. Green:

That is a really good and important question. Far more needs to be done and is being done around early intervention, particularly in schools. I am particularly pleased with putting the child at the centre of the things that the States do now, with the approach that is being taken by the Chief Minister and the new Chief Executive in putting all children's support in one place, so that prevention becomes as important, if not more important, than treatment. However, we still will need to have that treatment; it is not just Health, it is Education, it is Housing, it all those things put together. That is why we have the 'YES' (Youth Enquiry Service) project, why we have school counsellors. Mr. Ogilvie is right, there is more to be done.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone have a supplementary? Mr. Wyatt?

2.3.1 Mr. E. Wyatt:

I am aware of the existence of C.A.M.H.S. and I have dealt with a lot of people who have had interaction with C.A.M.H.S., although, what they have told me about often can be summed up by saying that their therapy sessions are essentially just small-talk with a therapist for about an hour. I have to say I cannot really think of this as all that effective [Approbation]. Therefore, is anything going to be done to improve the state of the current C.A.M.H.S. system?

Senator A.K.F. Green:

We are always striving to improve services. Of course, I am not the clinician and, as the Member said, I occasionally hear that people were concerned about the support that goes in there. However, talking is an important part of the therapy. For my part, I am absolutely embarrassed and ashamed of the premises that C.A.M.H.S. are housed in. I have fought for 3½ years to get them moved [Approbation]. If I was a youngster who perhaps had low esteem, or felt less than valued, attending that building with the plaster and paint hanging off the walls – I know good care can be provided anywhere but it is hardly welcoming. To that end, I can report that C.A.M.H.S. will be in their new premises by the 28th of May [Approbation].

2.3.2 Miss I. Helie-Merrony:

From my own experience, the waiting list for C.A.M.H.S. can be months and often they try to end treatment, or help, as fast as possible due to such high numbers suffering from a mental health problem. What would you suggest to improve this?

Senator A.K.F. Green:

When I first became Minister, I was aware of the huge waiting list and length of time it took to get to C.A.M.H.S. so that has very much improved, but it is improved by ensuring that those who need tier one support get that support where they should, in the school, within the youth service or within the home, so that the skills of the people in C.A.M.H.S. can be targeted directly at those who really need it. I do not have the figures to hand, but I can report that the waiting time for the initial appointment with C.A.M.H.S. is very much more in line with where we would expect it to be. That said, we should not rest on our laurels; we need to ensure that people get the support they need when they need it. Although it is said that one in 4 need mental health intervention, I think all of us suffer from mental health challenges at some times, but one in 4 need to seek that professional help. That help needs to be available when it is needed.

The Bailiff:

Any supplementaries?

2.3.3 Mr. L. Davis:

We have spoken about what we can do clinically and the treatment itself. Surely, there remains throughout the world, let alone in Jersey, a stigma attached to mental health issues. Surely, this stigma around the people, who perhaps regard themselves as mentally healthy, can contribute to what is being described here as an epidemic. What can we do in Jersey to ensure that the mental stigma is broken down among the population of Jersey to help those in the day-to-day workings of life both in schools and in the work place, so that we can help them on a daily basis and not just during a treatment clinic? [Approbation]

Senator A.K.F. Green:

That is a very enlightened question and, of course, the best thing we can do is again to be open about we all have mental health, whether that is good mental health, or whether we are experiencing challenges. It is sad, sometimes, that people are prepared to tell you that a family member has been

in hospital with a broken leg, but try to cover up that a family member has had mental health challenges. We need to break down that stigma in society. We need to be just as safe to say: “I have a mental health challenge,” as: “I have to have my appendix out.” I think it is getting better and the evidence of that is that – this is only one example – about 18 months ago a young man came up to me when I was carrying out a recycling exercise at the bins and he said to me that he thought the work he was getting through the mental health services was much better than previously. That is not the important point, the point is he was happy to say: “I have had a mental health challenge and I am happy to talk about it.” That would not have happened in the past. We all have to be more open about our health, be that mental health, or physical health. The 2 are not separate, they are inter-linked.

The Bailiff:

Supplementary?

Mr. L. Davis:

You acknowledged that we do have these problems with how we identify mental health. I have been fortunate enough to visit schools both in China and in Costa Rica, where they build into their educational programme elements of mindfulness and going outdoors to ingrain that within the educational culture. Are there facilities to do this within Jersey’s education system, so we can try and prevent this from as early an age as possible?

Senator A.K.F. Green:

Certainly. That is the way that the Education Minister working with us is looking at the moment. The earlier we get people to acknowledge that just as you have to exercise to keep physically fit, you have to exercise your mind to keep mentally fit as well. So, it is a really good point, it is something that is being worked on at the moment. I might add, slightly off the question, that one of the biggest challenges that you young people have, is the use of social media, the fact that you cannot escape when there is cyber bullying going on. When there was bullying at school when I was a youngster, you got away from it in the evenings and at the weekend. It is very difficult with social media. Perhaps we all need to be a bit more respectful of how we use social media and the effect that it has on people.

Connétable L. Norman of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Any more supplementary questions?

2.3.4 Miss I. Howells:

In support of Mr. Davis’s point, yes, social media does pose a big contribution, but I think what cannot be ignored is whether it is attributed to mental health or not, all of us here will have faced some kind of intense stress due to school. **[Approbation]** I think that especially on Island, the pressure to get amazing grades and succeed is very strong. There needs to be more done to allow for you to relax and help with that stress and I do not think that that is in the school systems at the moment or in mental health systems. **[Approbation]** I was wondering how we can improve the mental health of our students not through the counselling, or things like that, but simply by allowing our students to understand.

Senator A.K.F. Green:

I have to agree with the Member. There is an area of work that needs to be done. There is huge pressure for young people to achieve their greatest potential and that does put them under an extra strain. I do not have a magic answer, but I will certainly take the point back and discuss it with the Education Minister as well.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. I think we need to move on to the next question, which Miss Bethany Smyrk of Hautlieu will ask of the Deputy of St. Martin, Minister for the Environment.

2.4 Miss B. Smyrk of the Minister for the Environment, regarding renewable energy policies:

Having more renewable energy sources can lead to a more sustainable, environmentally friendly and possibly a more self-sufficient Jersey, so are there any renewable energy policies set for new builds?

[14.00]

The Deputy of St. Martin:

It is the current planning policy to encourage all new developments to incorporate on-site low carbon, or renewable technologies. For large non-residential developments and residential developments of 10 or more units, the policy generally requires renewable energy production equipment to offset predicted carbon emissions by at least 10 per cent. In addition to planning policies, stringent energy performance targets have been set for all new buildings under the building by-laws. These require high levels of insulation to reduce energy demand for space heating and to reduce the need for cooling systems. They also require new lighting, boilers and ventilation fans to reduce energy demand. Standards are now controlled through a requirement for the energy performance of all new buildings to be calculated and to be shown in the form of energy performance certificates for the building, which look very much like the energy performance certificates you issued with new household appliances.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Are there supplementary questions for the Minister? Miss Rumbold?

2.4.1 Miss L. Rumbold:

This issue seems to be brought up every year, but nothing seems to be happening. You said that there are planning policies in place which encourage developments. However, the public are not happy with it, because issues are still being brought up frequently. Consequently, what are you going to do to take more action on this topic? Is *encouraging* developments enough?

Deputy of St. Martin:

It is always a balance between encouraging and forcing. Certainly, the policies I mentioned in my answer are part of the Island Plan and will need to be conformed with, if the building is to receive an approval from the Planning Department. For example, if you apply to put an extension on your house currently, you will be asked now to spend an addition 10 per cent of the build cost of that extension on energy efficiencies in the existing property as well. All of these things are part of planning policy and unless the requirements that I have mentioned are complied with, the approval will not be issued.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Any further supplementaries for the Minister? Miss Howells?

2.4.2 Miss I. Howells:

Of course, you have these things in place, but so much of Jersey still runs on oil, which is not a very environmentally friendly fuel, even when compared with things such as gas. Are there any ideas to move gas into a larger area of the Island than the very central St. Helier?

Deputy of St. Martin:

Members may be aware that the gas company recently changed hands. I have had very recent meetings with the chief officers of the gas company and they are very keen to expand their offering on the Island, so I can tell the Member that that is something which is available now that might not

have been in the past. There is a big move away from oil and when I talk about the energy requirements of houses, any new build has to go through this calculation. If you intend to build a house and you want to heat it by using oil, you will find it quite challenging, because the carbon emissions are taken into account in making the calculation for the energy performance certificate that I spoke of earlier. Therefore, while you may be still able to use oil, if you do, you will have to incorporate a large number of other efficiencies to combat the amount of carbon that would be coming from that oil boiler.

2.4.3 Mr. E. Wyatt:

Might it be possible to provide an incentive for people to use less energy and, in doing so, increase the amount of money flowing into the system to be spent on other things by having a non-linear taxing system on energy?

Deputy of St. Martin:

The Member puts forward a very interesting concept. Encouraging people to use less energy is something that we are trying to do. Whether we could do that financially is certainly a challenge, but if the Member looks at the fuels that we use in our homes, both oil and electricity, I think he will find that we are using less and less on an annual basis anyway. Therefore, I would say that the policies that we currently adopt in building by-laws and planning are starting to drive down energy consumption.

2.4.4 Mr. L. Davis:

You previously mentioned the options between a person's choice, or forcing people to take steps in new builds to ensure they are more environmentally friendly. I know there are laws in place, but do you believe that it is now time that we started improving legislation and having to force more people to make improvements that are more environmentally friendly? As we see with the extreme weather conditions that we have been having and the decrease in effects such as the albedo effect. If now is not the right time to start forcing people to be more environmentally friendly in their policies, when is the time right before it is too late? **[Approbation]**

Deputy of St. Martin:

A very deep and meaningful question, and it is not easy to come up with an answer at short notice. What I can say is that forcing people to do things in their own homes is something that we would consider very carefully before we did anything about it. At the moment, education is the way and I have just come back from a conference of environment ministers around the British Isles. We are all very aware that it is no longer good enough for the environment ministers of various governments to make a stand. They now need their treasury ministers, their health ministers, their education ministers to come alongside. They also need pressure to be exerted from commercial entities within places to help guide the energy providers to produce low-carbon energy. Members may be aware that in Jersey we are quite fortunate. We have a low-carbon energy supply with electricity. Ninety per cent of our electricity demand comes from France and of that 90 per cent, 30 per cent is hydro-nuclear. We are doing well but we can do better and I take the Member's view on board. However, I think we are still a little bit away from having to force people, literally force people by law, to use less energy.

Miss L. Rumbold:

Before, you said that things are being put in place for housing to do with renewable energy, but why not places like the new Finance Centre? Surely, because that is south-facing, so it is going to be able to generate more energy than a house. **[Approbation]**

Deputy of St. Martin:

Yes, in my original answer I did say non-residential developments such as the office blocks and the Finance Centre are required to offset their emissions by 10 per cent. I take the Member's view on board and certainly I have already said that in St. Helier I want to make much better use of roof

spaces. That could be for amenity space, green space where people can relax, but I think mainly of environmental benefits. We have a large number of roofs, a great many roofs in St. Helier, that could provide energy from sustainable sources. I am thinking mainly of photovoltaic.

Mr. L. Davis:

You brought up the dilemma between encouraging people to use more energy-efficient and carbon-efficient power for sources of electricity and heating and forcing them to implement it. Would implementation of tax on pollution be more effective than the current regulations on planning laws to encourage the reduction of carbon emissions and other pollutants?

Deputy of St. Martin:

I am very aware of the carbon emissions that we get from burning liquid fuels and internal combustion engines. In last year's budget, I did make an attempt to increase the level of vehicle emissions duty. Indeed, I see this as a great source of money that could be used within the Environment Department for other environmental schemes. However, I need to work harder on persuading the Treasury Minister that monies raised by vehicle emissions can be used for other energy schemes. Members will be aware that most taxes the Treasury like to take into general revenue, general taxation, so they can use it for where they see the priorities and they may not be in environmental subjects. I take the Member's views on board, the environment is increasingly becoming an important subject for everybody on the Island. I very much hope that in the future there will be more money available for all sorts of environmental schemes.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

The final supplementary to Miss Smyrk.

Miss B. Smyrk:

As we are an Island surrounded by water, could there not be more done to encourage the use of renewable energy in society such as the introduction of more turbines?

Deputy of St. Martin:

The Member is absolutely right that our tidal range around Jersey is quite exceptional and our wind resources are also commercially harvestable. However, she may not be aware that the tidal flow is not as great as it might be. Certainly, up in Alderney where we have the Alderney race and a great deal of water moving through a small area, there is tidal energy, but the energy from the tide around Jersey's coast is not as extensive as it might be. In the future, if we are going to look to our tide for sustainable and renewable power, we may need to look at lagoons. The tidal stream is not something that we would currently do at sea, although, of course, we know that the French are at the moment building a large wind farm to the south west of our Island. We also know that, if we were to do something along similar lines, the wind would be good enough to justify doing that.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

The next question will be asked by Miss Ammar of Hautlieu of Senator Ian Gorst, The Chief Minister, who is representing the Minister for Education. Miss Ammar.

2.5 Miss S. Ammar of The Chief Minister (representing the Minister for Education) regarding financial literacy education:

How is Jersey ensuring that young people receive an adequate education in financial literacy to prepare them for life?

Senator I.J. Gorst (The Chief Minister):

Perhaps I could offer the apology of the Education Minister, who is not able to be with us today. I will not read the question which has been provided. I am very mindful that virtually every other Member of this Assembly, apart from myself, will know the answer to this question more than I do.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Do we have any supplementary questions for the Chief Minister, who is Acting Minister for Education? Miss Howells?

2.5.1 Miss I. Howells:

The response is detailed and it does offer a lot of suggestions. You say you can opt for financial studies, but there is a real lack in literacy for the basic financial things, such as how to fill in a tax forms and other social security things [**Approbation**]. Are there any ways of improving education on stuff like that?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Inevitably on these occasions, one gets into trouble with the department. I could simply say that one should employ an accountant, in order to help fill in those tax forms. However, that is a far from satisfactory answer. As far as I am concerned, we have progress to make in this particular regard. Financial literacy is fundamentally important in helping prepare people for everyday life. While the answer outlines some of the policies currently in place and some of the experiences that those in school will currently encounter, the main element of financial literacy is delivered through choice. I understand that financial studies is the 3rd choice out of 22 choices. However, I think that that education should be part of the wider curriculum earlier than it currently is.

2.5.2 Mr. E. Wyatt:

As well as financial education, I feel that there is something of a need on the Island and in the world at large for a more political education in P.S.H.E. (Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education) lessons [**Approbation**]. For example, all that I know about politics I practically taught myself; there were no lessons for it in school so I am self-educated in all those areas. Although it worked for me, for others there might not be the will to do that and there might not be the means to do that.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

I have to say, in the States of Jersey, that question would be ruled out of order, because it is not a supplementary question of what was asked. The question is about financial literacy not about political literacy. However, because I said to you that I would be a little more lenient today and bit harder on the Ministers, I will allow the question. Chief Minister?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Sir, with regret and respect, I think you will find it outside of Standing Orders but, anyway, there we are. There is very little that I can say, other than to agree with the Member. I was at a recent event where a young person stood up and said that while she felt that there had been an education about politics, largely in the United Kingdom, there was very little about the political processes, the political machine, the governmental machine that we have here in Jersey. That is not good enough. I know that there have been improvements and great strides have been made in political education. However, as they say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating and if individuals are still coming through our system without a knowledge of how one gets elected to this place, for example, it is not good enough and we have to do better.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Would anyone like a final supplementary on the subject? No? OK, we will move on to question 6 which Mr. Bannister from Victoria College will ask Deputy Susan Pinel, Minister for Social Security. Mr. Bannister.

[14.15]

2.6 Mr. H. Bannister of The Minister for Social Security, regarding the sustainability of Jersey's Social Security fund:

Given Jersey's ageing population, can the social security fund be sustained without rising contributions?

Deputy S.J. Pinel of St. Clement (The Minister for Social Security):

First, I thank Mr. Bannister for his excellent question, which is very pertinent to current decision making. People are generally expected to live longer in the future and this brings both opportunities and challenges. One of the major challenges is how to sustain the social security fund, given that the cost of the social security pension will increase sharply in future in line with the number of people of pension age and how long they live. By 2035, a mere 17 years, our pension bill will have increased by over £90 million, with an extra 11,000 pensioners claiming a pension. A year and a half ago, I started the Social Security Fund Review, which aims to answer this question, as well as looking at modernising the scheme to match the way our society lives and works today. We have completed 2 online consultations and you can read the results online. The whole review will be finished next year, in time to fit into the States' next financial planning cycle. There are many options to make the fund remain sustainable. Increasing contributions is one option, but we are exploring increasing the social security pension age above 67, setting the value of the social security pension to increase by less each year, tightening the rules for who can claim benefits from the fund and reducing the range of benefits available from the fund. One important consideration is inter-generational fairness. How would these options affect different generations of people – current pensioners, current workers and young people starting employment in the future - paying contributions and becoming protected by the fund. We are reviewing these implications for these options and it will be up to the next government to decide which ones are chosen.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Are there are supplementary questions for the Minister for Social Security? You are not going to let her get away that easily, are you? Well it appears you are, so well done Minister; you are a model of clarity. Thank you. We will move on to the next question which Miss Parker of Hautlieu will ask of Senator Lyndon Farnham, Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, who is representing the Minister for Infrastructure, regarding the sale of Fort Regent. Miss Parker.

2.7 Miss T. Parker of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture regarding the sale of Fort Regent:

Has consideration been given to the sale of Fort Regent for private regeneration?

Senator L.J. Farnham (The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture):

In a word, no. However, it is clear that doing nothing is not an option. A range of options for the future of Fort Regent are being considered by the aptly named Fort Future Group. Selling one of Jersey's most treasured heritage assets is not one of them. Having said that, it does not mean that we are not prepared to work with the private sector in finding a really good solution for the Fort.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Anybody have any supplementary questions? Miss Parker?

Miss T. Parker:

First, when you mention the options are being considered, many people are wondering what exactly are the States going to do for Fort Regent to be better than it is now? I have read the article that was published in December 2017 stating that the plan to demolish the swimming pool and bridge that attaches it, costing the States £4.5 million, is approved to begin in late 2018. If the plans from the

proposals in 2014 in the Rediscovering Fort Regent: A Vision for the Future document are carried out, that should improve Fort Regent for both locals and tourists. However, Jersey already has a lot of construction plans for the future like the new Les Quennevais School and the new hospital. Can you reassure us that actions for Fort Regent will actually be taken this time, as so many new builds on such a small Island could make many practical issues?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The future of the Fort has been subject to political debate and wider discussion for a number of years. It is an important matter for the current and the next Assembly. The Fort is both an iconic and a historic building, which is a place of fond memories for many Islanders, especially those of my generation. The creation of the leisure centre in the 1970s was ground breaking and world leading in many ways. I think it is a source of embarrassment for the Assembly that we have not managed to do anything with it. That is simply down not so much to political indecision, but that the size of the task and cost is not very appetising for Members to deal with when we have so many other important issues to deal with, such as a new hospital and education and new schools. Having said that, it is definitely time to decide on the future of the Fort. I am a big supporter of the Fort and the department are leading the charge in coming up with some ideas for rejuvenation. I am pleased to say that we are about to launch an expressions of interest exercise which hopes to engage with the private sector so we can get some money and some investment, which I hope to be able to persuade the States in due course to match so we can do something with Fort Regent.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Any further supplementaries for the Minister? Mr. Marsh?

2.7.1 Mr. L. Marsh:

Given that the States has taken so long to consider taking action on Fort Regent, surely the Fort would be best left in the hands of the private sector, given that action will be taken almost immediately?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

That might well be the solution, but we are going have to offer the private sector some incentives to come and work with us there, because it is a big and expensive area to run. That is what I hope to be able to bring forward in the new Assembly, subject to being re-elected of course and my manifesto will soon be available online for Members.

Miss T. Parker:

If selling Fort Regent is not being considered, then would you consider allowing local entrepreneurs to use Fort Regent to grow their business ideas? Plans to build a trampoline park, made by an entrepreneur in 2016 received 95 per cent of the 3,000 participants voting for this proposition, so why did this not happen?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am not entirely sure is the honest answer. I would think that it is because the future is uncertain and businesses wanting to invest in it now will want some long term security of tenure. It is difficult to do that while we are planning the Fort's future.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Final supplementaries anybody? Mr. Davis.

2.7.2 Mr. L. Davis:

You previously mentioned the historical and heritage value of Fort Regent. I agree that Fort Regent does need to be regenerated and made more of a facility for the Island's population. Can you reassure the Assembly that the cultural richness and currently accessible historic parts, such as the ramparts around Fort Regent and, indeed, the signalling mast, which is run by Jersey Heritage at the moment,

will be maintained as a site of historical richness, so that young people and adults alike can access the heritage of our Island, even though it may be one of the more hidden sites?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Absolutely, yes. That is part of the unique attraction of Fort Regent, the fact that it is a Napoleonic Fort. How many towns or cities around the world would like to have a Napoleonic Fort in this day and age – of course, not back in Napoleonic times – looking over their capital and providing the opportunities that it does for us? We have wasted plenty of time, but I would like to reassure Members that the Fort will always retain a very important heritage aspect, whatever we do with it in the future.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. We now move on to the next question, which Mr. Evans-Rentsch will ask of, again, Senator Farnham, the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture about increasing diversification of industries.

2.8 Mr. J. Evans-Rentsch of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, regarding the sustainability of Jersey's Social Security fund:

How does the States intend to increase diversification of industries on the Island to support and sustain financial growth?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The States adopts a dual approach towards sustaining economic growth, supporting both the finance sector and other sectors, such as tourism, agriculture and hospitality, while at the same time seeking to develop key new sectors, such as the digital economy. In doing so, it balances the resources at its disposal to achieve an optimum mix of direct support, promotion and access to business advice in order to deliver the most appropriate levels of input designed to produce economic growth and diversity.

Mr. J. Evans-Rentsch:

Thank you very much for your response, Senator Farnham. I have researched into your Department's Tourism Development Funds Investment Strategy and have found a key point of it is to enhance distinctiveness and environmental quality. Additionally, I have researched into the States report on the quality of life through economic success in Jersey. This looks at establishing a framework for sustainably exploiting renewable energy. This discusses your targets on working with global experts to identify and exploit the potential for generating power from the Island's natural resources. In this, the States specifically talk about the economic development potential of a renewable energy industry in Jersey. However, it has come to my attention that the States rejected a pneumatic car manufacturer's proposition to base their work here, which could have been an excellent opportunity to invest into the environment. Therefore, in regard to this, how do you believe that the States can diversify and do more to invest into the renewable energy industry so that it not only promotes the Island's progression into an eco-centric society but becomes a leading sector for financial growth?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Jersey is uniquely positioned to be a world leader and a test market environment for economic projects such as the Member has mentioned, but first we are going to need political will, and we have been lacking in that, clearly, judging by decisions by previous Assemblies. But not all is bad news, because I feel that society is changing, I think Members' views are changing. The Environment Minister talked briefly about some opportunities that are ahead of us. Therefore, I do not see any reason why, with a bit of political will and lots of encouragement from the electorate, we cannot grasp this and start utilizing Jersey for some world firsts. I, for one, would like to see Jersey as the

first place in the world to have all electric cars. That is something that is achievable, so let us set our targets high and get some political will.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Any further supplementary from the Minister? Miss Howells.

2.8.1 Miss I. Howells:

Is it not increasingly important to diversify away from our financial sector which we rely on hugely as an Island in light of the Paradise Papers and increasing view on the financial sector in Islands such as Jersey and the EU grey listing of the Island? Is it not important?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

First, there is no such thing as an EU grey list. The Chief Minister is gesticulating at me, I think. Would you like to take that Chief Minister?

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

The question is for you, Minister.

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Unfortunately, one must not believe everything one sees and Panorama especially. However, there are issues and Jersey is at the forefront of openness when we are promoting ourselves as a centre for financial services. My ambition is to see Jersey develop, not just as an offshore finance centre of excellence, but as an offshore business centre of excellence. Some of the good work being done by Locate Jersey now, which we will touch upon in a later question, is that we are promoting ourselves to global businesses around the world who are perhaps looking for new global, or European, or international headquarters to come to Jersey and help up develop as a business centre of excellence.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

No other supplementary questions for the Minister? OK, we will move on to question 9, which Miss Keyworth of Hautlieu will ask of Senator Green, who is representing the Minister for Housing regarding houses for first-time buyers. Miss Keyworth.

2.9 Miss C. Keyworth of the Acting Minister for Housing regarding houses for first time buyers:

Thank you. What action, if any, is being taken to improve the access to and the availability of housing for the first-time buyers?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

Again, I will pick out the main points from the answer that Members have. The Minister for Housing gives her apologies today, but she has an important States appointment that she could not break. The Minister and, indeed, the whole of the States Assembly, wants everyone in Jersey to have a good standard and a secure home that they can afford. This includes both households that rent and those who want to own their own homes. To get to the question, in order to help first-time buyers Andium Homes, Jersey's largest affordable housing provider, is planning to offer more than 1,000 affordable homes for purchase between 2017 and 2025. All of these homes will be available to first-time buyers at prices lower than the equivalent property values in the market. I believe that the security of that in the future is that if they are sold at a reduced rate to keep them affordable then they must always remain affordable and not then be sold weeks later at unaffordable prices. I will leave it there and pick up any supplementaries.

[14.30]

Miss C. Keyworth:

You say the housing will be affordable but what is *affordable*? [Approbation]

Senator A.F.K. Green:

That is a very good question, and not one that is easy to answer. Homes to buy will always be unaffordable for some parts of our community, there is no doubt about that. For that reason, we need to have a vibrant and good social housing support and income support with rent for those who, perhaps, cannot even access Andium Homes. It does depend on salary, but we do know that young people, professional young couples particularly, struggle to get a deposit together. Even if we can hold the price of the home to something affordable, or something that young people can aspire to generally, it is the deposit that is the difficult thing. For that reason, the Minister is looking at bringing forward a scheme to assist with the deposit. We did that a few years ago in the recession as part of our fiscal stimulus to help young couples and 50 families were helped on that occasion. I know the Minister is keen to reintroduce something along those lines.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Are there any further supplementary questions for the acting Minister for Housing? Mr. Huelin?

2.9.1 Mr. L. Huelin:

Do you feel that 1,000 affordable homes is really enough to cover the next 8 years or so? [Approbation]

Senator A.F.K. Green:

In a word, no, but we know we have clear plans for the 1,000. There needs to be more work done on that. States sites that are not in use, or that the States no longer have use for, are other sites that could be added to the list that we have. I could read the list out; we have a list of 1,000 homes available on the sites that we know about, but we need to increase it.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Further supplementaries? Yes, Mr. Marsh?

2.9.2 Mr. L. Marsh:

Does Senator Green have any information as to the cost of these 1,000 homes to the States Treasury?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

I am afraid I do not have that. The very first question I was asked was: "What is affordable?" or words to that effect. It will always be unaffordable for some but it will be at a rate cheaper than the market rate. This has been done very successfully in the Parish of St. Martin and they did it by the purchasers buying 75 per cent of the home and the Parish holding onto 25 per cent equity, that way ensuring that those homes always remain affordable, so there are methods. We need to learn from other housing associations I might suggest, in the U.K. but I do not have a figure to hand. We would be guided by the statistics unit who show very clearly, in their statistics, the affordability of homes or otherwise for people, depending on their earnings.

Miss C. Keyworth:

What restrictions are going to be placed to prevent the first-time buyers, who are coming through the system, from selling these properties on later in life just to make profit for themselves rather than re-selling them to first-time buyers?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

The Member makes a really important point. It is something that has irritated me in the past when a home that is subsidised – I'll make the figure up – at a reduction of, say, 25 per cent of market rate appears on the market a year later at full market rate. That has to stop. With the privilege of getting a subsidised home comes responsibility. Nobody wants people to lose out, but they have also to

ensure that those homes remain affordable for ever. That is part of the deal. I know the Minister is looking with Law Officers at how that law would be constructed.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

OK we will take one more supplementary. No? OK, we will move on to question 10 which Mr. Le Conte will ask, again, of Senator Green representing the Minister for Housing, regarding the cost of States housing. Mr. Le Conte?

2.10 Mr. J. Le Conte of the Acting Minister for Housing, regarding the cost of States housing:

What is the cost to the States of social housing per unit for each person who can have a dwelling and/or the average family?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

The cost for individual dwellings and associated repair and maintenance costs are linked to factors such as the size, the location and the condition of the dwelling. Therefore, it has not been possible to provide an accurate figure as a cost per tenant. However, it is possible to provide information regarding the general financial position of social housing. Social housing is managed by a States- owned company called Andium Homes. The rents received are £46 million and that generates an operating surplus of £33.5 million, of which nearly £28 million is returned to the States. Therefore, Andium Homes tenants, as indeed any tenant in the private sector who qualifies, are entitled to claim Income Support to help if they cannot afford to pay the rent for themselves. Income Support paid £16.5 million last year.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you, any supplementary questions for the Minister on this subject? Mr. Marsh?

2.10.1 Mr. L. Marsh:

Senator Green, given the profitability and the fact that Andium Homes is running an operational surplus, what is the point of the States control over Andium Homes and what difference would it make to have it run privately?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

First, Andium was a Housing Department that became a stand-alone company owned by the States and that was done in order to give it more flexibility and make it more agile in terms of providing social housing. I believe that has been achieved. The purpose of the States continuing to own, if you like, the company is to ensure that we have good control over a strategic asset - but not only the strategic asset, because we can give direction to the company; if it were a private company we could not – and that we can give it direction in order that it meets Council of Ministers' and States' objectives.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Any supplementary questions for the Acting House Minister? No? OK, in that case we move on to question 11, which Miss Johnston of J.C.G. (Jersey College for Girls) will ask of the Minister for Health, this time, Senator Green, regarding the new hospital. Miss Johnston.

2.11 Miss Z. Johnston of the Minister for Health and Social Services, regarding the new hospital:

What is the States doing to expedite the construction of the new hospital and when, exactly, is the expected completion date?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

Working with my colleague, the Minister for Infrastructure, as it says in the answer, I am doing my utmost to move plans forward for our much needed hospital. Funding arrangements for the preferred scheme were approved by this Assembly in December 2017 and in January 2018, as Members will know, the planning inspector rejected the outline planning application, while supporting the proposed location for the future hospital. We intend to lodge, shortly, new plans that take into account the inspector's comments. We hope to have those plans lodged by the 9th of April and we will release those plans on the 12th of March for States Members to see. There is a lot more in the written answer, but I am sure that Members will have lots of supplementaries they wish to cover so I shall sit down.

2.11.1 Miss L. Pitcher:

I agree that the hospital needs to be constructed really fast, because it is over-stretched as it is. My mum works at the hospital and she tells me all the time how stressed everybody is and how there are not enough staff. At the same time, given that we voted to have the hospital in the existing position, what provisions do we have in place to ensure that the construction focuses on maintaining patient care, at the same time? A huge tractor making lots of noise downstairs is not going to benefit patients.

Senator A.F.K. Green:

The question comes right to the heart of the difficulty in finding the right site. Clearly, if we could have developed a greenfield site in, or very close to, town, then we could have got on with it while the hospital continued to function. The site where the hospital is has been selected by Members. It was no mistake, I might suggest, that, over 200 years ago, Mrs Bartlett chose that site. Today, 60 per cent of our staff live adjacent to the hospital. Something like 49 per cent of our patients and outpatients walk to the hospital. So, what we need to do is to construct the hospital in a way that provides a good hospital, clinically, but also ensures the least disruption for patients. If we had gone with the original plan of renovating the old hospital, there would have been a lot more disruption for patients than there will be under the scheme. I urge Members, if they have 5 minutes over the weekend, to walk down to the International Finance Centre. The work continues all through the weekend there and nobody would know that a big office block was being built. There is virtually no noise. It is our objective, with modern construction methods and modern methods of demolishing bits that we need to demolish, that patients are disrupted the least in order that we can give them that single room with an *en-suite*, so that they can be ill with dignity and they can die with dignity and they can discuss with dignity their wishes with their relatives. The Member is absolutely right: the method of construction is going to be really important, to ensure that we disrupt the patients the least. One more thing, although I know that I have gone on too long. When the site was developed next door, where the Chelsea Hotel was – I think that block of flats is called Spectrum – that is closer to the patients than the majority of our development and yet the hospital hardly knew it was happening.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Any other supplementary questions for the Minister? It is a very important and topical subject. Miss Roberts.

2.11.2 Miss F. Roberts:

Are there any plans to address the rising population, as in the current plans there is no increase in the number of beds that are going into the hospital?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

Again, right to the heart of the matter. The simple answer would be just to increase the number of beds and, contrary to public myth, we are putting in 40 to 50 new beds, extra beds to what we have in the current hospital. However, that would not be the answer on its own. That is why, with what we call P82, which was a proposition in 2015, I think, we are completely modernising the way that we approach treatment. The public tell us that they would rather be at home if it is safe to be at home

to be treated and looked after and one of my favourite examples of that is that it is not that long ago that if one had a hernia operation one would have gone into hospital for 10 days. Now one goes in at lunchtime and comes out in the evening or, perhaps, from breakfast time to lunchtime, when it is safe to do that. So, the way that we treat patients, the way that clinicians are changing their practice supports the new hospital with its 50 or so extra beds.

2.11.3 Miss M. McLaughlin:

As was said before, yes the hospital needs to be completed as fast as possible, but will steps be taken to ensure that the new hospital has on-site low-carbon, or renewable, technologies?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

The quick answer to that is yes. We are going to heat it completely by electricity, but heating it is one thing, hot water is another. However, the way it is insulated and whether we can produce some of our own sustainable energy are also details that need to be worked through, but it will be as carbon-neutral that we can get it – if nothing else to save your taxpayers' money when you come to pay to run the hospital.

2.11.4 Miss J. Cullen:

You mentioned trying to squeeze 40 to 50 new beds into the current hospital. Does it have the capacity for that? Are the current patients going to be more uncomfortable squeezed together?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

First, I must correct a myth: we are not doing anything to the current hospital. We are building a new hospital alongside the current hospital. We are not squeezing it in; we are putting in individual rooms with toilets *en-suite* rather than, as at present, 6 patients in a room. Not to put too fine a point on it, that is not very dignified. When a patient is being given very bad news, everybody else in the room can hear it or, to make it even more basic, when a patient who has had a stomach operation is sitting on the commode, everybody in the room can hear it. That is not dignified, that is not acceptable in today's world. We are building a new hospital, not renovating the old one; a new hospital on part of the current site. That is very different from squeezing into the old hospital.

Miss Z. Johnston:

Do you feel that it is fair to say that a vast amount of money and time has been wasted on discussing and disagreeing of the building of the new hospital [Approbation] and what will be done in future planning for future projects to prevent this?

Senator A.F.K. Green:

Answering the last part of the question first, the new Chief Executive has plans to ensure that major projects are co-ordinated from the centre, so that should help to move things forward. When we compare the nearly £27.5 million, I think, that have been spent on a project of this size, compare it and benchmark it against similar schemes in the U.K., we benchmark very well. That is not to say that we could not have done it a little bit cheaper.

[14:45]

However, a considerable amount of that money has been spent in keeping the current hospital safe while the work is going on. It is difficult for people to understand that the delay has been in getting some of those permissions in place. The project has not been delayed. We are still on target to deliver a new hospital in 2026.

2.11.5 Miss L. Peters:

So many patients from Jersey have to go to the U.K. to get treatment. Surely, with a new hospital, there will be room for more specialist care and clinics. Will that be happening in the new plans for the hospital? [Approbation]

Senator A.F.K. Green:

A typical politician's answer: yes and no. However, I will explain. Yes, with new theatres and new facilities we will be able to either do more ourselves, or attract visiting surgeons to come, when it is safe to do so. That must always be the criterion: when it is safe to do so, get visiting surgeons to come over and do a number of patients with one condition, if we have the right facilities. For example and I do not know whether the Member was thinking about this, radiotherapy is something that we will not be providing. There are 2 reasons for that. First, we do not think that we will have sufficient numbers to attract the expertise and secondly it is believed that technology is changing so much that radiotherapy may not even exist in 10 years' time.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

I can take one final supplementary.

2.11.6 Miss S. Ammar:

Shortage of staff is a real problem, as mentioned before. How do you plan to encourage people from outside of Jersey who have expertise to come and work here in the new hospital?

Senator A.K.F. Green:

So, again, right to the hub of the matter of recruitment. It is difficult. Once people get here, they like it and they tend to stay, but we have to have packages that are attractive for them. So, good key worker accommodation is one issue; something that we do not have at present. It is also about affordable homes for key workers, which we were talking about earlier. The fact that, until recently, when the Minister changed it, there was no absolute right for children of couples coming over to work for us to gain their right to work. There will be now. The Minister has changed that. So, it is about putting the whole package together. It is a good place to work, but we have to make ourselves more attractive than the United Kingdom. In terms of improving our recruitment, we have found that if we just turn up at a recruitment fair, then we do not do any better than anyone else who just turns up. However, using social media, telling people we are going to be there: "This is the package that is available. Come and work for us. We are not part of the NHS. We have our challenges, but you will not have the difficulties that you saw last winter in the NHS. Why not come and see us at X Hotel? We will be there for the next 2 days." That has made a huge difference in our recruitment success, so you are right: recruitment of valuable staff, skilled staff is really important, so it is the whole package.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. We are moving on to the final question in Questions with Notice, which will be asked by Miss Walker of the Jersey College for Girls of Senator Lyndon Farnham, Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, regarding the benefits of high net worth residents in Jersey. Miss Walker.

2.12 Miss S. Walker of the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, regarding the benefits of high net worth residents in Jersey:

Thank you. What are the benefits of encouraging high net worth individuals to live in Jersey, and how are those benefits measured?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The States of Jersey has tasked Locate Jersey, a part of my department, with attracting businesses and high net worth families to Jersey. In terms of financial benefit, annual personal tax contributions by these high value residents were a minimum of £100,000 each year for those moving here between 2005 and 2012, £125,000 per annum for those moving here between 2013 and 2017 and £145,000 per year for those approved from the 1st of January 2018. In addition, annual stamp duty on

properties bought in by high-value residents is approximately £4.6 million in 2017 and, to give Members some idea, that relates to just under £100 million-worth of property bought in 2017 by these residents. These high-value residents also form a valuable part of our community in many other ways, by giving very generously to charities and projects and other worthwhile causes. Many give their time and considerable expertise freely on boards and trusts and other important organisations that benefit our small Island community greatly.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Any supplementary questions for the Minister? Are you sure? Last opportunity. In that case, that completes Questions with Notice.

3. Questions to Ministers without Notice – The Chief Minister

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

We now move on to 15 minutes, approximately, of Questions without Notice to the Chief Minister. Who would like to ask the first question? Mr. Marsh.

3.1 Mr L. Marsh:

Given you are responsible for bringing in cabinet collective responsibility, do you not believe this overrides the democratic mandate of the elected Members of this House to carry out their own wishes?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

No, I do not, but I do believe that it did not work as was intended when it was introduced at the start of this electoral term, which is why, last Tuesday, I asked the States to remove it. They agreed to remove it and the next Council of Ministers will have to agree, when they are formed, when they are elected by the Assembly, how they are going to work together.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Would anybody else like to ask a question of the Chief Minister? Miss Rumbold.

3.2 Miss L. Rumbold:

What actions can be taken to increase the choice of schools that children with disabilities, or learning difficulties, can attend as, at the moment, the choice of schools for these children is limited? The disability strategy for Jersey, which was brought out in May 2017 by the States, included many action plans that have short-term or medium-term time frames, but what sort of time frame is this? Does short term mean a few months, a few years or -?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am extremely grateful to Senator Routier and all the work that he has done in campaigning for disabilities, not only in the public domain, but in the Assembly. I tasked him with bringing forward this disability strategy. He worked with all voluntary organisations and all sectors of the States that have an interest and I am equally delighted that the Minister for Social Security, again at the last States sitting, received approval for the disability and discrimination changes. Those changes will not take effect in the broader community until September, I think it is, because we need to give employers time to change their premises. I do not have the strategy in front of me, so I cannot give any more detail with regard to short and longer-term implementation, but it really does have to continue to be a priority for the next government, as it has been for this government.

3.3 Miss Z. Johnston:

Given that we clearly still live in a patriarchal society in Jersey and lots of us here are young, intelligent females, who have ambitions to work and live here in future, what are you, as a male in

power, rightfully going to do to ensure that women can successfully be supported in working and having a family, as it is proven that, sadly, of these, one is often at the expense of the other?
[Approbation]

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I see that, only this afternoon, the Foreign Secretary in the House of Commons has got into quite a bit of hot water for the way that he has referred to the Shadow Foreign Secretary. I hope that I have not, during my time in the Assembly, made such comments. Coming from my generation, I have, throughout my working life, known bosses, directors, partners of both sexes and I have no problem whatsoever with anyone of any sex being a leader, whether in the work place or in the community. There are some first-class Members of the States Assembly who are female and male and the approach in the States Assembly is much more equal than it has ever been. I was invited by Deputy Doublet to join an equality forum, which is ably supported by the Greffe and we are, in that forum, particularly at the moment, encouraging female members of our community to stand for election, because until we have fairer representation in the States Assembly, which makes the laws of this Island, we will continue to have those difficulties. I am fully supportive. You may know that we have an election in May of this year. We will have a new States Assembly. I hope that we will have greater representation of females in that States Assembly and I hope that the next Council of Ministers will also have greater female representation. However, it is not something that I can do alone, simply because of who I am, as a male in our community. It is something that we must do together.

3.4 Miss L. Peters:

University is an aspiration for, probably, a lot of us in this room. Obviously, the proposal of the grant system has brought a lot of hope for us all. What do you think is the likelihood of the passing of this grant proposal and will there be future conditions to the grants? What do you think of it?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I think it was the British Foreign Secretary who once, when challenged, said that if such and such a thing did not happen, he would eat his hat. I am going to be so bold this afternoon as to say that if the States Assembly, on the 9th or 10th of April, does not pass the new proposals for higher education funding, I will eat my hat. I cannot envisage a situation in which there is unity across Members of the States Assembly that more should have been done earlier. Sir, I see from the look on your face that you might be voting against it, simply to see that comedy routine. I cannot envisage any scenario in which States Members will not vote for those new proposals. I said before a Scrutiny Panel yesterday that it may be, in future, that States Members want to bring refinements and improvements to those proposals in due course, but I will be shocked – but, most of all, I will be disappointed – if States Members think that it is not the right proposal to ensure that as many young people who want to, regardless of relative means, are able to leave our Island and go to university. Rather, we should be challenged to provide more money for equality of those who wish to study for higher education while remaining here.

3.5 Mr L. Davis:

With the current climate of fluidity of migration globally, many Islanders seem to think that the culture and specific history of Jersey is being lost. What can the States of Jersey do to ensure that local history and local culture is both taught in schools and enhanced in the wider community, and could the parish system in the Island have an input in this?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

There were many questions there. Of course, some of them are very much interlinked. When I meet my colleagues from other Island communities similar to ours – and I met one yesterday visiting our Island – rather than being concerned about population growth, they are concerned and worried about population decline, because that reduces the number of jobs for Islanders, it means that people move away, it reduces the viability of schools, it reduces viability of transport, so we need to be careful

about always being negative about inward migration, because the challenges for the future are about the effect of technology on jobs and what effect that will have on migration. So, there are a whole host of other challenges there. Of course, at the same time, we want all those who come to our Island community to respect and to celebrate what is unique about Jersey and our culture and our history.

[15:00]

We were talking, as States Members, only this morning about culture, about what we have to offer the world and how, when I travel the world, it is those issues of history, of culture, of our constitutional relationship, of the Jersey cow and all of those good things that people want to hear about and are impressed with. And our education system has an important role - as all of us, as Islanders, do - in maintaining our systems, which are unique. I think you hit on a point about the parochial system. Parochial systems are not just dry institutions. They are vital and we need to make sure that they are lively and that we can ensure that they are as relevant in future as they have been in the past. One of the things that we want to do in the States, is work much more closely with the Constables and with the parishes, simply to make sure that those connected with a parish know what is available for them in the States and how we can support them and how we can work together, because it is what is good about Jersey, it is what is unique about Jersey. However, as with any institution, if it wants to continue to be relevant, it must reform and make itself relevant to the community that it serves.

3.6 Miss L. McGarragle:

Following the Salisbury incident a few weeks ago, the U.K. Government has decided to reconsider the Magnitsky Act, which, as we all know, will freeze the assets of Russians who wish to withdraw their money from the U.K. Will this include the Jersey economy and, if so, how will it affect us?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Of course we enjoy a high degree of independence. We are autonomous on fiscal and domestic matters. This falls into that autonomy, so any Act of Parliament in the United Kingdom would not automatically affect us, nor be applied to us, but I have already said that we are working closely with the United Kingdom in their response to this act of terror and we will continue to liaise closely with them. First of all, we have seen the expulsion of Russian diplomats from London, we have seen the tit for tat that normally takes place and now we are seeing a far wider global removal of Russian diplomats from embassies around the globe. We continue to liaise with the U.K. to see what their next steps will be and our regulator, also, is carrying out further due diligence work, just updating some of its records about those organisations here and firms in Jersey that do have Russian assets, or money, that they manage and look after here. They have already met all of the anti-money-laundering requirements, all of the due diligence requirements, so we do not need to be concerned in that regard, but they are refreshing that and they are carrying out further work in that regard.

3.7 Miss I. Howells:

Does the Chief Minister know of any plans to re-work the tax system between married couples on the Island, because surely, to any reasonable person, that a wife should be taxed at the same rate as her husband, regardless of her faith, is entirely archaic in our current society? **[Approbation]**

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I get criticised for being a reformer. I think that in true conservative - with a small C - tradition, as I just said some moments ago about the parish system, if our institutions, particularly our governmental and political institutions, are to remain relevant today and into the future, they need to reform. So, the Member has just hit on something that, in a modern society, has no defence and no explanation. How can it be that one's wife, in this instance, can continue to be accounted for by the taxes office, in effect, feudally, as a chattel? It is wrong. It has to change. The taxes office is working on making those changes and I hope that early in the course of the next government they will be able to bring those changes forward. However, of course, there will be a cost to it and that cost needs to be

quantified, because we will need to spread out the various allowances that will need to be given. We now have a gentleman running the taxes office, who oversaw similar changes in the United Kingdom, so they know what they are talking about, they know what is required, but they need to quantify the cost before it is brought forward, but it absolutely has to be brought forward.

3.8 Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:

Are any initiatives being taken to bounce back and re-attempt creating possibilities for film and television projects in Jersey, following a failed attempt several years ago with regard to a written-off £200,000 investment to Canbedone Productions?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Sir, earlier there was a question that should have been directed at me about financial services and now it seems –

Senator L.J. Farnham:

Point of order, Sir, the Chief Minister is trying to [overspeaking] from the question.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

It should have been directed at Senator Farnham, so I will give way if he wishes for me to.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Do you want to make a point of order, Senator?

Senator L.J. Farnham:

The Chief Minister has started, so he can finish, Sir.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Chief Minister, please carry on.

Senator I.J. Gorst:

Fingers and burns spring to mind, if I am honest, in answering this question. The benefit of hindsight is always extremely useful. We have learned a lot about what due diligence should be undertaken before somebody simply comes knocking on the door saying they have a bright idea. We have also learned, of course, further with other projects. Are we going to look at that again? I think that anyone who had an appropriate idea with the appropriate due diligence would look on it favourably. We know now that in Senator Farnham's department they have – perhaps I should say this carefully – they have pots of money that they can use for these sorts of things, but in a positive way, because if they want to stimulate diversification, if they want to stimulate people coming to our community, if they want to stimulate tourism as well, we know that basing films here, is a good way of doing that. However, by goodness me, you have to know what you are talking about, you have to know what you are doing and probably the first port of call is when somebody comes touting round with a book that might be made into a film. It would be a good idea to get somebody to read that book and get a bit of expert advice as to whether it is any good.

3.9 Miss S. Ammar:

In relation to higher education, are there any plans to build a university campus in Jersey, so that people wishing to study things, other than finance, can be encouraged to stay and work in Jersey? [Approbation]

Senator I.J. Gorst:

The University Centre at Highlands is working to extend its syllabus. Other work is also ongoing to create stronger links with stronger institutions elsewhere in the United Kingdom, if I might put it like that. Of course, there is intrinsic value in higher education, in having a degree, but I still do think

that what we want is the best quality degree courses from the best quality institutions and that is why that work is ongoing, so that we can broaden the availability of courses, people can make a proper choice between where they are going to study for the degree that they want and the quality of the institution where they get that degree and there is an equality of funding available to match it. My desire is not just that Islanders should be able to study the highest quality degrees on-Island, but also that we can attract students from other places around the globe to come and study here. We have a fantastic environment, we have a safe environment and I think that we can be marketing ourselves in that regard as well. However, it is all about the quality of degrees and institutions and the range of syllabus.

3.10 Miss F. Roberts:

The unique beauty of our Island is a huge factor in attracting tourists and for people to live on the Island. Therefore, why do we not have an interior bus route, which can take people from town to the east, then cross into the west?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

It has always amazed me that you can go wherever you like on this Island, so long as you start and finish in St. Helier. My experience is that only during the working week do I ever want to start and finish in St. Helier, so that is why the bus route is configured in the way that is currently is. Liberty Bus has, without a doubt, enhanced the bus service that we enjoy in our community and it is a balance, again, about routes, about timing of routes, about cost and about subsidy. I am pretty sure that if the Economic Development Department came forward with proposals and perhaps some support funding for other routes – of course, we used to have the circular route as well during certain parts of the year – that would be looked upon favourably. However, it is about subsidy and it is about costs and our major routes are in and out of town and that is why it is configured in the way that it is.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

We have stretched the 15 minutes somewhat, so we will take one more question for the Chief Minister.

3.11 Miss E. Bridson:

In light of the very pertinent question on higher education at the moment and the want for the best quality education away from Jersey, what is Jersey doing to work with other offshore Crown dependencies to get home fees for the best quality institutions in the U.K., such as Cambridge and Imperial College, London?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

For the first time in a long time, despite all the work that has been undertaken by the Education Department and the External Relations Department and *alumni* from those institutions that prominent positions in our community, there is now a possibility – because we have started talking about this with the United Kingdom Government – that in light of Brexit there might be some possibilities of us getting breakthroughs in this area. What I would say, however, is if you want to apply to either of those excellent institutions, do not cross your fingers at this point. There is still a lot of work to do. We know now that Brexit issues will probably be ongoing until the end of 2020, so any clarification and any change is going to take all of that time and is not going to pop out of the end, as it were, until after that process is complete.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

I did say that that would be the last question, but I have seen Miss Parker's light and, obviously, there is something very important that she needs to ask.

3.12 Miss T. Parker:

There is currently only one public school with a sixth form centre and that has entry requirements, as well. Do you not agree that the new Les Quennevais School should include a new sixth form centre to provide for those people in other public schools? **[Approbation]**

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am pleased that we are joined by so many Members from the west of the Island. I look across the water to my friends and good colleagues in Guernsey and any desire I think that I, or any other politician might have had, to transform and change the education system, is stopped dead in its tracks. The reality is that we need to have a broader debate and conversation with Islanders about the total sixth form provision. Whether you are going to see that in manifestos of Members standing for election in March of this year, I am far from certain, because of the – I am not sure whether crisis is the right word, but the great difficulty that they have found themselves in in Guernsey. We do need to start that conversation, because what we should be aiming for is not only quality in sixth form provision, but also a breadth of opportunity and subjects, which currently, if we are absolutely honest with each other, excellent sixth forms as we have, we are letting young people down, because there is not the breadth of curriculum that there is elsewhere in the world and that we really want for young people into the future. It is an easy question, but there is no easy answer to it. However, it is going to require all of us – again, perhaps some Members of this Assembly – to start talking about those issues and breaking out of the old traditional approach that we cannot change what we are doing because it worked well, because I went and I enjoyed my time at that sixth form and somebody else went and they enjoyed their time at the sixth form.

[15:15]

The world is changing; transforming right before our very eyes and the ability to train Islanders, the ability to teach Islanders, the ability to give Islanders the very best of education is one of our greatest differentiating factors and we cannot take it for granted.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

I would like this question time to go on all afternoon, because it is interesting and fascinating. Miss Johnson, you did hear me say 2 questions ago that would be the last one. Can you make it very quick and, Chief Minister, would you make your answer very quick, please?

3.13 Miss Z. Johnston:

What is your opinion on male and female having equal maternity leave rights?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I am being glared at by the Minister for Social Security. I had to leave the Assembly early last week, so I am not sure, but I think she was successful in getting her amendment through, which is along those lines. It goes to the heart of the Member's earlier question about equality. We know that attachment to parents, be that one parent, or 2, is absolutely, critically, important to children's wellbeing. It is critically important to the growth of their brains, let alone anything else and those children, who have not attached, have smaller brains and society picks that up in the long term. So, I am greatly in favour of equality of provision, but it is not just about maternity and parental leave, it is also about adoption leave, it is also about foster caring leave as well. These are fundamental issues to our future wellbeing and the future wellbeing of our children and young people and we have to get away, again, from the old way of doing things, because there is a better way and the Minister for Social Security is committed to it. I am pleased to hear across the floor of this Assembly that she was successful in that proposition, but now we have to do far more work because, ultimately, what is the good of an in-principle decision to enable individuals to take that leave if they cannot afford it? That is the next order of questions that we need to deal with.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you, Chief Minister. That brings question time to an end. On behalf of Members of the Jersey Youth Assembly, could I thank the Chief Minister and his colleagues from the Council of Ministers for joining us this afternoon? All Ministers are very busy people, but they are also very keen to learn and understand your concerns and the issues that you consider to be important and they can have been left in no doubt about what you think after the excellent question time that we have had this afternoon. Can we show our appreciation to the Chief Minister and Ministers in the usual way? **[Approbation]**

Senator L.J. Farnham:

I wonder whether it is in order, on behalf of Ministers, also to thank Members of the Youth Assembly for their excellent questions and very testing supplementaries and for the research that went into them? It leaves some of us in the shade on a regular Tuesday, the work that they have done. They are our future. I wish them well and I hope to see some of them here by their own means in future. Thank you.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

4. Whether a licence should be required to have a child in the U.K. and Jersey

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you, Minister. We now go on to Public Business and the first item is a proposition by the Jersey College for Girls on Parenting Licences and I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Greffier of the States:

The Assembly is asked for its opinion that a licence should be required to have a child in the U.K. and Jersey.

4.1 Miss G. Magalhaes:

Friday, 23rd March 2018, hundreds of Britons arrested for child abuse but figures could be far higher. 12th March 2018, up to 1,000 children may have been victims in the U.K.'s worst abuse ring; Thursday, 1st March 2018, U.K. Government failed to protect over 4,000 children from sexual abuse over the last decade. These figures have been pulled from newspaper clippings over the past month. Statistics that shout for change to be instigated in our home front, scaling from smaller incidents to numbers as large as 4,000; the sheer quantities of lives impacted by child abuse are clearly unimaginable. It is undeniable that the U.K. is faced with many children placed at a disadvantage at the hands of what are supposed to be their closest allies: their family, their parents. Parenting can have an immediate negative effect on children, as well as effects far into the future. Within our current framework, anyone can become a parent. Considering the potential harm to all involved, regulating it with a licensing programme may not be so eccentric. Parenting, in itself, requires a minimum standard of competence. Those who have worked with children, or have their own, will stand firm in the knowledge that raising a child harbours a plethora of responsibilities. At a basic level this extends to feeding, bathing, caring for a child who falls ill, financing, clothing and the like. Taking care of another human life is no easy task. It reaches beyond the financial and to the virtuous. Parents who cannot comply and fail to provide for the basic needs of a child, its basic human rights, cannot be considered to have reached a minimum standard of competence. If parents cannot attain the basics, how can they be expected to build upon those foundations? How can they be expected to ensure that a child can lead a fulfilling life of its own? The licensing system is crucial in determining which participants are capable of caring for a child and, more specifically, which candidates are likely to be abusive and neglectful. The test has the potential to alleviate concerns and secure children who would otherwise face threats that they unequipped to combat. This method would be carried out in a manner that would be fair and provide equal opportunity for all parents and their potential children alike. It is arguable that this would be difficult to implement, but the truth is that we already face

examinations for a variety of elements in our lives. Driving, for instance, requires a licence and proof that the candidate can be trusted on the roads. A parenting licence would be implemented in a similar manner. If a candidate, who had acquired the licence, were to stray from the legal requirements, it could be revoked. That would effectively prevent, potentially, unnecessary suffering. While one cannot provide statistics that directly corroborate the parenting licence, it cannot be dismissed; this method would correlate well with an effective already-implemented system: adoption. The positive analogy in this area demonstrates the potential benefits of the licensing system. When comparing adoption statistics and laws with the current state of biological parenting, the hard facts become visible that prove that the licence would improve the lives of children, who would otherwise face grievous harm. By extension, this motion is beneficial further afield. In a world vulnerable to over-population, reducing the number of children would, even on a small scale, reduce our impact on the environment. One less child would save an estimated 9,441 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions. If that is not enough to convince you, I ask you to consider the impact on the economy. While this policy would have potential implementation costs, it would save an estimated £101 billion in benefits alone. These arguments, combined with the capacity that licensing, in itself, would have to prevent harm are morally indisputable. Above all, this House believes that it should be necessary to obtain a licence to have a child within the U.K. and Jersey. **[Approbation]**

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Is the proposition seconded?

[Seconded]

4.1.1 Miss E. Parris:

As previously mentioned, we also believe that in order to have a child a parent must be able to provide for its basic human rights. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Human Child states that children should be able to survive, grow, participate and fulfil their potential and sets standards for education, health care and social services, as well as laws to protect them. Therefore, before a child is brought into this world, potential parents must be vetted to ensure that they are able to provide these. However, it can be suggested that many children in the U.K. and Jersey do not possess them, as 390,000 seek help from a child service in England, with over 50,000 children needing protection from abuse. In Jersey, there are around 100 children living in a children's home and almost 30 per cent of Jersey families have to seek help to afford to pay for their children's living expenses. In order to adopt, there are basic requirements that must be fulfilled. According to the gov.uk website, in order to adopt, one must 1) go to a series of preparation classes; 2) arrange for a social worker to visit on several occasions to carry out an assessment to check that one is suitable to become an adoptive parent; 3) arrange a police check - applicants will not be allowed to adopt if they, or an adult member of their family, have been convicted of a serious offence, for example one against a child; 4) provide 3 referees who will provide personal references; and 5) arrange to have a full medical examination. We believe that those requirements must also be fulfilled by potential birth parents. From an economic perspective, if a licence were implemented, many benefits and child-care claims would not occur, saving millions of pounds in government spending. That would allow the government to allocate funding to other areas of need. Over all, we believe that, as one requires a licence to have a dog, to drive a car and to own a gun, why should we not have a licence to ensure that we are capable of caring for a child? **[Approbation]**

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

The proposition is proposed and seconded. It is now open for debate. Would anybody like to speak?

4.1.2 Miss T. Parker:

Traits of a good parent cannot be confined to requirements for a licence. There is no test that can evaluate the love that a parent will give to a child once it is born. Having a child is not like taking a driving test and there is no pass or fail; simply, a parent's maternal instinct should allow her to care

for her own child and I do not think that this can be judged by anyone but her. Do you not agree? **[Approbation]**

4.1.3 Miss I. Howells:

I disagree with the licence itself, but more support is definitely always a good thing in things like relationships and child raising. This links back to mental health, which we were talking about earlier. However, I feel that the licence is similar to the social work that is already in place on the Island to deal with this kind of issue and it will have the same faults in that it is said that a licence can be revoked but, clearly, those issues remain and we need to know that they exist. In Jersey, the more important issue is being more aware of what does go on in our Island. Also – talking about having the money to raise a child – I agree that a certain amount is needed in order to raise a child successfully. However, by making money a limiting factor on the licence, we would be restricting the population by basing something as integral as parenting on earnings. I think that that is a ridiculous concept. Why should one not be allowed to have a child, just because one does not have a well-paid job? **[Approbation]**

4.1.4 Miss S. Gomes:

In the U.K. there are people with many varieties of ethnic and religious roots. A good parent to one group may not, necessarily, be a good parent to another. How would they conform to all the different guidelines, if they did not fit in to just one category?

4.1.5 Miss F. Roberts:

Should the government be able to dictate women's fertility and how would this be morally and ethically acceptable? **[Approbation]**

4.1.6 Miss J. Cullen:

It is undemocratic and unconstitutional. What about unplanned children? The parents may not be in a position to provide for their child at that time and, taking the parenting test, they may not be ready. However, people in that situation have to sort out their finances and their situation and become prepared to be parents. What would happen if they did not get the licence? Would the baby be taken away from them? Would they be forced to have an abortion? What would happen to the mothers who were not allowed to obtain a licence but were already pregnant? **[Approbation]**

4.1.7 Miss C. Keyworth:

Is it proposed that if it is against one's religion to use contraception, one should abstain from sex if one has not received a licence?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Could I ask Members, who have already spoken, to turn off their microphones, please? Thank you.

4.1.8 Miss L. Peters:

This licence has been likened to that for a gun, or a car, but those licences can be lost and the consequences are not that great, one can have one's gun taken away, one can have a driving ban. However, with this licence, if a parent has a child and it has to be taken away, we are then left with a child with no parents. What will happen when the licence is taken away? **[Approbation]**

4.1.9 Miss B. Smyrk:

If child protection services take a child at birth, will the parents have an opportunity to improve and get their child back later?

4.1.10 Mr B. Ogilvie:

First, would this not infringe people's human rights to decide what they do with their bodies and, secondly, is it not possible that the system would deprive potential children of a good family in cases such as that of a murderer being reformed and meeting all the financial requirements?

4.1.11 Miss L. McGarragle:

Despite the fact that many speakers have argued that our proposition goes against human rights, we have to think of the human rights of the child. Every person, who comes into the world, deserves food, water, education and a home. Those who disagree with the licence are stating that we lucky ones, sitting here in the room, are the only ones who deserve those things and those who are born to unfortunate families do not.

[15:30]

Yet the 'unlucky family' status would not exist under our policy, because everyone would be able to get these basic necessities. I am sure that you can agree that domestic abuse is taken up through the influence and teachings of parents. Harsh as it may seem, like learning to walk, drive a car, read or write, parents and other older influences inflict and teach these traits. It must be noted that domestic abuse is one of the things that has been passed down through generations and we need to break the cycle. If the licence were to be implemented, the biggest issue it would tackle, by far, is the lack of care and safety that over 130,000 children face in the U.K. today. On my point about monkey see, monkey do, children who witness the abusive actions by their parents grow to do the same thing. The U.K. Government spent £246 billion on welfare alone last year, 18 per cent of that on family benefits, income support and tax credits. The new licence would ensure a definite decrease in government spending and we could use the money to improve the quality of the lives that are with us today. As to Miss Howells' point, we agree that we have social services concentrating on different parts of our society. However, we believe that the licence would make it possible for their policies to be more stringent.

4.1.12 Miss E. Bridson:

Many have questioned and argued how we would implement the system. In response to Miss Howells' comment about having sufficient funds and less wealthy families not necessarily being allowed a licence, we are aware of this as a concern. However, we are basing the licence on a minimum standard of competence. So, rather than discriminating on the basis of a maximum ideal of how wealthy a family should be, we are basing this on a minimum standard that someone should achieve to be a parent, rather than a maximum ideal of where they should be. In response to Miss Smyrk, if someone has a child accidentally, or cheats the system, the process that we have decided on is that the prospective parents should be asked to attempt to pass all the tests before the baby is born. If they fail, that child is taken away at birth until the parents are able to pass the licensing test. Removing the child provides incentive for obtaining a licence and does not add financial stress to the parents, allowing them to work harder and save to pass the test, without struggling to care for a child at the same time. Once they are able to have the child returned to them, they are closely monitored for up to 3 years and work in tandem with States representatives to ensure that they provide a stable home for their child. If there is evidence to prove that they are incapable of providing that child with sufficient care, the child is removed from the family and put back into care until a foster parent can be found, or it can be returned to the natural family.

4.1.13 Mr E. Wyatt:

Regardless of any subjective ethical, or moral, considerations, I would like to put forward some statistics on the matter. For example, a study was conducted in 2001 by Stephen Levitt and John Donoghue on the link between crime rates and unwanted, unwilling or unable parenting. They found that after abortion was legalised in various States in America, crime rates dropped significantly among the children in the generation for which abortion was available.

4.1.14 Mr I. Pike:

In response to Miss Keyworth's comment and various others about religion, we completely understand the point, but would like to suggest some counterpoints. First, the world is struggling with overpopulation. Do you not think that as people with dominion over creation, as it says in Genesis, we have a responsibility to take action? Furthermore, as my colleague said, do you not believe that these children, who have not yet been created, deserve us to think about the rights that they may have, or may not have? Of course, religion is a subjective and completely personal thing, but there are threads running through the main schools of thought and religion that are reflected within the U.N.C.R.C., the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Children. Christianity: do not provoke your children; love thy neighbour; look not only to your own interests, but the interests of others. Hinduism: multiple ceremonies on the sanctity, mental and physical health of the parents and the child. Buddhism: the heart is like a garden; it can grow compassion or fear, resentment or love. However, if the examples from these different religions do not persuade you, I ask you to think of the rights of these future children. There are 52 rights, which mirror these religious examples. For example, according to the fourth Article, the government has a responsibility to make sure your rights are protected and they must keep your family well to protect these rights; to the fifth Article, your family has the responsibility to help you learn your rights and to ensure that they are protected; and to Article 27, you have the right to food, clothing and a safe place to live and you have basic needs that should be met. We believe that if these rights cannot be met, then these parents are not fit to have that child.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Can I just remind Members that the rules of debate mean that each person can speak only once in each debate. Could anyone with their light on, who has already spoken in this debate, turn it off, because I shall not call them again.

4.1.15 Mr. L. Davis:

Who is going to decide the criteria, how do you create criteria and does this not begin to propose some form of child elitism? To my knowledge, the threat of selective breeding in humans in Jersey was taken away from us on 9th May 1945. We have a natural freedom to give birth and it is the right of the human construct of society to ensure that the life of a human being, who has been brought into the world, is prosperous and fulfilled. That can be achieved through education. This is a hard debate for an Assembly such as ours. To my knowledge, the majority of those in the Chamber have not had children, but a lot of parents often say: "You cannot know what extreme love is, until you have a child" and such love could, perhaps, turn around somebody who might have other thoughts. I agree with Miss Parker, who said earlier on, that people slip through the net. We have had examples of this from multiple countries in the U.K. and, indeed, Jersey and Miss Parker mentioned police checks in recent years on individuals who, as Members of this Assembly will know, have slipped through the net despite, the responsibility that they have had. **[Approbation]**

4.1.16 Miss L. Rumbold:

It has been said that the policy is to protect the child's human rights, but what about the mother's human rights? Are they no longer as important and should it be the decision of anyone, but her, whether she is ready to have a child? **[Approbation and Applause]**

4.1.17 Miss L. McLaughlin:

Were the figures that were supplied in the proposal about child abuse by parents, or they just for child abuse in general? If it is in general, then surely everyone who has contact with a child will need a licence. **[Approbation]**

4.1.18 Mr. L. Marsh:

I disagree with this proposal, in the first instance, because the Jersey population is ageing and is projected to decline, so our natural population growth is negative and we rely on migration for our population to continue to grow. There is a lack of data to support this policy in terms of anything meaningful and how will this be enforced? It reminds me of China in the 1980s, when children were dragged away from their parents because of the one-child policy and there is already a safety net in place for neglected children and such. Surely what happens in a bedroom between 2 consenting adults is no business of the States. [Approbation]

4.1.19 Miss H. Crichard:

To support Mr Wyatt's comment that crime rates dropped with abortion, I looked at a New Zealand study called the Dalladon Study. This corroborates the statement, as the study established that impulsive, restless and distractful behaviour observed at the age of 3 can be used to correctly predict a significantly higher risk of the child committing a violent crime by the age of 21. The majority of similar studies show a gradient of childhood self-control that predicts future health, wealth and public safety. This shows that poor parenting has already done its damage by the very young age of 3 and intervention at this age is both challenging - in undoing the damage - and costly. Hence, we propose testing prospective parents to license them to have a child. The rejection of inadequate parents following the testing process will significantly reduce the cost to society from poorly parented children. [Approbation]

4.1.20 Miss L. Pitcher:

Further to both Miss McLaughlin and Miss Rumbold's points, in modern times there are many different influences on the life of a child, not just those of the biological parents at the time of birth, so does the proposal take into account the re-testing of step-parents before they are allowed to enter into a relationship with an existing parent? [Approbation]

4.1.21 Miss R. Egerton:

How would someone be able to tell that a person could be an abusive parent before that person has even had the chance to have a child? [Approbation]

4.1.22 Miss Z. Johnston:

Can I just state formally that we are talking about both mother and father, not just mother? [Approbation]. One could argue that, yes, every child has the right to be born. However, what happens if that child is born into a family where the adults with the duty of care are suffering themselves with substance, or alcohol, abuse, or have a history of domestic violence? Would Members let someone with a known violent history care for their own children, or siblings or, for argument's sake, themselves? Of course not, because they would know that those children would be in danger. No, children are not objects, or the property of their parents but, yes, they are in the care of those adults. How can we expect people, who cannot take care of themselves, to take care of others? Sadly, reports of sexual abuse towards children are on the rise. Sadly, the number of children in need of child protection has increased. In 2016, it was estimated by the N.S.P.C.C. (National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children) that 58,000 children were in need of child protection in the U.K. On that point, I should like to remind Members that in order for these cases to be recognised, they have to be reported in the first place. The devastating truth is that often they are not. A thorough background check, allowing one to obtain a licence to love a child would decrease this significantly, either protecting children from being exposed to these toxic environments, or removing from the environments those who are already suffering. Furthermore, it would mean that adults, who were truly longing to have children, would be the ones having them. Some people use the benefits system to have a child for financial gain. This policy to protect would ensure that children were not born, fostered or adopted for the purpose of a pay cheque but were, instead, born, fostered or adopted into loving families, who just simply wanted to care for children. It would be

easy for me to stand here and disagree with this motion. It would be easy for me to stand here, coming from a privileged background and to be naïve as to the fact that there are children who have no voice and who are being ignored. The sad truth is that there are children in the U.K. and Jersey who are being brought up in abusive and damaging conditions. This is not a licence to take away the rights from a parent; this is a licence to love and a policy to protect a child from living a nightmare some of us could not even imagine. [Approbation]

4.1.23 Mr L. Huelin:

My question concerns the logistics. Will everybody who is pregnant at the time when the policy is being brought in have to get a licence, and those who already have children – because nobody will have a licence – also have to apply for a licence and will it be applicable up to age 18?

4.1.24 Miss C. Jegard:

In relation to Miss Cullen's statement, surely the stress of accidental pregnancy, without possessing a licence, will lead to an increase in mental health issues. [Approbation]

4.1.25 Miss F. Robinson:

Surely more action should be taken with social services to stop domestic abuse, rather than forcing someone to pass a test to give a child a positive life.

4.1.26 Miss N. Rog:

If people want children and do not pass the test, what is to stop them having a baby anyway? Also, has consideration been given to the psychological effect on rape victims, who might be forced into abortions?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. If no-one else wishes to speak on the proposition, I would ask the proposer to sum up, please.

[15:45]

Miss G. Magalhaes:

To conclude, I ask you all to consider the arguments I have put before you: the improvements that will be made upon our economy, the benefits to the environment and, above all, the safety of our children, nationally. It is necessary to put these elements at the forefront of our present time, if we wish for a successful future. In response to comments, we do not seek to financially discriminate; we wish only to isolate fields in which a child may face harm. This is not elitist. We are not focused on removing the potential for children but, instead, on maximising their future potential. I would like to add that there has been a common objection to the licensing system and I remind the Assembly that the licence would not be put in place to deny adults the right to have children. It would, in fact, allow them to make lifestyle changes, whether looking for stable jobs, or medical help, so that they could re-apply for the licence when ready to bring up children in a way that would maximise their futures. That leaves this House and, I hope, all of you, firm in the belief that it should be necessary to obtain a licence to have a child within the U.K. and Jersey.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

That completes the debate on that subject and we will now go to the vote. I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 6	CONTRE: 31	ABSTAIN: 0
Emily Parris	Rebecca Cushing	
Isabelle Helie-Merrony	Emily Bridson	
Lily McGarragle	Indigo Pike	
Sophie Walker	Gabriella Magalhaes	

Zara Johnston		Maria McLaughlin		
Jack Evans-Rentsch		Lily Pitcher		
		Bethany Smyrk		
		Lucy Rumbold		
		Freya Robinson		
		Tegan Parker		
		Honor Crichard		
		Claudia Keyworth		
		Cristabelle Jegard		
		Rachel Egerton		
		Tom Andrews		
		Louis Marsh		
		Billy Baker		
		Harry Bannister		
		Luke Davis		
		Ben Ogilvie		
		Natalia Rog		
		Freya Roberts		
		James Le Conte		
		Lyndon Huelin		
		Wilfred Waddington		
		Jennifer Cullin		
		Sally Ammar		
		Sabrina Gomes		
		Edward Wyatt		
		Lara Peters		
		Ione Howells		

5 Whether Jersey should reduce its contribution to pollution by restricting the number of cars per household

The Greffier of the States:

The Assembly is asked for its opinion that Jersey should reduce its contribution to pollution by restricting the number of cars per household.

5.1 Miss I. Howells:

Climate change is a contentious issue at the moment. According to the President of the U.S.A., it is nonsense, or an expensive hoax, so perhaps I should not be standing here at all. However, leaving his claims behind and moving on to slightly more local ideas, it is hard to dismiss its importance. The icy weather that we faced this month illustrates perfectly our massive effect on the environment and what is likely to come in the future if we, as a global community and an Island community, continue on our current path. I am unclear as to how many people here know this, because I am certainly not a biology student, but the cold snap in this past month has caused a period of record high temperatures in the Arctic, sometimes above freezing. Surely, everyone here can understand the issue with melting ice, especially for us on a small Island. We propose that Jersey's environmental pollution be reduced by restricting the number of combustion vehicles on the Island. Is it really necessary on a small Island, such as ours, for many households to own more than 4 cars – obviously, depending on the household size? As you can see from our report, the majority of Islanders commute by car every single day. Jersey's car ownership *per capita* is the highest in the world. It is the highest, but even a lap of the Island is only about 45 miles, including the wiggles in the road and that pales against some of the several hundred mile car journeys that I have been doing up and down the U.K. this year. We suggest limiting the ratio of fuel-based cars to households to one for every 2 residents, with an exemption for farm vehicles, other industrial vehicles and electric

vehicles. We hope that this will encourage Islanders to reduce their use of cars, or invest in electric cars, which are far more eco-friendly than their combustion alternatives. We would also like to introduce a banded road tax in Jersey, similar to that in the U.K. Looking at U.K. statistics and multiplying them by the number of cars on Island, this would generate, very approximately, about £200 million in income every year, which could be invested, in turn, back into our public transport system. That would, in turn, facilitate a further reduction of cars on Island. We could all do with a better bus system, to reduce our need for cars. Jersey is in a unique position, as has been mentioned already today, to take part in something such as this and become a front runner. Our small size and relatively low population allow us to quickly and easily, compared with other countries, change and adapt to our modern era, which many people may argue that we are not succeeding in doing currently. I am sure that all of us have studied some form of chemistry, probably at G.C.S.E., when we learned about nitrous oxide, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and particulates and their contribution to pollution. Our cars are flooding the air with carcinogenic, toxic compounds that cause us harm and respiratory irritation and damage the plant life that our Island is known for. These particulates also run off our roads, entering our water systems. Everything is connected. The pollution reflects back on us. It is not just the climate that will benefit from this change. I am sure that all of us here have had to suffer the congestion on Mont Millais, or Wellington Hill, or the surrounding roads. For me, it is the strong fumes as I walk to school, but for many of you it will be being stuck in a car, or a bus, or on a bike. If there were fewer cars and more of us walking, cycling or using public transport, congestion in Jersey would be lowered significantly. Half of commutes are only one person per car, so the reduction would be massive if these were on buses, which can hold 40 or 50 people per bus. This change is likely coming anyway and it has precedent. Many countries, such as the U.K., France and others that I have mentioned in the report, have pledged to reduce, or remove, combustion cars from the road in the next 30 or 40 years and Ministers have mentioned many times today that they would like to achieve it too. It is time for Jersey to pull its way out of the past and break new ground, becoming the front runner in environmental living and, really, this would be a very simple way to start.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Is the proposition seconded?

[Seconded]

5.1.1 Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:

As mentioned by Miss Howells, the States do have some, albeit small, persuasion tactics to promote the growth of electric and hybrid cars on the Island. However, these are fundamentally only directed towards the consumer, as opposed to the manufacturer. As Islanders, we have become accustomed to the benefits of electric and hybrid cars that will begin to support future lifestyle purchases. Therefore, I believe that this proposition will encourage manufacturers to embrace environmentally friendly vehicles, in order to adapt to a changing climate in the industry. We can follow the several countries already taking this initiative and demonstrate it this is indeed possible, not only to reduce simultaneously traffic and our Island's carbon footprint, but to achieve it cost efficiently. I fully support and second the statement.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

The proposition is now open for debate. Does anyone wish to speak?

5.1.2 Miss R. Cushing:

I understand the basis of the argument, but how can we ensure that the idea will work for everyone? For many families having a restricted number of cars would massively impact their day-to-day lives. For example, there are many people who need cars for their jobs, there are people who work at night, so cannot rely on public transport and there are some people who have physical disabilities, who may rely on cars. These families should not be restricted to a certain number of cars, because they need different transport at different times and have specific requirements. It may be argued that exceptions

to the rule could be applied. However, where would the boundary be between qualifying for an extra car and being classed as not in need of another one?

5.1.3 Mr L. Marsh:

Given the very unpredictable nature of our weather and climate, specific reactions such as the recent warm spell over the Arctic cannot be blamed on our actions, or specifically to anybody's. Secondly, there is a reason for our having the highest car ownership rates in the world. It is because people choose to drive cars, not because they are forced to. If congestion really were that bad, why would they drive cars? They have the choices. They can walk, they can cycle, or they can take a bus. Electric cars are not that environmentally friendly, given that production involves the use of rare earth metals, specifically in the car batteries, which are incredibly damaging to the environment, most notably in China. Entire lakes have been built on pollution. Further, with regard to the effect we could have on manufacturers, mentioned by the seconder of the proposition, Jersey does not have much of a manufacturing base and our ability to change the ways of manufacturers would be very limited.

5.1.4 Miss L. Pitcher:

What is proposed to be done in the case of emergency health care not serious enough for an ambulance yet still time-dependent if the household's cars are not available?

5.1.5 Miss R. Egerton:

If all these cars are coming off the roads, how will all the unwanted metal be disposed of? Surely this has other environmental impacts.

5.1.6 Miss T. Parker:

This policy will be hard to put in place until more electrical charging stations, like petrol stations, are put in place for people to access them.

5.1.7 Miss I. Pike:

What about people with show, or vintage, cars that they do not drive on a regular basis, but have, as it is their hobby to maintain them and appreciate them as, some would argue, works of art?

5.1.8 Miss I. Helie-Merrony:

As many of us are 17 or turning 17 and therefore the age to begin driving, does this mean that we would all be happy to share one car, potentially, with siblings and parents? I struggle to believe that even the proposers would not want their own means of transport, and this could cause many familial arguments. Does this mean no Members are planning on having their own cars? **[Approbation]**

5.1.9 Mr. L. Huelin:

Despite electric cars being cheaper to run, the price to buy them is certainly still a lot higher, even second hand, especially taking into consideration the number of young drivers, perhaps getting first cars, who will not want to be spending a lot of money on electric cars when they are statistically more likely to crash. Also, there is a lack of electrically trained mechanics on the Island, which would mean that we need to re-train some and some might lose out on jobs.

5.1.10 Miss Z. Johnston:

In response the point made by Mr Marsh about why people would drive cars if they were so bad for society, well, why would people drink alcohol and why would people smoke? It is because it is glamourised, on the whole. After the industrial revolution, the climate began drastically to change. As to Miss Howells' point, would there be some sort of bike system, or would bikes be on offer for people if they wanted to ditch their cars? If they were ditching cars, but were not on a bus route would they, perhaps, be given a bike, or something, to be able to cycle to school if they could not afford one, or if they did not have access to one? Will some sort of system be put in place?

5.1.11 Miss E. Bridson:

In support of Miss Helie-Merrony's point, as we are all turning 17 and have already passed the age to obtain a licence to possess a scooter, would this restriction be imposed on scooters and motorbikes as well?

5.1.12 Miss G. Magalhaes:

While I support the motion and I wholly appreciate its intention, how it is proposed to get rid of the cars that already exceed the legal number? Would people be compensated financially?

5.1.13 Mr. L. Davis:

The points being raised are extremely relevant and I agree with Miss Magalhaes in saying that we have to consider how this is going to run. In agreement with Miss Pike, we have to consider recreational hobbies, such as vintage vehicles and the cultural benefits they can provide. At the same time, we need to look at what are the real issues. Can we sacrifice having more than one car and where do our values lie? Do we want to see the clean oceans that we have had in Jersey, although we are seeing a rise in pollution globally, not to say locally? Do we want to be able to enjoy the natural beauty of Jersey and do we want our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren to be able to enjoy the fresh air that we do have over here in Jersey? **[Approbation]** A prime example is that I was lucky enough to accompany some Chinese students visiting the Islands and we took them to Noirmont Point, a very well known beauty spot in Jersey, as I am sure you will agree. They were jumping about just trying to breathe in the air and they could not believe how clean our air was. Having been to both Xian and Beijing, I know that the difference is very real. Having seen such realities, I ask, if we can go past our selfish, consumer-society needs to have combustion engine vehicles and perhaps switch to alternatives rather than capping a number, where do our values lie? How much do we really love the Island and how it looks currently?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anybody else wish to speak to this proposition?

[16:00]

5.1.14 Miss L. Peters:

Everyone has made good, valid points but, living on an Island as small as Jersey, we can all agree that we do not need as many cars as there are on the roads. **[Approbation]** It has been stated that everybody, who is turning 17, desires to have a car and it is great, but having one car per 2 people is not that much of an ask if an average family is, say, 4 people. Two cars per 4 people is not ludicrous; it is not a crazy idea, and if the result is to save our air and fresh air in the future and reduce pollution, surely the long-term benefit of that is so much better than not having car when one turns 17.

5.1.15 Miss E. Parris:

If a limit on the number of cars occurs, then surely the necessity for public transport will increase massively, meaning that more services will need to be run. That, then, will contribute to pollution. What is proposed, therefore, to encourage the use of other forms of transport, for example, bikes?

5.1.16 Miss J. Cullen:

Fossil fuels are finite. We do not have an unlimited supply. Is it not important that we start being more environmentally friendly now?

5.1.17 Miss L. McGarragle:

I completely agree with the argument made by Mr Davis about our society being based on consumerism, but surely we should be looking at other factors, such as the effects of animal agriculture on the environment, as well.

5.1.18 Mr. B. Ogilvie:

Electric cars could be given to people who are in need of an extra car and exceptions could be made for those who need them.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anyone else wish to speak in this debate? If not, I call on Miss Howells to sum up. Sorry, I think Miss Gomes has just come in at the very last minute.

5.1.19 Miss S. Gomes:

This proposition helps both the Island and the people. For example, lack of training has been mentioned. People could be trained if we brought in specialists, which would only increase their knowledge, making them more desirable for future employers. Furthermore, on the question of vintage cars, people usually have a licence to enable them to keep them. With regard to there not being enough cars, we could make it cheaper to hire taxis, so that they were more affordable, and buses more frequent.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anyone else wish to speak in this debate? Miss Howells, will you sum up, please?

Miss I. Howells:

I should like to thank everyone for their very good points. As I mentioned, it is a contentious issue. However, I feel that a lot of those here are looking at the smaller picture. Miss Helie-Merrony talked about wanting a car when one is 17. I have just turned 17; I am about to get my provisional licence in the mail. We have one car for a family of 3 and we are absolutely fine with that. We make allowances for that. I walk to school wherever possible and my dad walks, or gets the bus, and we are lucky there because we can; there are options available. And that leads to my next point. A lot of people were complaining about public transport on the Island at the moment. That can be addressed, as I mentioned, with the road tax; £20 million a year is no small amount of money and we can use it to invest. If we had those better buses, which are more eco-friendly than cars, even if they still use fuel, the cars would not be as necessary as they are. While electric vehicles, I agree, are not – of course they are not going to save the world but they are so much better than where we are at the moment, because our electricity is becoming greener and it is intending to become greener and rare earth metals, to address Mr Marsh's point, is a misleading name. I do not have figures, but I have read a lot into the issue and they are not, in fact, as rare as many people think. The scrap can be recycled, obviously. It would have to be exported away. Currently, we do not have a large recycling plant here, but we would not expect all the scrap of cars to go into landfill. The money from the road tax could also be reinvested in other ways. It is not just the buses, although that was the point I brought up. We can invest more in bikes and other such things. So, while there are issues to be worked through – that would be the Minister's job and not ours – there is a lot that can be done by starting with something like this and expanding from there. A lot of the knock-on issues that people are bringing up can be resolved in the cycle produced by the road tax and the reduction in cars themselves.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

That concludes the debate. We will now go to the vote. I ask the Greffier to open the voting, please.

POUR: 29	CONTRE: 7	ABSTAIN: 0
Indigo Pike	Emily Bridson	
Rebecca Cushing	Tegan Parker	
Gabriella Magalhaes	Wilfred Waddington	
Emily Parris	James Le Conte	
Maria McLaughlin	Harry Bannister	
Lily Pitcher	Louis Marsh	

Isabelle Helie-Merrony	Tom Andrews		
Lily McGarragle			
Bethany Smyrk			
Lucy Rumbold			
Freya Robinson			
Sophie Walker			
Zara Johnston			
Honor Crichard			
Claudia Keyworth			
Cristabelle Jegard			
Rachel Egerton			
Lara Peters			
Sabrina Gomes			
Sally Ammar			
Jennifer Cullin			
Lyndon Huelin			
Freya Roberts			
Natalia Rog			
Ben Ogilvie			
Luke Davis			
Billy Baker			
Jack Evans-Rentsch			
Ione Howells			

6. Whether Jersey's planning laws should be relaxed

The Greffier of the States:

The Assembly is asked whether it is of the opinion that Jersey's planning laws should be relaxed.

6.1 Mr T. Andrews:

Planning permission. Attempting to unravel the enigma that is planning permission is just as useless as someone allowing the rules and garlands of a law that he created only to subsequently ignore them. Unfortunately, Jersey's planning permission is stuck in a futile cycle, distracted by the constant conflict between the old and the new and unable to move forward, as it is so caught up in the past. To begin with, let us look at the foundation of this entire issue. The very building we walk into where we seek the solution to our problems regarding planning permission is a bleak white structure, jutting up into the skyline. Perhaps this would not be so bad if it were not for the surrounding streetscape, which is one of traditional granite walls and of a tranquil children's playground. To call this incongruous would be an understatement. The place that makes the laws breaks them. But, let us forgive and forget this mild indiscretion. Let us cast our eyes over the real issue, which I should like to address on 3 different levels: civic, private and cultural. First, I am confident that I am reasonable. Despite my ridicule of planning permission, I am not trying to suggest that we build a football stadium next to Liberty Bus Station, or a service station on the Five Mile Road at St. Ouen. We are not trying to suggest any elaborate designs for buildings, or anything remotely radical. We are simply trying to draw attention to what we, as a community, believe needs to be looked at thoroughly and with honest scrutiny. Let us walk it through. This Island, of fewer than 100,000 people, can be circumnavigated in, let us say, fewer than 20 hours, yet we find ourselves stumbling over the most trivial of issues. Fortunately, for my case today, there are issues that have resulted from planning permission that apply to each of the different areas. It would be best to start by tackling the giant elephant in the room, something that has become so big that it no longer fits in a room and instead has consumed an entire Island: the hospital. Yes, that is right, our hospital down in St. Helier. Not only has £13 million been wasted thus far on external advisers but, in addition, £212, 250 had been spent on planning fees, as at December 2017. Who knows how far it has spiralled out of control? I

cannot imagine that it has gone down since then. Incidentally, the cost of 10 top-of-the-range defibrillators would have been approximately the same as these fees. I leave you and the Ministers to mull over the morality of that. Not only is planning permission used to hide its blatant faults and flaws, it continues to wreak havoc in matters that are more private, such as the case of one house owned by Ivor Barette. One might think that this one man and this one house would be insignificant, or irrelevant, because it is simply just one man and his one house. However, that is far from the truth and his situation demonstrates the unreasonable and unjust power of planning permission. Ivor Barette was fined £50,000 in 2016 for removing windows from his listed property without permission. He responded by placing signs on the property that read: ‘Merry Christmas to all those at the Planning Department who don’t know what rotten wood looks like. Because of you I have no money left to restore my house.’ This emphasised the urgent need to reconsider the laws of planning permission, because the petty and unnecessary reaction of the Planning Department has caused great distress to a fellow Islander. When private feelings can only find an outlet in this way, it is certainly regrettable. Finally, I would like to address the case of the church in St. Lawrence and the infamous toilet extension. This, to me, is a case in which present-tense pragmatism meets stuck-in-the-mud obstruction. £80,000 has already been spent on a very sensitive extension project. This is not an attempt to ruin the church. It is simply an opportunity to improve and develop both the church and the community that depends on it. Ultimately, the current laws regarding planning permission need to be reformed. For the benefit of the Island community, they need to become cheaper and more accommodating of minor modifications to privately owned properties, otherwise the morally dubious sanctions imposed on individuals such as Ivor Barette will be levied wrongfully on other well-meaning members of our society in future and taxpayers’ money will again be wastefully spent on planning fees for future large-scale projects, as it has been on the hospital. This can only hurt our Island in terms of both economic development and communal spirit. Therefore, I hope you can all agree that something needs to be done.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. Is the proposition seconded?

[Seconded]

6.1.1 Miss I. Howells:

While I agree partially with the statement, I do have a question. I want to know how much the laws would be changed because, while it can be difficult – and I understand the scenarios presented, because the house I live in is listed and we have had issues with planning – it is important to preserve our culture and our heritage as an Island. Our buildings are one very massive way to do that, so reducing them too far could lead to the loss of a lot of our history as an Island and a lot of our more traditional buildings, so I want to know how much they would be affected.

6.1.2 Miss B. Smyrk:

Why is there planning on some minor buildings, but not on other factors, such as painting? In order to build an extension, you need to get permission. However, you do not need to get permission to paint your house. Surely the problem with the planning laws is consistency and not that they necessarily need reforming.

6.1.3 Miss C. Keyworth:

Jersey is very beautiful, with much unique infrastructure. Relaxing the planning laws may allow some people to take advantage of them and modernising Jersey buildings may not benefit the community over all.

6.1.4 Mr L. Davis:

May I, very quickly, before I go to my main point, respond to Miss Smyrk? There are laws on painting buildings in Jersey if they are old, if they are of certain grade listings – Victoria Crescent is

one example – various Georgian, Regency and Victorian structures in the Island cannot be painted, or can be painted only in certain colours in line with the listing laws. That leads on to the historic and cultural aspect of the buildings. Often young people – and adults are just as guilty – say we have no culture in Britain and Jersey alike. However, in fact, our culture is ingrained within our architecture. Look at the room around us and the ceiling as well. We have Gothic Revival engravings in the wood and the way – even down to the very colours the ceilings are painted. Look at cities such as Paris, Amsterdam and even London. In London, there are buildings such as Banqueting House, Whitehall and all of these buildings contribute to the cultural richness and identity of the people and the country. With regard to the gentleman and his rotting windows, the key words are ‘without permission’. Nobody is exempt from the law, whether they be a Member of a Chamber, or an average civilian and if that gentleman had a problem, he should have taken it to the courts and to the relevant people in charge. Before voting, consider what you see as the cultural aspects of Jersey. Do you see Jersey culture, far from the cows and the milk, as being the Gothic Revival architecture here in the States Chamber? Do you see it as Mont Orgueil? Do you see it as the Georgian architecture of Elizabeth Castle and the various buildings? The majority of the population, certainly in the northern and western parishes of Jersey, reside in Georgian and Victorian houses. If those were suddenly to be defaced, suddenly to have a lot of unnecessary modern adaptations, it would be highly noticeable to those who recognise such things. We can see here in the Chamber that there is a way of putting modern technology and other modern developments into traditional architecture.

6.1.5 Miss I. Pike:

Would the proposition change the planning laws to the extent of relaxing the conversion of agricultural land and how would this affect our agriculture?

6.1.6 Miss F. Roberts:

If planning laws are relaxed, would that take away more of Jersey’s green space and allow more development on greenfield sites, and would that then have an adverse effect on tourism?

[16:15]

6.1.7 Miss R. Cushing:

Are not even small features of houses, such as the windows, of enough historical importance to at least be inspected before they are removed? The planning application process ensures that no important features of historical value are destroyed.

6.1.8 Miss H. Crichard:

It can be argued that a main motive of property developers, like that of the majority of businesses, is to maximise their profits. When they develop sites, they will not necessarily make a profit from creating parking spaces, green amenity spaces and shared communal facilities. Currently, strict planning laws ensure that these community assets are included when property is developed. However, if the laws are relaxed, how are we to ensure that property developers will continue to provide these essential facilities?

6.1.9 Miss N. Rog:

Planning laws are designed to ensure that safety procedures are implemented on the Island and that professionals execute plans and actions correctly. As Jersey is rather a small Island, we cannot have individuals doing as they please with regard to property, especially when it is likely to be sold on later.

6.1.10 Miss Z. Johnston:

Yes, these old buildings and structures make up part of our culture and society, but then again, they are old. Once strong views of society may have formed our culture, but they have now been modernised. London buildings, such as Big Ben, have been renovated, so maybe more relaxed

planning laws would allow old buildings in Jersey to be renovated also, but without changing their value.

6.1.11 Miss E. Bridson:

Do the proposers believe that the extent of the relaxation would allow an elitism in that the wealthiest members of our society would end up conquering areas of land for themselves, to develop the largest houses that their wealth would allow and that others could not have?

6.1.12 Miss K. Pitcher:

Different stakeholders prioritise different aspects of what makes a building successful. So, a politician would prioritise its efficiency and possibility for economic success, or a member of Jersey Heritage, would prioritise historical value, so which body would choose the scale of the limitations?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anyone else wish to speak?

6.1.13 Mr. L. Marsh:

I would now like to make my seconding speech. To start with Miss Crichard, the car parking space and other such parks can be profitable and add their value to the property through charges for parking, for instance, or for entry to a park. Miss Roberts, yes, we would like to remove certain greenfield sites, as our linked study shows that we can develop significant numbers of housing units without impinging much upon our green spaces. Currently, the Planning Department has the power to treat people, who wish to build their own property for whatever use they see fit, as though they are criminals, through criminal prosecutions. Our planning laws have severely restricted the housing supply, making it incredibly inelastic and inflexible, such that any intervention by the States to improve affordability will ultimately be futile and serve only to make them even less affordable in future. It is important to remember that we should take into account the results of a policy, not its intentions. A policy may be intended to preserve our culture, but if it ends up increasing homelessness and decreasing affordability and availability of housing, what is its true purpose? With regard to culture and history, was it a bureaucrat who designed Victoria College and its Gothic Architecture? Was it a bureaucrat who required the building to be built as it was? No, it was the people who designed it, because they wanted their own buildings to be beautiful. Regarding elitism, and building the biggest house one can, I do not see any evidence of people having carried out such behaviour anywhere in the world. The planning laws, what do they achieve; what end? Are our houses more environmentally sound than those anywhere else in the world, any safer, constructed any more soundly? No, not to any measurable degree. The study that we linked to our report shows that, in the U.K., the major reason behind high house prices and the lack of availability and affordability is planning laws restricting housing supply and increasing house prices by up to 20 per cent, or 30 per cent. In short, to make homes more affordable, the States should do less and not more. The market of people, the housing builders and house buyers on their own can sort the crisis out. While there are vested interests who benefit from this competition and artificial scarcity in the housing market and those who own already-expensive houses benefit from these laws, we believe that sensible reform to our planning laws will end the consequences of doing nothing. The continuation of excessively low rates of building means that this proposal is necessary for our society.

6.1.14 Miss L. Peters:

What extent of relaxation is intended? Relaxed could mean the destruction of something that makes Jersey so unique and beautiful and, to support what Miss Roberts said about how it could affect our tourism industry, lots of people come to the Island to see the beauty and culture of our castles and our unique buildings, our vast beaches and the land that is free from buildings. Would not relaxing planning laws mean that all of that could be destroyed, or built up, and something that makes Jersey so beautiful and unique could be destroyed?

6.1.15 Miss J. Cullen:

Does Jersey have the capacity and elasticity to relax planning laws without consequences such as chaos and disputes within residential communities?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anybody else wish to speak in this debate?

6.1.16 Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:

We must remember that the value of property must be judged by its merit and its historical value as well as the value that would decrease if we relaxed the planning laws, due to many of the traditional buildings losing their place in society if they were to be tampered with.

6.1.17 Miss G. Magalhaes:

I support Miss Peters and insist the proposers define exactly what is meant by “relaxed”. It lacks clarity. It must be better refined if we are to consider it. We cannot simply relax our laws; we need to put in constraints. If it should be specific to ever case, can that not be dealt with through appeals?
[Approval]

6.1.18 Miss C. Jegard:

Would the proposers argue that relaxing planning laws is more important than Jersey’s green fields, which have been significantly reduced, due to the increase in new buildings?

6.1.19 Mr W. Waddington:

Looking at a map of Jersey, only about 10 per cent is built on, so I do not think that it would jeopardise that.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anyone else wish to speak on this proposition?

Mr. T. Andrews:

Thank you for granting us this opportunity to speak about what we believe to be a significant issue in Jersey. Our aim is simply to reduce the unjust power of the Planning Department, in order to allow people to develop their homes, to make Jersey both a happier and a more modern place to live in. I am of the opinion that we have provided sufficient evidence to allow you to vote in what we believe is the morally right way, considering that we are the future of Jersey.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

That concludes the debate. I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

POUR: 15		CONTRE: 17		ABSTAIN: 5
Lily Pitcher		Indigo Pike		Isabelle Helie-Merrony
Tegan Parker		Emily Bridson		Bethany Smyrk
Zara Johnston		Rebecca Cushing		Lucy Rumbold
Rachel Egerton		Gabriella Magalhaes		Freya Robinson
Sabrina Gomes		Emily Parris		Claudia Keyworth
Sally Ammar		Maria McLaughlin		
Jennifer Cullin		Lily McGarragle		
Wilfred Waddington		Sophie Walker		
Lyndon Huelin		Honor Crichard		
James Le Conte		Cristabelle Jegard		
Freya Roberts		Lara Peters		
Harry Bannister		Edward Wyatt		
Billy Baker		Natalia Rog		
Louis Marsh		Ben Ogilvie		

Tom Andrews		Luke Davis		
		Jack Evans-Rentsch		
		Ione Howells		

7 Whether there should be a subsidised fruit and vegetable scheme for morning break in all Jersey primary schools from Reception to Year 3

The Greffier of the States:

The Assembly is asked whether it is of the opinion that there should be a subsidised fruit and vegetable scheme for morning break in all Jersey primary schools from Reception to Year 3.

7.1 Miss M. McLaughlin:

According to the 2017 Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Report, approximately 10,000 people in Jersey have gone without fresh fruit or veg weekly for the last year. Furthermore, 69 per cent have eaten less than 5 portions of fruit or veg in the last 24 hours. When we consider that a significant proportion of this number is school-age children, it seems imperative, in an Island such as Jersey, to address and remedy this. As is stated in the Food and Nutrition Strategy for Jersey 2017 to 2022, implementing a first phase of methods designed to reduce preventable disease and encourage healthier lifestyles has already been agreed in the Jersey Medium Term Financial Plan. Our scheme would introduce healthy eating habits and better nutrition from an early age, establishing the foundation for a healthier society over all. This is important as we face growing numbers of child obesity, type 2 Diabetes, heart disease and many forms of cancer. It is also more economically viable for a society to address preventing disease rather than paying for the cumulative cost of medicine, treatment, health care and hospitalisation once diseases are diagnosed. Our second key point is that educational attainment will increase and students will benefit from a more positive educational experience. The N.H.S. currently runs a similar scheme, which states that children from 4 to 6, who attend a fully state-funded institution, primary school or special needs school in England are entitled to receive one free piece of fruit, or vegetable, each school day. Teachers from these schools have found that distributing the fruit in class groups helps to encourage a sharing, calm, social time, improving pupils' over all wellbeing. It also allows them to incorporate the scheme into teaching and learning, introducing ideas about healthy diets, through making them relevant in the everyday lives of pupils. From our research, we propose 2 methods of implementation. First, as is done in some Jersey businesses, a trolley could be placed in the school, with fresh fruit and vegetables for pupils to come and pick their healthy snack from. In addition to the many health benefits, jobs are created in the food preparation and organisation aspects of our proposal. Genuine Jersey businesses will have the opportunity to thrive from new business. We propose that the cut funding for school milk and trips to Durrell be put towards daily, subsidised, fruit and vegetables, because the benefits from this scheme are clear, and it also acts as a preventative health-care method for diseases caused by malnutrition. In addition, the £466 million that was originally proposed to be spent on our new general hospital should be allocated to include sufficient funds to promote healthy lifestyles, to reduce hospital visits relating to illnesses stemming from malnutrition in the first place. This is a sustainable and viable method to achieving this goal, costing only £137,000 a year to fund all the 7,413 students in both state and private primary schools. That is 0.0003 per cent of the cost of the new hospital. As the States of Jersey stated in their Food and Nutrition Strategy, obesity is a complex disorder with complex causes. There is no single, or simple, solution to tackle it. However, here we have clear evidence that our proposal is a definite solution that will improve social welfare within our Island and, ultimately, the health and happiness of our children.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Is the proposition seconded?

[Seconded]

7.1.1 Miss L. Pitcher:

I second the motion put forward by Miss McLaughlin. A proposal to introduce the benefits of a healthy nutritional supplement would, additionally, address the material deprivation in Jersey and assist the most vulnerable individuals in meeting nutritional needs in an increasingly challenging economic environment. The aforementioned 2017 to 2022 Food and Nutrition Strategy for Jersey revealed that 48 per cent of people agreed that it is difficult to find fresh fruit and vegetables in Jersey. Results from the Jersey Opinion and Lifestyle Survey in 2017 show that one in 7 households were materially deprived and almost one in 10 were in severe material deprivation. Fresh fruit and vegetables are expensive in Jersey and many families are unable to ensure that their children consistently receive even one of the recommended daily allowance, let alone 5. If all children receive the same supplement, this will take some pressure off struggling families, but avoid the stigma that may be associated with state-funded supplements, consequently reducing social inequality and its consequential detrimental effect on social welfare. We even subsidise the cost of primary school uniforms for those on lower incomes. We should also be prioritising their health. We have discovered that these issues are addressed by the Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey. Areas for action that have been identified include increasing access to breakfast clubs, introducing more targeted subsidies to influence the affordability of fruit and veg and, I quote: “Explore options to encourage early-year care settings to adopt healthy eating policies and standards, which support the promotion of age-appropriate healthy eating messages.” Our proposal is a simple way to ensure that these goals are met.

[16:30]

As human beings, we have a moral responsibility to look after every person in our society, especially those younger and more vulnerable than ourselves. Our proposal is a practical and efficient way of maximising social welfare, in terms of both reducing inequality and improving the healthier eating habits of our population from an early age.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Having been proposed and seconded, the proposition is now open for debate. Does anyone wish to speak?

7.1.2 Miss I. Helie-Merrony:

If children are expected to pick their own fruit from a trolley, how can we ensure that they do it? Is it not the job of parents to look after their children’s nutrition, rather than teachers? Is there not a risk that parents will relax in the amount of fruit that they provide for their children to save money, as they trust that their children are receiving this at school?

7.1.3 Miss L. Peters:

I support what was just said. It is a really good idea to try to provide more fruit and veg for children, but should we not try to aim to subsidise parents, so that families as a whole can have fruit and veg at home, not just young children up to Year 3? **[Approbation]** If they are in a family that cannot afford the fruit and veg, as has been said, what will happen when they get to Year 4 and their parents can still not afford the fruit and veg? Surely we should be supplying it to a family so they can give it to their children.

7.1.4 Mr L. Davis:

This is a great proposal as a step forward to what could be a great educational advantage. Education, unfortunately, is often seen as just the academic maths and English. While it is that, education, especially at primary school age, can and should go further. This is a good step to teaching children – and they could go forth to teach their parents about the nutritional and health benefits of eating fruit and vegetables – but this could also be linked with trips and talks from members of organisations such as Genuine Jersey to make them aware of the importance of agriculture in Jersey and where

their food comes from. A series of T.V. programmes and many reports have been published, especially recently, about people – not so much in Jersey, but perhaps further afield – not know where their food comes from. People are starting to become more interested and concerned as to where their food is coming from and how it is coming to them. This could, in turn, lead to programmes, such as the introduction of more home economics in schools, teaching these young children how to prepare, provide, grow and cook the food and to create a whole package of nutritional meals for themselves and their families.

7.1.5 Mr E. Wyatt:

I agree wholeheartedly on the issues raised by the proposer. However, I disagree with the methods chosen to deal with them. The proposition only deals with the surface level of the issue, whereas a much more effective solution, perhaps, would be to deal with how nutrition is handled at home. For example, a lot of parents choose unhealthy meals for their children, simply because they do not necessarily know how to cook meals that might be more nutritionally balanced. Perhaps educating parents and children alike in how to cook meals better and with greater heed to nutrition would be more effective.

7.1.6 Miss E. Parris:

Further to Miss Helie-Merrony's point, it should not be the sole responsibility of the school to prevent obesity and to ensure a healthy lifestyle. It should be the role of parents and guardians to ensure that their children are healthy and have good, sustainable lifestyles. Therefore, instead of a fruit and veg break-time snack scheme, should we instead be asking for a subsidy to educate those looking after children about a healthy lifestyle and how it is possible for lower-income families to afford simple and healthy habits?

7.1.7 Miss C. Keyworth:

With regard to some of the comments that have been made, it would be best to provide each child with fruit at school, because it is much harder to monitor whether children are being provided with fruit at home. We cannot know about families' financial status and I do not understand how it can be monitored if they do not have enough money to buy the fruit, or provide the children with healthy options, whereas if we ensure that each child is provided with a supplement at school, then we can be sure that they have been given a healthy option.

7.1.8 Miss Z. Johnston:

I do not know about anyone else, but when I go into the canteen at school to buy something and I see an 80p packet of crisps or a 45p banana, even though the banana is the cheaper option, I do go for the crisps and that is due to the society in which I have been brought up. Having fruit and veg seen as a positive thing from a young age will reduce obesity and help people make smarter choices as to what they eat. Furthermore, if we are encouraged to eat better, that will positively impact our mental health, because when eating better foods makes one feel better physically and mentally. The western diet of unhealthy, fatty food is a cancer-causing problem, which is often hidden, as our culture does write off things such as alcohol, cigarettes and fast food and I agree with Miss Peters that healthy attitudes should be encouraged at home from the start of life and then brought into schools when a child starts there, as that will positively impact them from the beginning. If we were, then, for some reason, unable to continue providing the fruit and veg, by the time they reached year 3, 4 or 5 they would be more educated and more able to make good decisions. I agree with Mr Davis' point about home economics being encouraged in schools. It should be heavily encouraged in primary schools, as opposed to one lesson a week in secondary schools. It should be taken seriously as a food science, rather than just that lesson that is done for 3 years at secondary school.

7.1.9 Miss I. Pike:

I have 2 questions. First, would the proposers also look to introduce a sugar tax, to tackle the obesity problem that has been mentioned and secondly, how would they support farmers and people who are producing the fruit and vegetables? **[Approbation]**

7.1.10 Miss E. Bridson:

The milk cuts were mentioned in the proposers' initial argument. Do they agree with the cuts that schools have made to milk, as children receive fewer vital nutrients, such as calcium and other macronutrients such as protein, which are in no way represented by fruit which, in its own way, is full of sugar? Milk often lasts longer, as well and with recyclable waste, it can supplement children's learning about the environment. How is it proposed that children be exposed to all of the nutrients that are necessary to health, not just fruit and vegetables?

7.1.11 Miss B. Smyrk:

I agree with the many valid points that have been raised and would like to state some statistics from the Fruit and Nutrition Strategy for Jersey from 2017 to the present. As mentioned in the original statement, 69 per cent of people have eaten less than 5 portions of fruit and veg in the last 24 hours. One in 2 adults have visited a pharmacy for health advice in the last 12 months, compared with one in 3 in 2009. This shows that not enough people are getting the nutrients that are needed. Providing school children with a healthy lunch, consisting of fruit and vegetables would encourage healthy eating throughout their lives and, inevitably, improve these statistics. Material deprivation is a factor that influences the amount of fruit and vegetables available, but children should not be allowed to not have a beneficial, healthy lifestyle, which could improve attainment, due to their parents' financial position.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Do you wish to speak now, Miss Egerton? No? OK. Mr Marsh.

7.1.12 Mr L. Marsh:

I would like to pick up on the point made by Miss Johnston about the demand for different types of food. She mentioned that large differences in price, such as 2 or 3 times the price changes very little. Will the proposers acknowledge that their policy will have either very little effect or a very great cost, given that people are reluctant to change their diets? Surely, it is the role of parents, or individuals themselves, to look at their own diets before they suffer the consequences as a result, such as shortened life span and such? The comments made with regard to material deprivation are outside the debate as they refer more to economic issues – the standard of living of the people of this country, not of their nutrition. Reforms such as fruit and things in schools as proposed, schools are already providing this. Fresh fruit and veg is already available in the form of meals, or bananas and things.

7.1.13 Miss L. Rumbold:

I agree with Miss Johnston. This is why the proposal is that all the children eat together, as small children are more likely to eat fruit and veg at school with their friends, rather than alone at home, because of the stigma mentioned before.

7.1.14 Miss T. Parker:

Regarding Miss Pike's point about milk, we were going to propose that today. However, we disagree about the cuts. The primary schools themselves, not the States, decided to cut the milk because they found that, because young children are unable to brush their own teeth, it was causing dental problems.

7.1.15 Miss S. Ammar:

I have not been to a primary school here in Jersey, but I believe that they have allocated snack time, so that they can ensure that kids have the right amount of fruit and vegetables. Additionally, I found on work experience that some companies provide fruit so that people can snack on it throughout the day. While I agree with the proposition, I believe that actions are already being taken to ensure that these health requirements are met. It just depends now on the personal decisions of individuals about their dietary requirements.

7.1.16 Miss C. Jegard:

The children of Jersey are the future of Jersey and the lack of healthy fruit and vegetables due to material deprivation, or unavailability of access, will result in their not reaching their full educational potential. No child at all should suffer because of decline in health.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anybody who has not already spoken wish to speak on the proposition?

7.1.17 Miss R. Egerton:

We are not offering the whole solution, but this would give children a better start to life as, from reception to Year 3, they are going through their main growing phase and this will help to give them a better foundation for their future. **[Approbation]**

7.1.18 Miss H. Crichard:

In a way, we may be approaching this as though the children cannot get the fruit, but in some cases it is a personal choice. What if some children go to school and decide they do not like fruit, which is quite a common thing for children. What if they refuse to eat it?

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Does anybody else wish to speak in this debate? If not, I shall ask Miss McLaughlin to sum up.

Miss M McLaughlin:

I should like to thank everyone for their very valid points and I am grateful for the opportunity to make our proposal here today. To respond to some of the points about whether this should be a job for the home rather than the school, I agree that this is important for parents to address. However, we cannot rely on just the parents as the job of the school is to educate. Therefore, it is the school's responsibility to offer the fruit and vegetables, because this is what we see as the best way to educate children about healthy eating and for future life. The benefits of our proposal far outweigh the costs of the programme. Keeping in mind the costs of the new hospital, as we said before, we would want to do everything in our power to prevent disease and, in turn, the overstretching of the new hospital, which is always a big problem. We would want to do everything in our power to give the children of Jersey the best childhood possible and I think this proposal really does offer that. On the point about why it is only Reception to Year 3, we would want to offer this for all school years, but we would want to start with those years, because that is when the children are youngest and we want to ingrain it for the future. If the scheme were to work well, we would want to extend it to all the other years. Thank you.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

That concludes the debate. We will now move to the vote and I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

[16:45]

POUR: 29		CONTRE: 4		ABSTAIN: 4
Indigo Pike		Lyndon Huelin		Edward Wyatt
Emily Bridson		James Le Conte		Sally Ammar
Rebecca Cushing		Harry Bannister		Ben Ogilvie

Gabriella Magalhaes		Louis Marsh		Tom Andrews
Emily Parris				
Maria McLaughlin				
Lily Pitcher				
Isabelle Helie-Merrony				
Lily McGarragle				
Bethany Smyrk				
Lucy Rumbold				
Freya Robinson				
Tegan Parker				
Sophie Walker				
Zara Johnston				
Honor Crichard				
Claudia Keyworth				
Cristabelle Jegard				
Rachel Egerton				
Lara Peters				
Sabrina Gomes				
Jennifer Cullin				
Wilfred Waddington				
Freya Roberts				
Natalia Rog				
Luke Davis				
Billy Baker				
Jack Evans-Rentsch				
Ione Howells				

That brings us to the end of Public Business, but before we leave I want to say a couple of things, if I may. A couple of thank yous: this event has today run extremely smoothly, as I am sure you would agree. It has run smoothly only because events like this do not just happen by themselves, but because of the tremendous amount of work that has been put in by the Greffier and, if he does not mind my saying so, by the Deputy Greffier, who has liaised with the schools, organised the order papers, changed the names when you have changed your delegates and at the least I want to thank you very much indeed. **[Approbation]** I have just been passed some statistics about today. Amazingly, we had 64 questions during Question Times in just under 2 hours. Everyone in this Youth Assembly has contributed either to Question Time, or the debate, which is excellent; that is what we would like to see. I can tell you that all the paperwork, pens *et cetera* that have been left on your desks are yours to take away. Our generosity knows no bounds, as you can see. I am told that there is a voting leaflet in there, as well. Please take note of that, in particular. I know that you are interested in politics, otherwise you would not be here, so please make sure you use your vote in May. It is interesting that this Youth Assembly has been going on for 21 years. Two of the current Members of the States were Youth Assembly participants. One of them is sitting up there in the gallery this afternoon. Perhaps, in due course, some of you will consider political careers in Jersey. Certainly, judging by your performances today, you would all be very good. I want to thank not only the Greffier but all of you because I found – both questions and participation in debates – your contributions have been elegant, incisive and very thoughtful and it gives me great hope for the future so thank you all very much indeed. Nibbles are available downstairs in the Members’ Room and we hope that you will all come down, including your tutors and friends and anybody who might be in the gallery. Do not forget, you can watch your performances again on the States Assembly website this evening.

Mr J. Evans-Rentsch:

Sir, I should like to say, on behalf of Hautlieu, and I am sure all the other students would as well, a big thank you to you for all your statements **[Approbation]** as well as to all the Ministers who took part and the 2 wonderful Greffiers. Thank you very much.

The Connétable of St Clement (in the Chair):

Thank you. That concludes our business and I declare the 21st Jersey Youth Assembly closed. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

[16:48]