

STATES OF JERSEY



COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY: HISTORICAL CHILD ABUSE – ADDITIONAL FUNDING (P.20/2015) – AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 10th March 2015
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade

STATES GREFFE

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY: HISTORICAL CHILD ABUSE – ADDITIONAL
FUNDING (P.20/2015) – AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (c) –

- (1) Delete sub-paragraph (c)(ii).
- (2) Delete sub-paragraph (c)(iv).
- (3) Delete sub-paragraph (c)(v).

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

REPORT

On this proposition, the Chief Minister was reported in the media (I trust accurately) that: *in order to preserve its independence the Inquiry must be allowed to complete its work unhindered – a move that means a cap on its budget would simply not work.*

We know that there have been suggestions from some politicians, who never wanted or supported the Committee of Inquiry, that the Inquiry should be closed down. The Chief Minister has thankfully emphasized that not only must the Committee continue, but that it should do so unimpeded.

Sub-paragraph (c)(ii)

I am uneasy about adding any additional terms of reference at all at this time, but the one that causes me most alarm is sub-paragraph (c)(ii), which asks the States to agree that a separate procedural terms of reference be appended in order that the Inquiry operates within the agreed revised budget of £13.7 million.

To me, this does put a cap on spending and may have the negative consequence of restricting the work of the Inquiry and/or making the Inquiry team feel restricted as to what process, methodology and areas of investigation they pursue.

It also seems unnecessary, given that paragraphs (a) and (b) are both sufficient to indicate: (1) the new budget allocation; and (2) the fact that any further requests for money (if any) will be for the Assembly to consider at that time. This should be a sufficient safeguard for those members genuinely concerned about costs.

Sub-paragraph (c)(iv)

Similarly, if putting a cap on funding is undesirable and/or impractical, then surely the same could be argued to apply capping the length of the Inquiry.

Given the professional nature and experience of those involved, it would seem unlikely that the Inquiry team would take any more or less time than were necessary for them to present their final report.

Sub-paragraph (c)(v)

This paragraph appears both unnecessary and, quite frankly, patronizing.

The Inquiry team are independent and professional individuals, and they can make their own decisions: *to make full use of all available published and unpublished reports which it deems relevant to the Terms of Reference.* As such, it should be deleted.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no additional financial or manpower implications arising from these amendments.