

Witness Name : William Bailhache
Statement No : First
Exhibits: WB1 – WB71
Dated :

THE INDEPENDENT JERSEY CARE INQUIRY

EXHIBIT WB52

William Bailhache

From: Stuart Syvret
Sent: 18 August 2008 20:57
To: William Bailhache
Subject: RE: Questions on Behalf of My Constituents

Attorney General

I'm pleased that you read my blog. Doing so, you will be very familiar with my assessment of you and the truly startling degrees of arrogance, hubris and megalomania you exhibit.

More of which is, sadly, on display in this e-mail.

Rather than re-tread old ground in detail, let me just furnish you with the one, simple, insurmountable obstruction in your path of determination to remain involved in these matter.

The test of the appearance of objectivity. You are aware, presumably of the case of Lord Hoffman and Augusto Pinochet? Lord Hoffman was one of the Law Lords who adjudged Pinochet. It was later revealed that Lord Hoffman was connected with the human rights campaign group Amnesty International. It was not suggested that he HAD been biased - merely that there was an POSSIBLE APPEARANCE of bias. This mere suspicion alone caused the judgement to be set aside.

There is not the remotest possibility of you meeting the APPEARANCE of objectivity test. Indeed - you really must think all people fools to believe that you could appear to be objective in these prosecution cases - whilst having a mutually-exclusive role in giving legal advice to the Council of Ministers, Departments of the States and the States assembly itself. For example - advice in respect of minimising insurance claims. As was - perhaps foolishly - admitted that you gave, by the Chief Minister in one of his train-wreck media appearances.

You claim to be committed to doing your job properly. How can this be so when the very position in which you find yourself - even assuming good faith - renders you incapable of doing your job properly.

In order to do your job properly you have to avoid even the merest suspicion of bias. As is obviously the case - you cannot meet that objectivity test. Therefore for you to do your job properly would require you to recuse yourself from all involvement forthwith.

You are not going to do that. Therefore you cannot do your job properly. QED.

You assert that the suggestions of a connection between you and [REDACTED] are untrue. Though it cannot be but noted that if [REDACTED] is a member of said [REDACTED] as are you, that fact would place at risk the appearance of objectivity. It cannot be regarded as anything other than quite alarming that you haven't seen fit to check whether [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] of the same [REDACTED] as you. But let us, for argument's sake, assume there to be no connection. You want me to withdraw the suggestion and apologise to you "in an acceptable manner".

I will withdraw the suggestion, and apologise to you - on condition that you, first, apologise for the many gross abuse of authority, biases, interferences and failures you have exhibited over the years.

You would, perhaps, like a list?

I'll certainly prepare one - but off the top of my head, here are a few to be going on with.

Obstructing my H & SS Committee in its efforts to review child protection standards [REDACTED]

Exhibiting an unprecedented degree of interference in the present work of the police - to the point of slowing and obstructing charges.

Conniving with the Data Protection Commissioner in the biased application of the data protection law as a tool of oppression against me and [REDACTED]

Failing to advise the Privileges & Procedures Committee that, insofar as matters occurring outside the walls of the legislature are concerned - they are bound by the ECHR.

Making insulting and untrue assertions against me in the States Assembly during your tediously predictable political interventions; for example, when you spoke in connection with the legal issues concerning the magistrates and centeniers as raised by Deputy Hill.

Continuing to involve yourself in the McGuire case - even though you were the senior partner of the law firm which - in 1998 - failed disastrously to properly represent those young victims.

Reducing certain of my constituents to devastation and tears by obstruction the charging of [REDACTED]

Allowing the States to treat members in my position in a way manifestly non-compatible with the Social-Security law; the avoidance device as used by the States over the years being precisely the kind of unethical practice which would have been stamped on in the private sector.

Perhaps - whilst we're at it - you might like to ask your brother, the Bailiff, to respond to the letter from the Jersey Care Leavers Association in which they sought an apology for his outrageous, and frankly deranged, speech with which he hi-jacked Liberation Day to attack the child abuse investigation.

It is - in a tragic kind of way - really quite funny that you can be so out of touch with reality that you commit to writing such Orwellian words as these: "But I tell you that your attacks on the prosecution service and the rule of law do no good for those you claim to represent. Your position can only act to influence persons not to come forward and make statements to the police. Such an approach is directly contrary to my own position. Having all the available evidence to hand is the way the prosecution authorities can evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the cases."

Orwellian Newspeak indeed.

Such a claim - that it is I who am to blame for the parlous appearance of justice in Jersey - as opposed to people like you and your brother - and the manifestly knackered and unworkable system you cling to - could only be made by someone living in some kind of Victorian dream world.

I will, in due course, produce a detailed and full list of your various misfeasances and biases over the years. Then we can, perhaps, engage in the swapping of apologies.

But, really, in the meantime would just please stop obstructing the investigation and see that the suspects are extradited and charged - in order to try and give some little comfort to my constituents?

You should, of course, simply withdraw from these matters entirely - your position being manifestly unsustainable by any respectable standard of jurisprudence. But you won't, of course. So, as you choose to resist by asserting it is appropriate for you to be involved - prove that fact by seeing all the suspects charged and prosecuted.

Senator Stuart Syvret
States of Jersey.

-----Original Message-----

From: William Bailhache
Sent: 18 August 2008 18:53
To: Stuart Syvret
Subject: RE: Questions on Behalf of My Constituents

Dear Mr Syvret

I am in receipt of your e mail of 16 August, and of course of the e mail 40 minutes ago.

I said in my e mail to you of 20 May that:

- Your lack of balance made it extremely difficult to engage with you
- Given that your mind was clearly made up, there was little purpose in corresponding with you further
- I intended to do my job as Attorney General objectively and responsibly.

I remain committed to doing my job properly. Your repetition of your earlier wild allegations makes them no stronger. But I tell you that your attacks on the prosecution service and the rule of law do no good for those you claim to represent. Your position can only act to influence persons not to come forward and make statements to the police. Such an approach is directly contrary to my own position. Having all the available evidence to hand is the way the prosecution authorities can evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the cases.

I obviously cannot comment on current individual investigations or cases.

I note, however, your question 4, which you have already answered untruthfully. I remind you of your blog posting of June 25 2008, the main purpose of which was to attack the rule of law in Jersey. You wrote this:

" YOU COULDN'T MAKE IT UP.

.....
Remember a couple of weeks ago, another suspect was arrested. On that occasion too, the police had to release him without charge. The suspect's name was [REDACTED]

This is getting so easy - but let's do it anyway; who do you think is a friend of [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] of the same [REDACTED]

Yep - William Bailhache, Jersey's Attorney General.

One of the tragic and bizarre features of this episode is this man's arrogance, megalomania and hubris - that he just cannot see that he has, essentially, corrupted the rule of law in Jersey."

You did make it up. The fact that you now ask me a question which is framed only in terms of whether [REDACTED] is an acquaintance as opposed to a friend shows this to be so.

For the record, I am not a friend of [REDACTED] nor is he a friend of mine. As far as I am aware, I have never met him. I confirm I am [REDACTED]. I do not know whether [REDACTED] is one of the other [REDACTED] but he may well be. Whether he is or is not [REDACTED] will have no impact on the way I conduct my duties as Attorney General.

I am not prepared to correspond with you further for all the reasons I gave in my e mail of 20 May. I will however reconsider that position if you withdraw this allegation you have made, acknowledge that it was without foundation and that you should not have made it, and apologise to me in an acceptable manner.

Yours sincerely,

William Bailhache

-----Original Message-----

From: Stuart Syvret
Sent: 18 August 2008 18:10
To: William Bailhache
Subject: RE: Questions on Behalf of My Constituents
Importance: High

Attorney General

I note I have not yet received an acknowledgement of this e-mail in which I ask urgent questions on behalf of my constituents - let alone a substantive response.

This matter is urgent, as abuse survivors are suffering, and, incidentally, your actions are doing profound harm to Jersey's international standing.

Sadly, I also know from past experience that you, like your brother, the Bailiff, have an intense dislike and reluctance to communicate with any person who may question your actions or conduct. Therefore I have little expectation of a meaningful response to the questions I ask on behalf of my constituents.

There is, therefore, no point in prevaricating. If I have not received a substantive response by tomorrow lunch-time, this correspondence will be released to the national media.

Senator Stuart Syvret
States of Jersey.

-----Original Message-----

From: Stuart Syvret
Sent: 16 August 2008 18:34
To: William Bailhache
Subject: Questions on Behalf of My Constituents
Importance: High

Attorney General

As you will be aware, I am extremely committed to representing a significant number of my constituents; people who have survived abuse over the years and decades. The age-range of these people is from teenage, to people in their 70s.

To say that these people have suffered in their lives would be a dramatic understatement. Most are profoundly damaged by the abuses they suffered; abuses often committed by States of Jersey employees - or by the States of Jersey itself.

Amongst these constituents are victims of [REDACTED] a substantial number of victims of Mr and Mrs McGuire and victims of [REDACTED]

I understand perfectly well from previous correspondence that you appear to be labouring under the delusion that your job enables you to pick and choose those politicians you will or will not correspond with. You have made it plain that you do not wish to correspond with me.

With all due respect, you do not have the luxury of making such personal choices.

You are paid a vast amount of taxpayer's money each year to undertake your duties. A significant part of those duties involves you being in correspondence with politicians. After all, it could never be said of you that you have exhibited reluctance to pro-actively engage in the political sphere.

It really is extremely difficult to see how you could possibly remain in your job if you continue to act as though you could pick and choose which of the 53 elected members of the States who you will deign to correspond with.

My job is to represent my constituents. In order to do so, I require answers to the following questions.

1: Are [REDACTED] going to be charged and prosecuted for the offences it is alleged they have committed, and if so - when?

2: Are Mr and Mrs McGuire going to be extradited, charged again with the offences they were charged with in 1998 - before their prosecution was corruptly abandoned -and will Mr McGuire, in particular, be charged and prosecuted for those new offences it has been alleged to the police that he committed - and if so - when?

3: Is [REDACTED] going to be charged and prosecuted for the offences it is alleged he has committed, and if so - when?

4: Will you confirm or deny that [REDACTED] is an acquaintance of yours? Would you confirm or deny that you and [REDACTED] are both [REDACTED]

5: Will you state whether any of the suspects identified by the police during the Historic Child Abuse investigation, or the friends and family members of such suspects, are personally known to you?

6: It is a fact, as has been previously accepted by you, that you were the senior partner of the law firm which was, supposedly, representing many of the victims of the McGuires in 1998. I can state that having read two very substantial lever arch files of evidence against the McGuires, and having read the legal files of certain of the victims, I can state categorically that the performance of your then law firm was catastrophically deficient.

There is clearly a plain and inescapable reputational conflict of interest which affects you in this

matter. Clearly, if, as most certainly should happen, the McGuires are prosecuted, the utterly shameful performance of public administration - including several states departments, the prosecution service, and the judiciary - will be fully exposed in open court. And joining that line up of incompetence, ethical bankruptcy, professional negligence, humiliation and shame - will be Bailhache LaBesse - the then law firm of which you were THE senior partner.

On this one a ground alone - although there are a number of others - you are hopelessly conflicted. Indeed, it cannot be regarded as anything less than staggering that you yourself did not see, and to this day still do not accept, that you are so conflicted in respect of the McGuire case.

In previous correspondence you wrote, in an e-mail of the 20th May:

“For the record, I add that I had and have no knowledge whatever of the retainer which some or all of the complainants in the Maguire case had with Messrs Bailhache Labesse in 1998, nor have I any interest, financial or otherwise, in any claim which those persons might bring against that firm for alleged breach of that retainer.

I do not propose to have any further correspondence on this matter with you.”

In reply, in an e-mail of the 20th May – to which you did not respond - I made the following points:

“I note your comment’s concerning Bailhache Labesse. You assert you have no financial interest. That may well be so - but it is, frankly, irrelevant to the broader point. You were the senior partner of that firm when it failed to properly represent the victims of the McGuire abuse episode. You - therefore - have - at least - a very serious reputational stake in this particular case.

That reputational stake renders you hopelessly conflicted.

And even if you avow that you do not consider yourself to have a reputational stake - frankly - it is not your opinion which is relevant.”

The impeccable validity of the point I made has simply been reinforced in recent months as I have taken further advise and undertaken my own researches.

It is, literally, extraordinary, that you cannot see the overriding conflicts which engulf you in respect of the McGuire case.

To re-iterate the point I made in my e-mail, you can assert all you like that in ‘your judgement’ you do not consider yourself to have “any interest, financial or otherwise” arising from the gross failure of Bailhache LaBesse – but as far as ancient, rock-solid legal principle, jurisprudence and case-law are concerned – your ‘personal’ opinion as to whether you are conflicted is a matter of complete irrelevancy.

I repeat – it has simply no bearing on the fundamental question.

That question being this: “is there the risk of the appearance of conflict in respect of your position vis-à-vis the McGuire case? Might the proverbial “ordinary man on the Clapham omnibus” look at the situation and perceive an appearance of, and a risk of conflict?”

The answer to that question is – plainly – yes.

You should be aware of the fact that amongst a significant number of lawyers with whom I’ve discussed this question – both in Jersey and in the UK – you are completely and utterly alone in your view that you are not conflicted; indeed, it isn’t as though I have detected any ambiguity in the legal opinions I’ve sought.

You cannot hope to even get close to meeting the appearance of objectivity test.

It is, the proverbial, open & shut case.

To move to question 6: will you now accept the inevitable, the inescapable, and recognise that you are, and by extension any agent of yours is, hopelessly conflicted insofar as the McGuires are concerned?

7: Would you please provide to me a detailed explanation of how you imagine to be realistic and workable, the vast array of over-lapping and mutually exclusive duties undertaken by the Law Officers' Department as described on that Department's web-site under the heading " Main Functions of the Law Officers' Department"?

8: Would you please provide me with a copy of the detailed written guidance – which I assume must exist, surely – which defines "The Public Interest", and when, and in what circumstances, that supposed "public interest" can be invoked to prevent the charging or prosecutions of suspects?

I look forward to a detailed and timely response.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Senator Stuart Syvret
States of Jersey.

O'Donnell, Laurence

From: O'Donnell, Laurence
Sent: 18 December 2007 14:54
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: 'Tim Allen'; Robin Morris
Subject: FW: PPC & Child Protection Failures: URGENT[Scanned]
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

William

Robin and I have just spoken to Lennie regarding Senator Syvret's comments. We have advised that in relation to Syvret's concerns regarding intimidation it is not appropriate for a letter to be sent to any of the parties and there is no criminal offence disclosed at present. We have suggested that Syvret should take independent legal advice in any event. We understand that SCJP will be asking Syvret if he has any evidence in relation to his allegations regarding the Governors of Victoria College.

Regards

Laurence

-----Original Message-----

From: Harper, Lenny
Sent: 16 December 2007 11:33
To: O'Donnell, Laurence; Morris, Robin
Subject: FW: PPC & Child Protection Failures: URGENT[Scanned]
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

As per my last e mail guys. can you tell me if you think there are any criminal offences disclosed? See particularly the bit in red.

Lenny

Lenny Harper
Deputy Chief Officer
States of Jersey Police
Tele. [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]
E. Mail: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Stuart Syvret [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 December 2007 09:45
To: Harper, Lenny; Fossey, Alison; Power, Graham
Subject: FW: PPC & Child Protection Failures: URGENT[Scanned]
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

18/12/2007

Lenny, Alison & Graham

I forward here a self-explanatory e-mail which I sent last night to all members of the States Privileges & Procedures Committee, and the Greffier & Deputy Greffier of the States.

As you may have noticed in the media, I have had another run-in with the Establishment. As Father of the House I was giving the customary Christmas address, which I attach below. There is absolutely not one sentence of this speech which conflicts with standing orders or the States members code of conduct. It was entirely within order. Indeed, since it was printed in the JEP, I have had tremendous feedback from the public, including many victims, which support what I was saying and my right to say it.

My purpose in writing to you is that - given the speech was entirely within order (as was the answer which I gave in the Assembly to Deputy Martin back in July which triggered the engineering of my dismissal) - I am forced to regard the barracking down by Establishment members, and in particular the interference in my right to free speech by the Bailiff, as further components in the covering up of abuse, essentially attempts to pervert the course of justice.

As I explain below, the Bailiff is himself culpable for the period of time he was Chair of the Board of Governors of Victoria College when sustained child abuse, although know of by staff and governors, was not reported to the police. Indeed, his culpability in this matter may go some way to explain his unconstitutional and improper silencing of me.

I have warned PPC, towards the end of the e-mail below, that I will regard any further attempt to interfere with me as attempts to pervert the course of justice. There is an extremely strong probability that I will be a prosecution witness in several of the cases that ultimately come to Court; for example, those charges laid against the States of Jersey itself for its various illegal practices of institutionalised abuse of children - and of several potential cases of perverting or attempting to pervert the course of justice. Again, by States entities and/or individuals employed by the States of Jersey.

As a potential witness I feel extremely intimidated and under threat from the political Establishment. They are clearly intent on harassing me continually, publicly attacking me, silencing me in the Assembly with no just cause; I will, no doubt after today's PPC meeting which begins at 9.30, be under the threat of censure motions at the very least; more likely is suspension from the States along with the removal of my States lap-top and access to the States e-mail system. They may even seek to suspend me for a long period of time without pay. I could not afford this, as I have no assets and my only source of income is what I am paid as a States member. So, I repeat - I feel very threatened and intimidated by these people. As a potential witness against the Establishment in these child protection cases, I cannot regard their actions as anything other than an attempt to intimidate me as a witness and - a priori - mount these attacks to attempt to discredit me as a witness.

These are attempts to pervert the course of justice.

Of particular concern must be their possible removal of my States e-mail usage. I know from what I have heard on the grapevine that this has been a long-standing objective of theirs over the months, as they know the removal of such communication facilities would greatly hamper my own work, and thus any assistance I was able to give to the police.

I also heard from reliable sources that they even got very close to agreeing to fund Mike Pollard from taxpayers money to attempt to sue me for defamation. Provided the case was before a just and uncorrupted court, he would not win of course. Justification and fair comment are easily demonstrated on the facts. But they almost certainly realise this - their intention was to "put a frightener on me" and just to get me silenced, perhaps with an injunction.

I repeat - I feel under great threat from these people and am intimidated by them. Again, I repeat, nothing in the speech or anything in the answer I gave in July is or was against standing orders. Thus their actions against me are simply mob-rule & anarchy - designed to protect the Establishment from any disgrace which may fall upon them following the legal processes.

My purpose in writing is to seek your protection, as far as you are able, from these kind of attacks, assaults upon my right to free speech, threats and intimidation of me as a potential witness, and a priori attempts to undermine & discredit me as such a witness. I understand fully, of course, that it is not your role or wish to get involved in politics - and that given the nature of parliamentary privilege, certain legal peculiarities may exist.

18/12/2007

So I understand you options may be limited.

But after what I have gone through in the last 7 or 8 months - simply in lawful attempts to expose service failings, malpractice and abuse of vulnerable children - it isn't too much to ask for just a little bit of protection from these clowns. What I had in mind was a confidential letter to the Chair of PPC, The Bailiff, Deputy Bailiff and the Lieutenant Governor - perhaps from Graham or Lenny - warning them that their repeated obstructions of, and attacks upon me, are straying perilously close to the intimidation of and interference with a witness - and thus a potential perversion of the course of justice.

Could you do something like this? I need not be made public, just a clear warning to them.

As I said - after what I have gone through over the past 7 or 8 months, I don't feel a little protection from further harassment and oppression is asking too much.

Let me know what you think?

I attach the speech below.

Thanks

Stuart

<<Speech by Senator Stuart Syvret Shouted down and Disallowed.doc>>

From: Stuart Syvret

Sent: 11 December 2007 22:15

To: Derek Gray; Juliette G. Gallichan; Mike Vibert; Kenneth Le Brun; Gerard Baudains; Sarah Ferguson; Ian Gorst

Cc: Michael De La Haye (States Greffe); Anne Harris

Subject: PPC & Child Protection Failures

Importance: High

Dear Chairman & Members.

I note you are meeting tomorrow, and at that meeting you will be considering actions against me for what took place last week.

Within this context, there are a number of important points I must explain to you (unfortunately, even the procedural points, as these appear to have eluded everyone, including the Bailiff.)

Firstly, you all should acknowledge and accept that you are all conflicted from any involvement in pursuing any kind of enquiry or action against me whatsoever in respect of any issues arising out of, or related to, the child welfare & child protection controversy, with the possible sole exception of Deputy Baudains.

The reason for this is plain: all other members voted to dismiss me from the post of Minister for Health & Social Services. You have, therefore, placed yourselves in a position where you are hopelessly conflicted - far beyond any attempt to even appear as "an impartial tribunal".

Indeed, on the contrary, all those who voted for my removal when I was attempting to expose various child abuse scandals, now have a clear, unavoidable and inescapable personal political interest in further attacking me; this for the diversionary purpose of drawing attention away from the real issues - but in the case of PPC, more significantly maintaining desperate attempts to shore-up the collapsed edifice of the position its members chose to take.

Let us just recap that position, shall we?

I gave an answer to an oral question without notice from Deputy Martin on the subject of progress of the Kathy Bull recommendations. The full answer is in Hansard should any of you be faintly interested in examining the facts.

18/12/2007

In essence, the answer said that 'If the Deputy was asking me whether I had any great confidence in the entire child welfare & protection apparatus of the States, I would have to say, frankly, no.'

You have clearly not absorbed, or are unwilling or incapable of absorbing, the magnitude of what then transpired. This answer, when reported in the JEP a few days after its delivery, caused utter panic amongst senior civil servants, and other senior staff in the child welfare & protection sector. They knew my remarks were more than justified; they knew that their gross incompetence was possibly on the cusp of being exposed; they then set about engineering my dismissal as Minister.

This manifested itself in a letter "from" Iris Le Feuvre, to Senators Walker & Le Sueur which demanded my dismissal. I say "from" Mrs Le Fevre, because she was the signatory - the actual author was Marnie Baudains, Social Services Directorate Manager - and THE civil servant at which the buck stopped for the variety of gross service failures.

The evidence which proves the genesis of the letter is attached. An e-mail exchange from Dr Richard Lane at the Jersey General Hospital in which he informs me that the letter was substantively written by Marnie Baudains, that it was approved by certain other members of the then JCPC - all of whom carry substantial culpability for the grotesque failings towards vulnerable children; and that "advice from senior officers was obtained by Marnie Baudains prior to and after production of the draft and final letters." The senior officers in question being Mike Pollard & Richard Jouault.

The worth of the letter by Baudains can be readily assessed by the most cursory of research. For example, amongst the variety of lies it contains, it makes the assertion that I, by speaking out about a failing system, was putting children at greater risk. Every single respectable organisation working in the field of child welfare & protection say that it is always better to speak out against failing systems. That the Directorate Manager of Social Services should lie in stating the diametric opposite of the truth in her letter really goes a long way to explaining why this community is about to face an apocalyptic reckoning concerning decade after decade after decade of failures, cover-ups and deceptions concerning child abuse.

Thus most members of PPC & the States chose to side with corrupt and defective civil servants over the interests of vulnerable children.

Catastrophic political errors do not come much larger.

And now we know that I was right - the child welfare & protection system in Jersey has failed - repeatedly and disastrously. The Police expect to begin making arrests before Christmas.

The public reaction to the evidence once it emerges is likely to be deep and angry. Next year is an election year; it has to be recognised that there is a strong possibility that those who voted to support child abusers - for that, effectively, is what the vote amounted to - will not be re-elected.

And most members of PPC chose to side with the abusers - and those who have covered-up abuse.

Thus those members of PPC have an overriding personal & political interest in mounting diversionary attacks against me in a desperate attempt to salvage your careers.

As I said, with the possible exception of Deputy Baudains, all the remainder of you are hopelessly conflicted in any matter concerning me and the child protection controversies.

However - there is one member of PPC who is especially conflicted, namely Senator Mike Vibert. He was one of the other two thirds of the Corporate Parent at the time when my work to expose all the gross failings was taking place. Instead of siding with me in the protection of children, he chose to side with those who wanted the matter buried. Moreover, especially unforgivable as a part of the Corporate Parent, by taking the actions he did, by joining in with the civil servants and the CoM, he actively obstructed me in my legal duties to investigate child protection issues - child protection responsibility laying principally with the H & SS Minister.

Therefore Senator Vibert is even more hopelessly conflicted than the rest of PPC. He, like all PPC members, with the possible exception of Deputy Baudains, must declare himself conflicted and take no part in any actions against me, or, frankly, any matter that touches upon child welfare & protection.

I would now like to address two procedural issues - although these being blindingly obvious to 90% of the

public, they apparently elude the curious parallel universe that is the States of Jersey.

Consider the answer I gave in the States to Deputy Martin, which was the trigger for the engineering of my dismissal. The States assembly do not appear to have comprehended a crucial fact - a fact key to democracy, key to free speech - and key to good order in the chamber. The answer I gave was entirely, 100% in order.

It conflicted with no standing order, no part of the States members Code of Conduct, and no part of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

So let us just think about that, shall we? A Social Services Minister gave an entirely honest, frank and publicly important answer to a question asked of him in the parliament - an answer that was entirely in order and conflicted not one jot with any rule of procedure. And for giving this answer the senior civil service establishment, the Council of Ministers and, ultimately, the States assembly dismissed the Minister.

The States of Jersey have become the first and only legislature in the modern democratic world to have sacked a social services Minister for telling the truth.

Members of PPC, and most of the States clearly see nothing wrong with this. I could recommend several good books on 'Groupthink' which you clearly need to read.

Turning to the events of last week - again - tragically for the island, the States assembly simply disgraced itself yet further. One gets to a point when one imagines that the States cannot possibly sink any lower - yet somehow it always contrives to plumb new depths of ethical and intellectual bankruptcy.

Though I should in fairness point out that a number of members, many not those one might imagine to be political allies of mine, have contacted me since the speech was printed and said that they felt it was a good speech and I should not have been prevented from delivering it.

But as with the answer to Deputy Martin - the speech was entirely within order, it complied with all rules of procedure, it did not conflict with standing orders or the States members Code of Conduct.

So why - quite extraordinarily - was I prevented from delivering it?

The speech was stopped simply because some members, the Bailiff included, did not like what I was saying. I was barracked down, attacked and silenced - and to his shame the Bailiff joined in with this - simply because certain members did not want what I had to say to be heard.

To be clear - I was perfectly in order. Senator Le Main, Deputy Troy, Senator Walker and others were out of order, they were breaking various standing orders in an attempt to prevent the broadcast of a message that did not suit them politically. This is simply anarchy & mob-rule. And quite extraordinarily the Bailiff joined in with this illegal, anti-democratic assault upon free-speech and the rights of minority members.

To be clear, in speaking I was breaking no standing order - on the contrary, the standing orders and Code were being broken by Deputy Le Main, Deputy Troy, Senator Vibert & Senator Walker. And most profoundly and disturbingly, the gravest assault upon the States of Jersey Law and the standing orders was carried out by the Bailiff.

To recap - I gave an entirely honest, frank and publicly important answer to a question put to me in the States - an answer which was entirely in order with all rules & procedures - yet most of the States - including most of PPC, clearly do not like this and would instead have preferred that I had lied or spun my answer in some way. But for telling the truth, I become the victim of a witch-hunt.

And again - I give an important Christmas speech in the House - a speech which is entirely within all rules of procedure - and I get barracked and shouted down - and the Bailiff, who should be defending the rights of minority members, orders me to stop, then adjourns the meeting. He does this notwithstanding the fact that he is conflicted himself, and failed to declare this conflict, in that he was for a time Chair of the Board of Governors at Victoria College when child abuse was taking place over a period of years and it was not reported to the police.

Last week I - the first ever member of the States of Jersey to do so - the first ever person from within the island's elected authorities - was giving a speech which sought to acknowledge the suffering of the victims, to

18/12/2007

reach out to them, to show empathy, and to show compassion. The very first time a States member has ever stood in the chamber to do this - and I get shouted down for it - and silenced by the Bailiff. And you wonder why I view the States with such contempt?

But aside from all the above observations - you should pay particular regard to this warning.

The Police will, in due course, make a number of arrests and lay charges. The offences will fall largely within two categories - the abuse itself - and the cover-ups of abuse - namely perverting or attempting to pervert the course of justice.

I will certainly be a prosecution witness in certain of these cases; those concerned with issues such as institutionalised abuse - abuse carried out by the States of Jersey as an entity; and particularly a number of cases of perverting, or attempting to pervert the course of justice. Again, largely involving the States of Jersey and various of its employees.

As a witness, I regard all establishment actions against me as attempts to intimidate, deter, obstruct, hinder and prevent me from being the effective witness that Law and conscience requires of me.

As I do with the events of last week - I shall regard any attempt by PPC or any other member of the States to further intimidate or obstruct me as a clear attempt to effect a witness, and as such an attempted perversion of the course of justice. I will, without hesitation, report it to the States of Jersey Police as such.

Indeed, because of my role in uncovering the gross child abuse scandals, I have already had reason to inform the Police of concerns for my safety, and seek their advice.

Believe me - this time my constituents are going to get justice. And not PPC, not the Jersey Council of Ministers and not the States of Jersey are going to stand in my way. This time - after decades of contemptible failure - the vulnerable children of Jersey are going to gain recognition, justice and support. And the perpetrators are going to be brought to book.

Senator Stuart Syvret
States of Jersey

<<E-Mail Proof of Authorship of JCPC Letter.doc>>