
STATES OF JERSEY



CODE OF CONDUCT FOR ELECTED MEMBERS AND DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS: REVIEW

Presented to the States on 16th October 2009
by the Privileges and Procedures Committee

STATES GREFFE

REPORT

Foreword

The Privileges and Procedures Committee has been considering amendments to Standing Orders in relation to disciplinary sanctions for States members for some time and has now formulated the proposals for change that are set out in this Report.

As this issue is clearly of importance to all members the Committee has decided to circulate details of its proposals to members before the actual amendments to Standing Orders are finalised and lodged for debate. PPC welcomes any comments that States members may have on these proposals and will consider any comments received before lodging the actual amendments to Standing Orders for debate in due course. Comments can be sent to PPC c/o States Greffe or e-mailed to the Committee Clerk (a.heuston@gov.je) and should be submitted no later than Friday 13th November 2009.

Introduction

1. On 13th May 2009 the States adopted a proposition of the Deputy of St. John by 43 votes to 4 requesting the Committee to “review the Code of Conduct for Elected members of the States and the sanctions available for breaches of the Code”.
2. The present PPC had already begun work on reviewing the sanctions available in Standing Orders and this followed work that had been begun by the Committee as previously constituted. Amendments to Standing Orders had been drafted but were not presented to the States prior to the dissolution of the previous Committee as appropriate legal advice was sought on the amendments that had been prepared.
3. The proposition of the Deputy of St. John did not specifically call for the sanctions available under the Code to be strengthened as it simply requested PPC to review the matter. There were nevertheless comments made during the debate that the available sanctions were not sufficient for serious breaches of discipline. The Deputy of St. John expressed the view that, *“in putting any Code of Conduct together [he] would expect a monetary sanction available as well as a period of suspension from office, which would give a Member considerable thought as to the actions he or she takes against fellow Members”*. Senator F.E. Cohen said: *“in the current circumstances, proper sanctions are required,”* and Senator B.E. Shenton expressed a need for *“higher standards”*. During the debate, the Chairman of PPC made the following statement: *“the PPC does not necessarily feel that the Code is defective but it is not entirely effective and that is surely due to the lack of sanctions and this Assembly can rest assured that when PPC brings its proposals ... they will have been informed by the usual work that our officers do in investigating what happens in other jurisdictions, in other parliaments and they can rest assured that we hope to bring forward measured proposals; proposals which will reinforce the integrity which States Members must act with and not to challenge their democratic role.”*

Code of Conduct

4. The present Code of Conduct which is found in Schedule 3 to the Standing Orders has not been amended since the Standing Orders came into force in December 2005.
5. PPC does not consider that the Code itself is defective and does not believe that any significant amendments are necessary although the Committee believes it may be worthwhile to specify in the Code that members must not disclose publicly the contents of any debate held *in camera*. Although the Committee would have hoped that this was very much implicit when a debate is held *in camera* an investigation earlier this year showed that there was not specific provision in the Code or Standing Orders that required members to keep the details of *in camera* debates in confidence.
6. Other than this minor change the Committee believes that the Code itself is adequate. It is based very largely on similar Codes in many other jurisdictions and the present Committee and its predecessors have found no evidence that

the Code does not cover all necessary matters. The difficulties that have arisen in dealing with breaches of the Code have almost exclusively related to the available sanctions.

7. PPC has often been criticised for recommending no action when it has made a finding that the Code has been breached. The Committee would nevertheless point out that the range of sanctions available is limited and, in addition, it is not necessarily appropriate for a formal sanction to be recommended in every case of minor breach of the Code. PPC has nevertheless felt somewhat constrained in relation to serious breaches of the Code as it considers that the present provisions relating to suspension are too inflexible and not always appropriate.

Suspension from the States

8. Suspension from the States is a very serious sanction for any member and it is thankfully over 10 years since the States have had cause to vote on a suspension. Suspension is nevertheless a sanction available to parliaments to express their displeasure with any member who has committed a grave breach of order or other breach of the agreed rules of discipline. It is therefore important that suspension is seen as an effective deterrent for members. Some examples of suspension procedures and recent incidents in other parliaments are attached at the Appendix.
9. Suspension from the States Assembly may arise in a number of circumstances and the amendments being proposed distinguish between the various possibilities. A proposition to suspend a member could, for example, be lodged as a result of a serious breach of the Code of Conduct for Elected Members or some other incident outside the Assembly. In these circumstances a proposition must be lodged for 2 weeks and then debated in the usual way, with the only exception from the normal debating rules being that the member who is the subject of the proposition is able to speak twice.
10. Suspension may also be considered to be a necessary and more immediate sanction following an incident of disorderly behaviour in the States Assembly itself. Suspension of parliamentarians across the world often happens in these circumstances. At present, under Standing Order 110, the presiding officer can, after giving appropriate warnings, require a member to withdraw from the Chamber if the member has (a) obstructed the meeting; (b) conducted himself or herself in a grossly disorderly manner; (c) used offensive, objectionable, unparliamentary or disorderly words and refused, when directed by the presiding officer, to withdraw the words or apologise; (d) persistently or wilfully refused to conform to any standing order; or (e) persistently or wilfully disregarded the authority of the presiding officer. If the presiding officer exercises his or her powers in this way, the presiding officer can direct that the exclusion should last for the remainder of the day or for a lesser period if the presiding officer considers that to be more appropriate.
11. If a member is excluded by the presiding officer in these circumstances Standing Order 111 then allows any other member to propose, on the next day that the States meet, that the member who had been excluded on the previous sitting day should be suspended from the States. Standing Order 111 specifies

that any member can make this proposal if he or she considers that the requirement to withdraw on the previous sitting day was '*insufficient sanction for the actions of the member*'. Whether or not such a proposition will be considered appropriate will obviously depend on the circumstances of the exclusion. If a member has simply made an intemperate remark but, in the heat of the moment, refused to withdraw it and been excluded, other members may consider that no further sanction is required. If, however, a member has, for example, been grossly disorderly and had to be physically removed from the Chamber, other members may consider that suspension is an appropriate sanction and decide to propose this under Standing Order 111.

12. Any proposition to suspend a member made under Standing Order 111 would be debated in the normal way, with all members able to speak and the member who was the subject of the debate able to speak twice. PPC has reviewed whether this procedure, which is clearly appropriate in any other debate on suspension, is equally appropriate in the very particular circumstances of a proposition brought under Standing Order 111 on the next sitting day after exclusion. In practice all members would be fully aware of the events of the previous sitting day and would already have formed a view on whether any further sanction was necessary. It could be argued that to allow the matter to be debated at length could easily lead to a situation where the disorderly member simply decided to repeat the disorderly behaviour leading to a vicious circle of further exclusion from the Chamber etc. The previous Committee's research found no other parliament where proposed suspension immediately after disorderly conduct would be subject to a full debate, the normal parliamentary procedure being for the Speaker to put the matter to the vote immediately without debate.
13. Although PPC considered whether to propose amendments to the current procedures to restrict the scope of any debate the Committee concluded that, as the process has never been used to date (and hopefully will never need to be), there was no current evidence of a 'problem' that needed to be addressed and there would be significant disadvantages in restricting a member's right to defend himself or herself. As a result PPC has decided not to bring any amendments to the Standing Order 111 procedure at the present time. As a result the debating procedure for any proposition to suspend a member, whether after 2 weeks lodging or without notice under Standing Order 111, would remain as at present and the member who was the subject of the proposition would be able to speak twice in the debate.
15. As suspension is a serious sanction that should only be recommended following a proper investigation, and not in any way manipulated for political purposes, PPC believes that Standing Orders should be amended to provide that, subject to the exception below, only the Privileges and Procedures Committee can lodge a proposition to suspend a member. This would mean that a full investigation would be undertaken by the Committee, which represents all members of the States Assembly, before the proposition was lodged. There would, nevertheless, be an exception that a given number of States members, probably 6, could bring a proposition to suspend another member if PPC had been requested to do so and decided not to proceed. This would preserve the right of all members to bring forward matters for debate whilst ensuring that no suspension could be lodged before PPC had considered

the matter. In practice, of course, if PPC was to investigate a matter and decide not to lodge a vote of suspension this, in itself, would undoubtedly be an important factor for members to consider during the debate if the proposition was then brought by other members.

The effect of the suspension of a member

16. PPC considers that suspension is not only to be seen as a sanction but also as a deterrent. If the possibility of suspension is to have any deterrent effect to encourage members to conduct themselves in an appropriate way, the effect of suspension must be seen to be sufficiently serious. Having reviewed the current wording of Standing Order 164, PPC does not consider that the present provisions meet those criteria. PPC therefore believes that the present provisions on suspension should be strengthened and made more flexible. The comparison between the present provisions and the proposed changes can be summarised as follows.
17. **Access to the States Chamber and members' facilities.** At present a member who is suspended cannot access the Chamber and the members' facilities when the States are meeting. PPC wishes to amend this so that access would be totally prohibited during the period of suspension. The committee believes that it is curious that the States can vote to suspend a member only for that member to be able to access all the normal facilities throughout the suspension as long as the States are not meeting.
18. **Undertaking official responsibilities.** At present a suspended member cannot take part in any meeting of a committee such as PPC or PAC or a scrutiny panel but there is currently no restriction on a Minister continuing to undertake ministerial duties during a period of suspension from the States. In practice it is possible that a Minister may not survive politically after being suspended from States as a result of misconduct but PPC thinks that it is important to make it a formal requirement that a suspended member cannot undertake ministerial duties during a period of suspension. The Chief Minister, or another Minister nominated by him or her, would have to discharge the functions during the period of suspension as if the Minister was absent or indisposed.
19. **Lodging propositions, presenting reports and submitting questions.** At present a suspended member cannot lodge propositions or submit oral or written questions and only one minor change is proposed to specify that a suspended member cannot also present a comment or report to the States. This is of particular relevance in relation to a suspended member who is a Minister.
20. **Receiving remuneration.** At present a member who is suspended continues to receive his or her remuneration in the usual way. In some ways this could be said to reduce the effectiveness of the suspension and PPC notes that, for example, in the United Kingdom House of Commons remuneration is stopped completely during the period when a member cannot undertake his or her official duties as a result of suspension. As indicated below the proposed provisions on suspension are based on a form of graduated scale where the penalties available for a second or third period of suspension during a term of office are more severe than on the first occasion. PPC is proposing that

remuneration should not be ceased during a first suspension during each 3 year States cycle. However on the second suspension during the 3 year period PPC proposes that a member should lose half of his or her remuneration for the period of suspension. On any third and subsequent suspension the member's remuneration would be totally removed. In the event of a suspension lasting up to four meeting days this would represent a significant financial penalty and PPC is hopeful that it would therefore act as a significant deterrent in the very unlikely event that a member is suspended for a third time in a 3 year period.

21. **Length of suspension.** At present periods of suspension are fixed and there is no flexibility to adapt the period of suspension to the seriousness or otherwise of the matter for which the member is being suspended. PPC does not believe this is appropriate. In addition the Committee does not consider that the present periods are adequate. At present the period of suspension is counted by a number of meeting days as follows –

1st suspension during a term of office – 2 meeting days
 2nd suspension during a term of office – 4 meeting days
 3rd and subsequent suspension during a term of office – 6 meeting days

22. In each case the day on which the suspension starts counts as the first of the above days meaning that a first suspension only lasts for one more meeting day after the day on which the States vote on a suspension. If the States were meeting for 3 consecutive days, and the suspension was agreed on the first day, the suspended member would be able to return on day 3 and this can hardly be described as a serious sanction particularly as the member is currently remunerated throughout the period of suspension. PPC would point out that the current provisions are also inequitable as the actual length of a period of suspension is totally dependent on the schedule of States meeting dates. In the example above a member could return on day 3 of a 3 day sitting whereas if, for example, the suspension began on the last sitting day before the summer recess, it could last for over 8 weeks.
23. PPC believes that much greater flexibility should be given to the States when voting on suspension and also believes that the maximum periods should be related to a number of weeks and no longer be related to a certain number of States meetings. This will ensure that the period is not affected by the effect of periods of recess. In addition, to ensure fairness for all members in the present structure where the term of office of Senators is not the same as the term of office for Connétables and Deputies, PPC is proposing that the 'graduated' scale of sanction for a first, second or third and subsequent suspension should relate to the 3 year States cycle and not to a member's individual term of office.
24. Under PPC's proposals any proposition to suspend a member would, in future, need to specify a proposed period of suspension which would, in the normal way, be open to amendment. The period would nevertheless be subject to a maximum period of suspension to avoid open-ended suspensions of indefinite duration. The proposed maximum periods are as follows and PPC believes

that these represent an appropriate balance between the need for a suspension to be effective whilst not being unduly oppressive –

1st suspension during a 3 year States cycle – 1 week (with no loss of remuneration)

2nd suspension during a 3 year States cycle – 2 weeks (with loss of 50% of remuneration)

3rd and subsequent suspension during a 3 year States cycle – 4 weeks (with loss of all remuneration)

25. PPC believes that these periods are sufficient to act as a realistic deterrent and, because they are only maximum periods, it is possible that any proposition relating to a suspension would propose a period that was shorter than the maximum possible.

Suspension provisions in other jurisdictions

The table at the end of this section compares the provisions of the current Standing Orders relating to disorderly conduct in the States Chamber with those applied in –

- (a) the UK House of Commons;
- (b) the Australian House of Representatives;
- (c) the Canadian House of Commons;
- (d) the States of Guernsey;
- (e) the Isle of Man House of Keys; and
- (f) the National Assembly for Wales.

The table shows a significant degree of variation in approach to the issue, with the lightest touch having been adopted by Guernsey, where the presiding officer is empowered to propose that a named member be suspended for the remainder of the meeting day. There is no scope for debate, instead the matter is voted upon immediately. No provision for further sanction has been made.

Elsewhere, the presiding officers in Canada, the Isle of Man, Jersey and the UK are granted the power to order a member to withdraw for the remainder of the sitting without resorting to a proposition. In Australia the Speaker can also order withdrawal unilaterally, although the affected member is required to withdraw for one hour only. In the event that withdrawal is regarded as insufficient punishment, the option to suspend a member is generally available in the other jurisdictions. Parliaments in Jersey, Australia, Canada and the UK rely on a member other than the presiding officer to move a proposition calling for a member to be suspended, whereas in the Isle of Man it is the presiding officer that moves the motion (however, the Isle of Man House of Keys also requires that at least 16 of the 24 members vote in favour of suspension for such a motion to be adopted). The Welsh Assembly adopts a slightly different approach in that suspension is not pursued under Standing Orders unless the member refuses to comply with an order to withdraw. Of the jurisdictions listed, only Jersey employs a cooling off period following which, if a proposition to suspend is made, the member accused of disorderly conduct can present their case to the Assembly before the matter proceeds to a vote.

Regarding the effects, and length, of suspension, Jersey has adopted longer suspension periods than those permitted in Guernsey or Canada. The Isle of Man House of Keys has the option to take a much stronger line than Jersey in respect of second and subsequent suspension, with suspension lasting until the House resolves that it be terminated. The UK and Canadian House of Commons and the Welsh Assembly require that suspended members refrain from serving on committees (with the exception in the UK of committees for the consideration of private bills). Both the UK House of Commons and the Welsh Assembly withhold a member's salary for the duration of any suspension. This rule was introduced in the UK House of Commons in June 1998. It is also the case that a member who refuses to withdraw from the UK House of Commons, necessitating the use of force to ensure compliance, can be suspended for the remainder of that session.

Although the power of the UK House of Commons and the Welsh Assembly to withhold member's salary does not appear to have been adopted by a substantial number of other parliaments worldwide, broadly comparable rules do exist elsewhere. In 1991 the Parliament of New South Wales, Australia, adopted a motion that the consequence of suspension for disorder should be forfeiture of the relevant daily portion of the base salary of the member concerned. More recently, in November 2007 the Legislative Council of Western Australia was advised that it was unclear whether the enactment of legislation in 1975 had, by necessary implication, abrogated the power of the Council to suspend Members without pay¹. Although the Canadian House of Commons does not have the option to withhold a member's salary, the provincial Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan requires that members forfeit \$200 per day, while the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia deducts salary at a rate determined by the Assembly Management Commission.

When comparing procedures for addressing disorderly conduct in the States of Jersey with those of other jurisdictions, it is important to remember that Jersey operates largely without a political party system. In many other comparable jurisdictions individual members are held accountable by their party, as well as by the parliament and, ultimately, by the electorate. Clause 8 of the rule book of the Labour Party of the United Kingdom charges the party's National Executive Committee with upholding and enforcing the constitution, rules and standing orders of the party and *'to take any action it deems necessary for such purpose'*. It enjoys *'the power to suspend or take other administrative action against individual members of the party'* subject to the provisions of the party's own disciplinary rules.

Recent examples of suspensions in other jurisdictions

John McDonnell MP – UK House of Commons – 15th January 2009

On 15th January 2009, during questions that followed a statement made by the Secretary of State for Transport on future transport infrastructure in the United Kingdom, Mr. John McDonnell, the MP for Hayes and Harlington, rose and lifted the Mace as a protest against the proposals for the expansion of Heathrow Airport. He was immediately 'named' by the Deputy Speaker and the matter of his suspension put to the vote immediately without debate. In accordance with Standing Order 44(2) he was suspended for 5 sitting days.

4 Scottish Socialist MSPs – Scottish Parliament – 30th June 2005

In a protest related to the right to demonstrate at the G8 summit that was to be held in Scotland the following week 4 Scottish Socialist MSPs marched to the front of the Chamber during First Minister's questions brandishing placards. They were escorted from the Chamber on the instructions of the Presiding Officer and, later in the sitting, the Parliament agreed a motion that they should be excluded from all proceedings of the Parliament for the month of September 2005 and that their right of access to the Parliamentary complex, their right of access to Parliamentary facilities and services together with their salaries and allowances were withdrawn for that one month period.

¹ Select Committee of Privilege on a Matter Arising in the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations – November 2007

Lord Truscott and Lord Taylor of Blackburn – House of Lords – 21st May 2009

The House of Lords voted to suspend two Labour peers from Parliament until the end of the parliamentary session, a period of some six months for misconduct, the first such action since the 17th Century. Lord Truscott and Lord Taylor of Blackburn were found by a Lords committee to have been willing to seek to amend legislation in exchange for cash.

Appendix A – Suspension Procedure in Various Jurisdictions

JURISDICTION	CONDUCT DEFINED AS UNACCEPTABLE	INITIAL PROCEDURE	SUBSEQUENT SUSPENSION PROCESS	EFFECT OF SUSPENSION	DURATION OF SUSPENSION
Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obstruction of the meeting; • Conducting himself or herself in a grossly disorderly manner; • Use of offensive, objectionable, unparliamentary or disorderly words and a refusal, when directed by the presiding officer, to withdraw the words or apologise; • Persistent or wilful refusal to conform to any standing order; or • Persistent or wilful disregard of the authority of the presiding officer. 	<p>The presiding officer can require a member to withdraw from the States for the remainder of the day or for a lesser period.</p>	<p>Where the presiding officer has required a member of the States to withdraw from the Chamber, another member of the States may propose without notice that the member be suspended from the service of the States.</p> <p>The proposal may only be made on the meeting day or continuation day following the day on which the member is required to withdraw.</p> <p>The States may decide to debate the proposal immediately or later in the same meeting, or to list the proposal for debate at another meeting.</p>	<p>Required to leave the precincts of the States immediately and not return at any time when the States are meeting.</p> <p>Not permitted to part in any meeting of a panel or committee established by standing orders.</p> <p>Not permitted to lodge a proposition;</p> <p>Not permitted to ask any written or oral question in the States.</p>	<p>1st suspension = 2 meeting days or continuation days;</p> <p>2nd suspension = 4 meeting days or continuation days;</p> <p>3rd or subsequent suspension = 6 meeting days or continuation days.</p> <p>(n.b. Suspensions incurred during a previous term of office are not counted)</p>
Guernsey	<p>Presiding Officer considers that the conduct of a Member is grossly disorderly or offensive</p>	<p>The presiding officer proposes that the named member be suspended from the service of the States. No debate on or amendment is permitted. If the proposition is carried, the member is directed to withdraw.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Required to withdraw from the Meeting and to leave the precincts of the States Chamber.</p>	<p>Until the close of the business of the Meeting on the day on which such suspension was imposed.</p>

JURISDICTION	CONDUCT DEFINED AS UNACCEPTABLE	INITIAL PROCEDURE	SUBSEQUENT SUSPENSION PROCESS	EFFECT OF SUSPENSION	DURATION OF SUSPENSION
Isle of Man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House; • Disorderly conduct; • Persistent interruption; • Disregarding the authority of the Speaker. 	After a formal warning, the Speaker may order the member to withdraw immediately from the House for the remainder of that day's sitting.	<p>If the Speaker considers that the order to withdraw is inadequate, or if a member is absent without leave, the Speaker may name the member, and move (without provision for amendment, adjournment or debate) that the member be suspended from the service of the House and, if supported by a majority, the member shall withdraw.</p> <p>The member may be present while the motion is discussed and the motion cannot be carried unless it is supported by at least 16 Members.</p>	<p>Not permitted to attend sittings of Tynwald.</p> <p>Forfeiture of access to all facilities available to members.</p>	<p>1st suspension = up to and including the next sitting of the House;</p> <p>2nd and subsequent suspensions = until the House resolves that it be terminated.</p>
UK House of Commons	<p>Grossly disorderly conduct is sufficient to order withdrawal for the remainder of the day.</p> <p>Disregarding the authority of the chair, or persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House by abusing the rules of the House or otherwise, can result in the member being named.</p>	The Speaker can require the member to withdraw for the remainder of that day's sitting.	<p>If on any occasion the Speaker, or the chairman, deems that his powers under the previous provisions are inadequate, he may name such Member or Members.</p> <p>Having named the member, the Speaker puts the question, on a motion being made, 'That such Member be suspended from the service of the House'.</p>	<p>Requirement to withdraw from the precincts of the House immediately.</p> <p>Salary withheld for the duration of the suspension.</p> <p>Not permitted to attend committee meetings, other than those for the consideration of a private bill to which he may have been appointed before the suspension (distinction exists because of the quasi-judicial nature of private bill committees).</p>	<p>1st suspension = 5 sitting days;</p> <p>2nd suspension = 20 sitting days;</p> <p>Subsequent occasions = until such time as the House considers the suspension should terminate.</p> <p>If force is necessary the Speaker may declare that the member is suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of the session.</p>

JURISDICTION	CONDUCT DEFINED AS UNACCEPTABLE	INITIAL PROCEDURE	SUBSEQUENT SUSPENSION PROCESS	EFFECT OF SUSPENSION	DURATION OF SUSPENSION
Australia	<p>Persistent and wilful obstruction of the House;</p> <p>Use of objectionable words, which the member subsequently refuses to withdraw;</p> <p>Persistent and wilful refusal to conform to a standing order;</p> <p>Wilfully disobeying an order of the House;</p> <p>Persistent and wilful disregard of the authority of the Speaker;</p> <p>Conduct that the Speaker considers disorderly.</p>	<p>The Speaker can require that the member withdraw for one hour.</p> <p>If a Member refuses to follow the Speaker's direction, the Speaker may order the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove the Member from the Chamber or the Main Committee or take the Member into custody.</p>	<p>If the Member does not leave the Chamber immediately, the Speaker can name the Member.</p> <p>Immediately following a naming, on a motion being moved, the Speaker shall put the question—</p> <p><i>That the Member be suspended from the service of the House.</i></p> <p>The question must be resolved without amendment, adjournment or debate.</p> <p>If the Speaker determines there is an urgent need to protect the dignity of the House, the Speaker can order a grossly disorderly Member to leave the Chamber immediately. When the Member has withdrawn, the Speaker must immediately name the Member and put the question for suspension without a motion being necessary. If the question is resolved in the negative, the Member may return to the Chamber.</p>	<p>Exclusion from the Chamber, its galleries and the room in which the Main Committee is meeting.</p>	<p>1st suspension = 24 hours</p> <p>2nd suspension = 3 consecutive sittings following the day of suspension; and</p> <p>3rd suspension = 7 consecutive sittings following the day of suspension.</p> <p>(Suspensions incurred during the course of a previous calendar year are not counted.)</p>

JURISDICTION	CONDUCT DEFINED AS UNACCEPTABLE	INITIAL PROCEDURE	SUBSEQUENT SUSPENSION PROCESS	EFFECT OF SUSPENSION	DURATION OF SUSPENSION
Canada	Not defined in standing orders beyond disregarding the authority of the Chair.	The Speaker can require a member to withdraw for the remainder of the sitting (as a consequence of naming).	It is practice that after being named by the Speaker, a Minister, usually the Government House Leader, moves a motion to suspend the Member,	Exclusion from the House. If suspended by motion the Member is barred both from the House and from attending committees.	Suspension period is determined by the House but is typically for the remainder of the day's sitting. There are no guidelines for such cases.
National Assembly for Wales	(i) engaging in conduct which would, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer, constitute a criminal offence or contempt of court; (ii) obstructing the business of the Assembly; (iii) seeking to raise a matter outside the scope of the debate or motion; (iv) discourteous or unbecoming conduct; (v) using disorderly, discriminatory or offensive language or language which detracts from the dignity of the Assembly; (vi) refusing to conform to any Standing Order or other requirement for the conduct of Members; or (vii) disregards the authority of the chair.	A Member may be required by the Presiding Officer to withdraw from Assembly proceedings for the remainder of the day if the Presiding Officer considers the conduct such as to warrant withdrawal.	When the Presiding Officer has required a Member to withdraw from Assembly proceedings and the Member has not done so, a motion to exclude the Member from Assembly proceedings must be proposed by the Presiding Officer and must be voted on immediately.	Salary forfeited for the duration of the suspension; Not permitted to attend any Assembly proceedings.	(i) on the first occasion during any 12 month period, until the end of the working day immediately following the day of exclusion; (ii) on a second occasion during the same 12 month period, for five working days immediately following the day of exclusion; and (iii) on a third or any subsequent occasion during the same 12 month period, for 20 working days immediately following the day of exclusion.

N.B. Each of the jurisdictions listed empowers its presiding officer with authority to suspend proceedings without notice in the event that business is disrupted by grave disorder.