

# Chairmen's Committee

## Record of Meeting

Date: 8th April 2014

Present	Deputy T.A. Vallois, President Deputy S.G. Luce, Vice-President Senator S.C. Ferguson Deputy J.G. Reed [representative of HSSH Scrutiny Panel] Deputy J.H. Young
Apologies	Deputy K.L. Moore, Connétable S. W. Pallett, Deputy J.A. Hilton.
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs. K. Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>1. Minutes of previous meetings</b></p> <p>The records of the meetings held on the 11th, 18th and 31st March 2014 were approved and signed accordingly.</p>	
510/3(5)	<p><b>2. Newsletter</b></p> <p>The Committee recalled that it had received a presentation from Jersey Post in respect of using their services to circulate a questionnaire in/with the 2014 newsletter.</p> <p>The Committee considered the various options with associated costs and the time factor for production of the newsletter. It was agreed that a survey would not be included in the 2014 newsletter, however, the information received on the various options was useful and should be retained for the Chairmen's Committee Legacy Report.</p>	KTF
510/1(42)	<p><b>3. Filming of Scrutiny Hearings</b></p> <p>The Committee welcomed a member of the public to the meeting who explained his rationale for permitting members of the public to film Scrutiny hearings under the same rules as the media.</p> <p>Following withdrawal of the member of the public from the meeting, the Committee reconsidered its protocol and agreed that it should remain as it currently stood. It also agreed, however, that work should be commenced in drawing up a Code which might permit members of the public to film Scrutiny hearings. It was noted that this would take some time and would be a matter for a subsequent Committee to take forward as it so decided.</p> <p>On a related matter, the Committee considered webstreaming and its expense, although it was appreciated that this was the best solution. Upon consideration of this the Committee considered whether there were other more appropriate rooms where Scrutiny could hold hearings. The Scrutiny Manager undertook to follow this up.</p>	KTF
11.02.14 Item 7	<p><b>4. Code of Practice: amendments</b></p> <p>In the first instance the Committee considered whether the Public</p>	

<p><b>510/1(5)</b></p>	<p>Accounts Committee should fall under the joint Code with the Executive given the number of differences between it and Scrutiny. It was agreed that the Public Accounts Committee should have a completely separate Code.</p> <p>Secondly it agreed that both the joint Scrutiny/Executive Code and the PAC Code should be adopted by the States.</p> <p>The Committee then received and considered the prescriptive nature of Standing Order 143, which determined all areas which must be included in a Code of Practice. If the joint Code were not to include all these areas, a proposition to amend this Standing Order would need to be debated by the States.</p> <p>This led to consideration of areas of P.33/2014 “Draft States of Jersey (Amendment No. 8) Law 201- “ and it was noted that there was therein a statement that the conduct of scrutiny be debated under Standing Orders. However, this wasn’t the case for Ministers or Assistant Ministers who presented their Code to the States. It was agreed that the Committee should seek advice on amending this.</p> <p>The Committee received a draft Code of Practice, however, consideration was suspended at this point until after the debate on the above proposition and the outcome was known.</p>	<p><b>Pres</b></p>
	<p><b>5. Panel Activity Reports</b></p> <p>These were taken as read.</p>	
<p><b>510/1(59)</b></p>	<p><b>6. Propositions by non-Executive Members: scrutiny</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the Privileges and Procedures Committee (PPC) had been approached by a States Member asking it to consider scrutiny of propositions which were brought by non-Executive Members.</p> <p>The Committee noted that Scrutiny had been established to hold Ministers to account and not to hold other non-Executive Members to account. It considered the scenario whereby a Scrutiny Panel could be considering a proposition brought by one of its Panel Members.</p> <p>The Chairmen’s Committee was of the view that it was inappropriate for Scrutiny to scrutinise such propositions, that this was a role for the Executive; the Council of Ministers should consider all such propositions as part of their Part A agenda.</p> <p>It was also noted that the role of the States Assembly itself was one of scrutineer in terms of debating propositions and that if the States Assembly were so minded it could refer a proposition to scrutiny under Standing Order 79.</p> <p>The representative for PPC on the Committee agreed to report back at the next PPC meeting.</p>	
<p><b>1367/3(41)</b></p>	<p><b>7. Esplanade Quarter</b></p> <p>Consideration was given to the current situation in respect of the Esplanade Quarter and the number of concerns which existed. It was</p>	

	agreed that this would be kept under review and that it may be relevant for the Public Accounts Committee to refer to it in its legacy report.	
<b>513/40</b>	<p><b>8. Budget 2014 Review</b></p> <p>The Committee considered whether Panels should devote some time at quarterly hearings to questioning Ministers on the relevant areas of the Budget. It was agreed that it would be good if all Panels could achieve this although it was recognised that time was of the essence and that not all Panels may be able to do this.</p>	
<b>511/1(46)</b>	<p><b>9. Legacy Reports</b></p> <p>It was agreed that all legacy reports should be succinct and to the point with recommendations appropriate to Scrutiny/PAC. These should be forwarded to the Chairmen's Committee for presentation to the States as an "R".</p>	
	<p><b>10. Future meetings</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting was 20th May 2014, 9.30am-11.30am, Le Capelain Room, States Building. Apologies were noted from the Chairman, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel and the Vice-Chairman would attend on behalf of that Panel.</p>	