

STATES OF JERSEY

r

DRAFT STANDING ORDERS OF THE STATES OF JERSEY (P.162/2005): THIRD AMENDMENTS

**Lodged au Greffe on 13th September 2005
by the Privileges and Procedures Committee**

STATES GREFFE

DRAFT STANDING ORDERS OF THE STATES OF JERSEY (P.162/2005):
THIRD AMENDMENTS

1 PAGES 37-38, STANDING ORDER 1 –

In paragraph (1) –

- (a) *for the definition “budget proposition” substitute the following definition –*

“ ‘budget proposition for a financial year’ means a budget proposition mentioned in Article 17(1) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2005;”;

- (b) *after the definition “proposition” insert the following definition –*

“ ‘relevant taxation draft’ means a taxation draft referred to in Article 17(3) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2005;”;

- (c) *in the definition “States” omit the words “constituted under Article 2(1) of the Law”;*
(d) *delete the definition “taxation draft”.*

2 PAGE 41, STANDING ORDER 5 –

- (a) *In paragraph (1) for the word “7” substitute the word “4”;*
(b) *in paragraph (3) after the words “The Bailiff” insert the words “, as soon as practicable and after consultation with the chairman of the PPC,”.*

3 PAGE 44, STANDING ORDER 15 –

After paragraph (5) add the following paragraph –

“(6) When a question has been approved, the Greffier shall, as soon as practicable, forward a copy of the question to the member to whom it is addressed.”.

4 PAGES 45-46, STANDING ORDER 17 –

- (a) *For the heading substitute the heading “**Notice of intention to make statement on a matter of official responsibility**”;*
(b) *after paragraph (1) insert the following paragraph –*

“(2) Any member of the States may make a statement during a meeting on a public matter for which the member has an official responsibility.”;

- (c) *in paragraph (2) for the words “An office holder wishing to make a statement” substitute the words “A person wishing to make a statement on a matter of official responsibility”;*
(d) *in paragraph (6) –*

- (i) *for the words “an office holder leave to make a statement” substitute the words “a person leave to make a statement on a matter of official responsibility”,*
 - (ii) *for the words “the office holder” substitute the words “the person”,*
- and renumber the paragraphs in Standing Order 17 accordingly.*

5 PAGE 47, STANDING ORDER 21 –

In paragraph (6)(c) for the words “ensure that the proposer is” substitute the words “direct that the proposer be”.

6 PAGE 48, NEW STANDING ORDER –

After Standing Order 23 insert the following Standing Order and renumber the remaining Standing Orders accordingly –

“-- Additional requirement for amending proposition

A proposition which a member of the States wishes to lodge in his or her own right, and which is to amend a proposition lodged by a body of which he or she is a member, cannot be lodged unless he or she has informed the body of his or her wish to lodge it.”.

7 PAGE 48, STANDING ORDER 26 –

In paragraph (3) delete subparagraph (e) and renumber the remaining subparagraphs accordingly.

8 PAGE 50, NOTE TO STANDING ORDER 26 –

After the words “budget proposition” insert the words “for a financial year”.

9 PAGE 51, STANDING ORDER 31 –

For paragraph (2)(b) substitute the following sub-paragraph –

“(b) a budget proposition for a financial year, including any relevant taxation draft;”.

10 PAGE 52, STANDING ORDER 35 –

In paragraph (1) after subparagraph (b) insert the following subparagraph and renumber the remaining sub-paragraphs accordingly –

“(c) any member of the States, on a public matter for which that member has an official responsibility;”.

11 PAGE 56, STANDING ORDER 51 –

Delete the words “, in French”.

12 PAGE 61, STANDING ORDER 68 –

- (a) *For the heading substitute the heading “**Statement on a matter of official responsibility**”;*
- (b) *in paragraph (1) for the words “Minister, or a chairman or president of a committee or panel, or the chairman of the Comité, is to make a statement” substitute the words “member of the States is to make a statement on a matter for which he or she has responsibility as an office holder or on a public matter for which he or she otherwise has an official responsibility”;*
- (c) *in paragraph (3) for the words “Minister, chairman or president” substitute the words “member of the States”.*

13 PAGES 62-63, STANDING ORDER 72 –

- (a) *After paragraph (1) insert the following paragraphs –*

“(2) If the chairman of the relevant scrutiny panel informs the States that he or she does not wish to have the draft referred to the panel, any member of the States may propose, without notice, that the States request the panel to reconsider the decision.

(3) If the States agree to the proposal –

- (a) the 2nd reading of the draft shall not continue at the meeting; and
- (b) the presiding officer shall, at the next meeting, ask the chairman of the relevant scrutiny panel whether, the panel having reconsidered the matter, he or she wishes to have the draft referred to the panel.”;

- (b) *after paragraph (6) insert the following paragraph –*

“(–) If both the chairman and vice chairman of the relevant scrutiny panel are absent when a question is to be put to the chairman by the presiding officer pursuant to this standing order, the presiding officer shall instead ask the members of that panel who are present, and any one of them may answer.”;

- (c) *for paragraph (7) substitute the following paragraph –*

“(7) This standing order shall not apply to any relevant taxation draft included in a budget proposition for a financial year.”,

and renumber the paragraphs in Standing Order 72 accordingly.

14 PAGE 63, STANDING ORDER 73 –

- (a) *For paragraph (1) substitute the following paragraph –*

“(1) The States may decide to continue the 2nd reading of a draft Law or draft Regulations –

- (a) where the draft has not been referred to the relevant scrutiny panel and the States have not requested that panel to reconsider its decision not to have the draft referred, immediately following the debate on the principles of the draft; or

- (b) where the States have requested the panel to reconsider its decision not to have the draft referred, immediately following the chairman of the panel informing the States, the panel having reconsidered the matter, that he or she does not wish to have the draft referred to the panel.”;

(b) *for paragraph (3) substitute the following paragraph –*

“(3) The meeting must not be later than the 2nd meeting, disregarding any additional meeting day, following the meeting at which the States could have continued the 2nd reading pursuant to paragraph (1).”

15 PAGE 65, STANDING ORDER 79 –

(a) *In paragraph (1) for the words “a scrutiny panel” substitute the words “the States”;*

(b) *for paragraph (1)(b) substitute the following sub-paragraph –*

“(b) the States request the relevant scrutiny panel to consider having the proposition referred to it.”;

(c) *for paragraph (2)(b) substitute the following sub-paragraph –*

“(b) a budget proposition for a financial year, including any relevant taxation draft.”;

(d) *for paragraphs (3) to (5) substitute the following paragraphs –*

- “(3) If the States agree to the proposal, the debate shall be suspended until the next meeting.
- (4) At the next meeting, the presiding officer shall ask the chairman of the relevant scrutiny panel whether he or she wishes to have the proposition referred to the panel and –
 - (a) if the chairman confirms that, the panel having considered the matter, he or she does not wish to have the proposition referred to the panel, the States may either resume the debate immediately or decide at which meeting the debate shall be listed to resume; or
 - (b) if the chairman confirms that, the panel having considered the matter, he or she wishes to have the proposition referred to the panel, the States must decide at which meeting the debate shall be listed to resume.
- (5) The debate must be listed to resume at a meeting which is not later than the 4th meeting, disregarding any additional meeting day, following the meeting at which the chairman confirms the panel’s decision.
- (6) The debate on the proposition may resume, notwithstanding that the scrutiny panel has not reported on it.
- (7) The relevant scrutiny panel is the scrutiny panel or panels assigned scrutiny of the topic to which the proposition relates.
- (8) If there is doubt as to which is the relevant scrutiny panel, the presiding officer shall take the advice of the president of the chairmen’s committee.
- (9) If both the chairman and vice chairman of the relevant scrutiny panel are absent when a question is to be put to the chairman by the presiding officer pursuant to this standing order, the presiding officer shall instead ask the members of the panel who are present, and any one of them may answer.”.

16 PAGE 65, STANDING ORDER 80 –

- (a) *In the heading delete the words “(with approval of presiding officer)”;*
- (b) *in paragraph (1) delete the words“, with the approval of the presiding officer,”.*

17 PAGE 67, STANDING ORDER 84 –

Delete paragraph (7).

18 PAGE 79, STANDING ORDER 115 –

- (a) *In paragraph (1) after the words“nomination of” insert the words “an elected member as”;*
- (b) *after paragraph (2) insert the following paragraph –*

“(3) In this standing order “elected member” –

- (a) includes a person who has been elected as a Senator, Deputy or Connétable, but who has not yet taken his or her oath of office; and
- (b) does not include a Senator, Deputy or Connétable whose term of office expires upon a person mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) taking his or her oath of office.”

19 PAGE 79, STANDING ORDER 116 –

In paragraph (5) for the word “20” substitute the word “40”.

20 PAGE 81, STANDING ORDER 118 –

For paragraphs (5) and (6) substitute the following paragraphs –

- “(5) If more than one person is nominated, the presiding officer shall then, according to the order in which the candidates were nominated, invite each candidate to speak for up to 10 minutes.
- (6) After a candidate has spoken, the presiding officer shall allow up to 20 minutes for elected members to question the candidate.
- (7) While a candidate is speaking or being questioned, other candidates must withdraw from the Chamber to a place where they cannot hear the proceedings in it.
- (8) When the speeches and questions are concluded, a secret ballot shall be held.
- (9) The candidate who receives more than half of the votes cast is selected for appointment and assignment to the Ministerial office proposed.”

and renumber the remaining paragraphs in Standing Order 118 and the cross-reference in them accordingly.

21 PAGE 92, STANDING ORDER 134 –

For paragraph (3) substitute the following paragraph –

“(3) An elected member cannot be a member of more than 2 scrutiny panels and can only be chairman of one.”.

22 PAGE 100, STANDING ORDER 153 –

Delete paragraph (3).

23 PAGE 102, STANDING ORDER 161 –

(a) *For paragraph (3) substitute the following paragraph –*

“(3) The Minister for Treasury and Resources must, at least 15 working days before any binding arrangement is made for the disposal, acquisition, letting or rental of land on behalf of the public of Jersey which does not, by virtue of paragraph (2), require the prior agreement of the States, present to the States a document setting out the recommendation which he or she has accepted.”;

(b) *after paragraph (3) insert the following paragraph –*

“(4) Nothing in this standing order requires the States to agree, or the Minister for Treasury and Resources to accept or present to the States any information regarding, the grant, renewal, extension or variation of a tenancy that is terminable upon giving one month’s notice or less.”

and renumber the remaining paragraph in Standing Order 161 accordingly.

24 PAGES 108-110, SCHEDULE 2 –

(a) *In paragraph 3(1) insert the word “any” before the word “company” where it first appears;*

(b) *in paragraph 7(2) insert the words “spouse or” before the word “cohabitee”;*

(c) *in paragraph 8(1) for the words “his spouse” substitute the words “his or her spouse”.*

PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

REPORT

Introduction

The Privileges and Procedures Committee made it very clear when lodging the draft Standing Orders (P.162/2005) on 9th August 2005 that it remained open to discussion and comment on the draft and would be willing to consider amendments if appropriate.

The Committee is grateful for the various comments it has received to date and, in particular, for the helpful discussion that took place at the presentation for all members on 6th September 2005. The Committee is lodging these amendments to address some of the concerns raised and rectify oversights and minor errors that have been drawn to its attention since the lodging date.

Details of amendments

Amendments 1(a), (b) and (d)

These amendments are largely consequential on a substantive change to Standing Order 72 and 79 made by Amendment 13(c) and 15(c) which is explained below.

Amendment 1(c)

The Committee's attention has been drawn to the fact that the definition of "States" given in P.162/2005, namely "the States of Jersey constituted under Article 2(1) of the [States of Jersey] Law [2005]" could imply that the Assembly with its long history was, in some way, 'created' by a 2005 statute. This would clearly be inappropriate and this amendment simply removes reference to the Law.

Amendment 2(a)

During the presentation to all members on 6th September 2005 there was discussion about the discrepancy between the fact that 7 members would be required to requisition a meeting of the States whereas only 4 (proposer and 3 others) were required to lodge a vote of no confidence. As the decision on the number of members required to bring a vote of no confidence was agreed by the States in response to a proposition brought in 2004 by Senator Syvret, the Committee decided that it would be inappropriate to make any change to that provision. Nevertheless, in order to address the discrepancy, the Committee is proposing this amendment to Standing Order 5 which will mean that only 4 members will be needed to requisition a meeting. Although requisitioned meetings are extremely rare (as in practice they are only likely to be needed during a long recess) a vote of no confidence could be one occasion when a requisitioned meeting would be appropriate and this change will bring the 2 procedures into line with each other.

Amendment 2(b)

During the presentation on 6th September it was pointed out that there is currently no time limit specified in Standing Order 5 to show when a requisitioned meeting must be held. Although, in practice, it is likely that the Bailiff would take steps to convene the States 'as soon as practicable', this amendment will put the matter beyond doubt by specifying that he must do this, after consultation with the chairman of PPC to discuss an appropriate date.

Amendment 3

It has been pointed out to the Committee that there is an omission in Standing Order 15 as there is currently no formal requirement for the Greffier to notify the member to whom an urgent oral question is addressed once it is approved. This amendment rectifies the omission and mirrors the procedures in Standing Orders 11(7) and 13(8) in relation to written and oral questions respectively.

Amendment 4

The Committee's attention has been drawn to the fact that the list in Standing Order 17 of the persons who can make a statement on a matter of official responsibility would, as drafted, prevent members with certain official responsibilities making a statement. These could, for example, include the Attorney General, the Chairman of the future Overseas Aid Commission or the Chairman of the Commission Amicale. This amendment rectifies the oversight by providing that any member with an official responsibility for a public matter may make a statement under this Standing Order. Consequential changes are set out in Amendment 12 below which makes the necessary amendment to Standing Order 68.

Amendment 5

The purpose of this amendment is to clarify that the Bailiff will not necessarily be required to undertake the notification of the reasons why a proposition is out of order to the member himself but must 'direct' that the proposer be notified. This mirrors the wording used in relation to questions in Standing Orders 11, 13 and 15. In practice it is likely that the Bailiff will simply request the Greffier to notify the member concerned of the reasons.

Amendment 6

At present, following rulings from the Bailiff, it is not possible for a member of a Committee to lodge an amendment to a proposition brought by that Committee without first resigning from the Committee concerned. Although this situation will arise less frequently in the future with the abolition of the Committee system it is possible that there will be occasions when, for example, members of a scrutiny panel or the Council of Ministers may wish to lodge an amendment to a proposition in the name of that body. This amendment makes it clear that this will be possible but, as a courtesy, the member will be required to notify the body concerned of his or her intention.

Amendment 7

This amendment is consequential on a substantive change to Standing Order 80 made by Amendment 16 which is explained below.

Amendments 8 and 9

These amendments are largely consequential on a substantive change to Standing Order 72 and 79 made by Amendment 13(c) and 15(c) which is explained below.

Amendment 10

This amendment mirrors, for the presentation of reports, the change in relation to statements made by Amendment 4 above. This amendment will allow any member with an official responsibility for a public matter to present a document or comment to the States.

Amendment 11

It has been pointed out to the Committee that it is unnecessary and somewhat inappropriate to specify in Standing Orders that the first roll call is conducted 'in French' when this is not specified for matters such as prayers or second roll call which are also conducted in French. In addition the use of the words in this Standing Order might be seen to imply that French could not be used in other circumstances in the Assembly. For the avoidance of any confusion this amendment removes the words 'in French'. The Committee would stress that it has no intention of proposing any change to the tradition of conducting this part of the proceedings in the French language.

Amendment 12

This amendment is consequential on the change made by Amendment 4 which is explained above.

Amendment 13(a), 13(b) and 14

Significant changes are being proposed to Standing Orders 72 and 73 to reflect comments received from members and made at the presentation on 6th September.

In comments received and during discussions at the presentation to all members it was suggested that the States as a whole should be able to refer a draft law for scrutiny rather than restricting this provision to the panel itself. The Committee considered the views expressed very carefully but was also conscious of the need to ensure that panels remained in control of their agendas without having matters imposed on them. These amendments set out a compromise position that the Committee believes meets the concerns expressed as well as preserving the overall autonomy of the scrutiny function to set its own work programme.

The amendments will allow any member to propose without notice that a draft be referred to a scrutiny panel even if the panel has indicated that it does not wish to exercise its automatic right to seek a referral. Under the proposed amended procedures the panel would then need to assess by the next meeting of the States whether or not it wished to scrutinize the draft in accordance with the request of the States. The panel would no doubt be expected to explain its reasons if it felt unable to comply with the request. Once the decision of the panel was known it would be possible for the States to fix a date for the resumption of the debate.

Amendment 13(b)

This amendment is to clarify that if both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of a scrutiny panel are not present the request to refer draft legislation to the panel can be made by any member of the panel. As originally drafted the Standing Order only referred to the Chairman and, although Standing Order 134(6) would have allowed the Vice Chairman to act in the Chairman's absence, there was no provision for the absence of both of them together.

Amendment 13(c)

This amendment and associated Amendment 14(b) vary the current restriction on matters that cannot be referred to scrutiny under Standing Orders 72 (and Standing Order 79 for Amendment 15(c)). In order to ensure that urgent matters that need to be implemented are not delayed during the annual budget debate, the Committee agreed that taxation drafts contained in the budget or the budget proposition itself should not be capable of being referred to scrutiny under these procedures. It was nevertheless pointed out to the Committee that as originally drafted the provisions would have prevented any taxation draft from being referred to scrutiny. This was clearly not the Committee's intention as taxation drafts might also be brought forward for debate at other times of the year. This amendment and other associated ones referred to in Amendments 1(a), (b), (d), 8, 9 and 15(c), make this change by limiting the restriction to matters which form part of the actual annual budget debate. As set out in the report accompanying P.162/2005 the Committee is nevertheless hopeful that adequate scrutiny of financial measures will take place in advance of the budget debate itself.

Amendment 15(a), (b) and (d)

This amendment is similar to the one made to Standing Order 72 by Amendments 13(a), 13(b) and 14 referred to above. In response to concerns from members the Committee is proposing that any member of the States, not only a member of a scrutiny panel, can propose that a debate be suspended so that a panel can be requested to scrutinize the matter. As with Standing Order 72 the panel would then need to assess by the next meeting whether it was able to undertake a review in response to the request. Once again, as with a request in relation to draft legislation under Standing Order 72, the panel would no doubt wish to explain its reasons if it was not able to comply with any request from the States. Although scrutiny panels will hopefully be responsive to requests of this nature the Committee believes it is important to recognise that panels will normally be working to an agreed work programme and will not always be able to take on additional reviews at short notice.

Amendment 15(c)

This amendment is explained in the report on Amendment 13(c) above.

Amendment 16

This amendment makes a significant change to Standing Order 80. As currently worded a proposal to suspend a Standing Order cannot be made without the approval of the presiding officer. Having given this matter further consideration, the Committee believes that this places an unnecessary and inappropriate restriction on the States' ability to regulate their own proceedings. Any proposal to suspend a Standing Order will need to be debated and agreed by a majority of members and the Committee does not believe it is appropriate to give the presiding officer the power to restrict the ability of any member to put forward a proposal of this nature for consideration.

Amendment 17

This amendment is consequential on the proposed amendment to Standing Order 80 above. Paragraph (7) of Standing Order 84 allowed a proposition to suspend the closure motion to be made without the approval of the presiding officer but the change made by Amendment 16 above means that a proposal to suspend any standing Order will now be possible in this way and this paragraph is therefore superfluous.

Amendment 18

The Committee is grateful to an election candidate who pointed out an inadvertent error by the Committee in Standing Order 115 as originally drafted.

As the Chief Minister will, after an ordinary election, be appointed on the same day that new members are sworn to office the nominations for this post will need to be submitted before successful candidates who are not already members of the States have been sworn to office and actually become 'elected members'. As Standing Order 115 refers to 'elected members' making nominations and being nominated for the post of Chief Minister, successful candidates would have been prevented from this process. Conversely members who were about to leave office would, technically, have been able to sign nominations. This was clearly never PPC's intention and this amendment corrects the error by making it clear that successful candidates can sign nominations and even be nominated for Chief Minister. Members who are about to leave office are precluded from participating in the process.

Amendment 19

At the presentation on 6th September concern was expressed that the 20 minute question period for candidates for Chief Minister was not long enough to allow for adequate questioning of the candidates. The Committee fully accepts this point and this amendment will extend the maximum possible length of the question period from 20 to 40 minutes. As a result each candidate will speak for 10 minutes and then be questioned for up to 40 minutes.

Amendment 20

This amendment corrects an oversight in Standing Order 118 which arose because of a failure to reflect adequately the consequences of the adoption of the amendment of Senator Syvret to the States of Jersey Law 2005 which will allow alternative candidates to be nominated for ministerial positions in addition to the Chief Minister's nominees. The amendment inserts the 10 minute speech and 20 minute question period for candidates to mirror the provisions for other appointments such as the Chairman of PPC. The Committee believes that if alternative candidates are proposed it will be important for members, particularly newly-elected members, to hear the candidates' views and question them before a ballot is held.

Amendment 21

The Committee has given further consideration to the restriction on membership of scrutiny panels contained in Standing Order 134 in response to comments made by the Chairmen's Committee. As originally drafted a member can only be a member of one panel and PPC now accepts that this may be unduly restrictive. Although the Committee is hopeful that a large number of members will become involved in the scrutiny function in the future it is possible that there may be some members who wish to devote a significant proportion of their time to work on the panels and for this reason this amendment will allow any member to serve on up to 2 panels although a member can only be chairman of one.

Amendment 22

The Committee is proposing this amendment, which will take away the requirement for internet publication of the Register of Members' Interests, as a result of concerns expressed to it about the possible security implications for members and their families of this requirement. The Committee is conscious that its decision to bring forward this amendment could be seen by some as running counter to its usual commitment to freedom of information and it appreciates that some members of the States may not be supportive of this change. The Committee believes that further research needs to be undertaken on the appropriate manner to ensure that adequate public access to the information contained in the Register is possible whilst nevertheless not putting members and their families at risk. It is possible that further changes will be proposed to these provisions in the future.

Amendment 23

There was concern at the presentation for States members on 6th September 2005 that the provisions of Standing Order 161 were too far-reaching as disposals and acquisitions of States property could take place without members even being aware until after the relevant transaction was completed. These amendments are brought in response to these concerns.

As can be seen the Committee is proposing that any proposals to dispose of, acquire, let or rent property would need to be notified to members at least 15 working days before the transaction became binding by way of any contract or other legal agreement. In this way members would be able to make enquiries if they were concerned about a particular transaction and, if they wished, lodge a proposition to initiate a debate on the matter. The system would, in effect, operate as a form of 'call-in' of the Minister's decisions in these circumstances. It is important to point out that, because of the provisions of Standing Order 37 about presenting documents to the States, the Minister's notification could be made on any working day throughout the year and this process would not therefore be restricted to a States meeting day.

A second minor change which is proposed by this amendment is the exemption from the provisions of this Standing Order of any tenancies that are terminable by one month's notice or less to ensure that there is no requirement for transactions such as each individual housing tenancy agreement to be approved in this way and reported to the States.

Amendment 24

This amendment corrects minor drafting errors in Schedule 2 and makes no change of substance.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no additional resource implications as a result of these amendments.

Standing Orders being withdrawn

In addition to these amendments the Committee wishes to give notice that it has decided to withdraw 4 of the Standing Orders in P.162/2005 and these will not therefore be proposed during the debate.

The first Standing Order that will not be proposed is Standing Order 24 which referred to the ability of other members of the States to sign a member's proposition. During the presentation to States members on 6th September 2005 there was discussion about the merits or otherwise of this Standing Order and concern was expressed that, if a majority of members signed a proposition in advance, it would, effectively, indicate that the proposition had been virtually approved before any debate. Having given the matter further consideration the Committee has concluded that the arguments against including this Standing Order outweigh those for including it and it will therefore not be proposed.

The Committee received advice from the Bailiff that Standing Order 97 concerning the Presidency of the States when sitting in Committee was *ultra vires*. The States of Jersey Law 2005 states that the Bailiff is President of the

States and if he and the Deputy Bailiff are unable to preside a member or officer is selected by the Bailiff to undertake this rôle. Although the Bailiff has made it clear to the Committee that he would not normally wish to preside over any sitting in Committee he has pointed out that the original Standing Order 97 is incompatible with the provisions of the Law which must take precedence. This Standing Order will not therefore be proposed.

Standing Orders 110 and 111 refer to the powers of the presiding officer in cases of disorderly behaviour. Members will have noted that the Committee has presented a report to the States (R.C.68/2005) setting out its proposals for the entire disciplinary process for members. Certain amendments would be required to Standing Orders 110 and 111 if the proposed procedures are to be implemented and the Committee believes it would be more appropriate for the entire set of Standing Orders relating to disciplinary matters to be brought to the States as one package rather than amending and debating Standing Orders 110 and 111 in isolation. These 2 Standing Orders will not therefore be proposed during the debate on P.162/2005 but will be resubmitted in a slightly amended form as part of the next set of Standing Orders that will be lodged as soon as the outcome of the debate on the repeal of Article 51 of the States of Jersey Law 2005 is known.