

STATES OF JERSEY



HUSTINGS FILMING

**Lodged au Greffe on 9th March 2022
by Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour
Earliest date for debate: 25th April 2022**

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

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

to refer to their Act of 6th November 2013, in which it was agreed, amongst other things, that conventional hustings meetings should be web streamed, and to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee to film hustings in parish halls at the next and subsequent general elections rather than only film proposed online hustings, as is currently suggested.

DEPUTY J.M. MAÇON OF ST. SAVIOUR

REPORT

As seen in written answers 54/2022 and 81/2022 PPC has taken upon itself to completely change the hustings provisions with no consultation from anyone who has participated in, or has had to organize, hustings.

The filming of hustings is a centrally approved resource provided by the States Assembly. PPC has decided to change this without referring this proposal back to the Assembly - reducing the budget allocation for this work and then using the money to do work elsewhere without States Assembly approval. This is despite the fact that the Assembly specifically authorised the web streaming of hustings in adopting [P.110/2013](#).

The forced online provision, in the States Assembly, removes the ability of candidates to choose the rules of their hustings or how they operate. It's a take or leave it offering from PPC - this is unacceptable. If candidates do not want to use the provision in the States Assembly they then lose the chance of any funding for filmed and uploaded hustings.

There is no explanation offered as to how questions will be vetted to ensure, for example, questions are from the registered voters in the designated district. Further there is no guidelines as to how candidates can change any of the rules governing this.

How are planted questions to be dealt with?

What are the rules governing electronic devices whereby candidates can receive answers to questions from those asking them in real time?

How will individuals who don't have access to the Internet be able to participate in a meaningful way?

And so on and so forth.

This move also breaches the Venice Commission principles in that any changes to elections and their processes should be in place at least a year before a (general) election.

The due process to govern a hustings process is very important but has to be agreed by the participating candidates.

It's bizarre to have a situation whereby PPC has confirmed that hustings are the responsibility for candidates but then wishes to impose its own model for hustings with the associated allocated funding with no consultation or States Assembly approval and remove centrally funded resource for those that do not wish to use this format.

Financial and manpower implications

The Greffe has been allocated a specific budget for the election, from which the web streaming of conventional hustings can be accommodated. Other election initiatives may need to be cut in order to ensure hustings can be filmed, or additional budget for the election may need to be found from other elements in the Greffe budget.