

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 25th MARCH 2015

| | |
|---|-----------|
| PUBLIC BUSINESS | 2 |
| 1. Committee of Inquiry: Historical Child Abuse – additional funding (P.20/2015) - resumption..... | 2 |
| 1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade: | 2 |
| 1.1.1 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour: | 9 |
| 1.1.2 Deputy T.A. McDonald of St. Saviour: | 10 |
| 1.1.3 Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade: | 10 |
| 1.1.4 Senator L.J. Farnham: | 11 |
| 1.1.5 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier: | 11 |
| 1.1.6 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity: | 12 |
| 1.1.7 Deputy R.G. Bryans of St. Helier: | 13 |
| 1.1.8 Senator I.J. Gorst: | 14 |
| 2. Draft Amendment (No. 28) of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey (P.24/2015) | 17 |
| 2.1 Senator I.J. Gorst (The Chief Minister): | 17 |
| ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS | 18 |
| 3. The Connétable of St. Clement (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee): | 18 |
| ADJOURNMENT..... | 18 |

[9:33]

The Roll was called and the Vice-Dean led the Assembly in Prayer.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

The Bailiff:

The States now resume debate on P.20 and accordingly I will withdraw from the Assembly and let the Connétable of St. Clement take over the chair.

1. Committee of Inquiry: Historical Child Abuse – additional funding (P.20/2015) - resumption

Connétable L. Norman of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Before we adjourned last evening, I saw Deputy Tadier.

1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

It is good to be back home, despite the hospitality of the Constable of St. Helier. I am sad to be here - in another context, to be here at all - to have to debate this. I thought we had put this to bed in the last session. The initial reason I came into politics was to seek justice for abuse survivors, to make sure we had a Committee of Inquiry, that we could learn from the mistakes that had been made, all the reasons that we have heard yesterday, yet we are back here again to reopen old wounds. One has to ask why. This could have been quite a simple debate, but it was brought back to the Assembly, additional funding requested, and lots of the arguments that have been made, which I will look at, do not relate to the Committee of Inquiry, they are peripheral issues which are to do with other perhaps malaises in our system that need to be addressed at some point. It is with a heavy heart that I am here to have to fight again for something which I thought was secured for the survivors of abuse, but also for ourselves. We are not covering ourselves in glory. This is not about money today, this is about whether we continue to have a Committee of Inquiry, which has already started, or whether we stop that in the full view of the watching interested parties in our Island, but also across the water in the U.K. (United Kingdom) and throughout the world. We have a choice at the end of today to vote one way or the other. We can be, I think, in this sense a model democracy, we can show that we are mature, that we have made a conscious deliberation to make the right decision and to show the U.K., who are suffering with similar problems at the moment, how we can do it in our jurisdiction; or we can simply say that we are no longer capable of governing ourselves and that we need foreign intervention, because that is what a 'no' vote will be tantamount to. We will be saying to the U.K.: "We can no longer govern ourselves. We can no longer ensure that justice is achieved and seen to be done in our Island. Oh, and incidentally, we are in financial dire straits." Is that the kind of message we want to be putting out to the U.K. at this time as they come up to their general election: "Oh, by the way, Jersey is in financial dire straits. They cannot even afford to cough up £14 million" which is peanuts for them, because we are told that they have got savings in the bank while we have got billions in debt? Very interesting constitutional questions will be raised about the relationship of Jersey and also the culture that exists here and it will not be long before a Royal Commission or the like is called for. That is not to say the U.K. do not have their problems. Let us look at the U.K., because I think sometimes it is interesting to take a step back. What I am interested in in the U.K., and I think what we are all fascinated and perhaps disgusted by in that strange tension way, is the abuse that has happened over there over decades. Jimmy Savile has become synonymous with child abuse and predatory action in the U.K. Of course the questions are: "What happened? What did he do?" but the real underlying question is not so much: "Why did he do it and what did he do?" but it is: "How was it allowed to be done for such a long time and how was he able to get away with that for such a long period of time?" We know partly what the answer is, and that must be to do with power, secrecy

and fear, because you cannot do these things alone. Somebody as high-profile and as powerful as Jimmy Savile - and he was not the only one, but he is the most high-profile - could not have done what he did without other people knowing, without other people either being complicit, turning a blind eye, people in the media not reporting a story for fear of reprisals, people not reporting things either because the mechanisms for whistle-blowers were not in place or because they feared for their own jobs. How many times have we heard now: "He was too powerful. I tried to say something at the time. People told me: 'Oh, do not be so silly. Do you not know who he is?'" That exists in the U.K., and this is not something that is unique to the U.K. and it is not something that is unique to Jersey. This is to do with the culture of abuse and to do with the machinations of power, secrecy and fear. The only way to deal with it is to shine a bright light in there by somebody who is independent and impartial and to come in from the outside, which is what we have done - I thought this was already done and dusted - and so we want to know what happened in Jersey, we want to know how these things were allowed to happen and we would like to make recommendations so that we can put in place a system, with your assistance, in future so that these things, to the best possibility, can never happen again. That is certainly what I would like to see. Now, moving back home to Jersey, let us take another local example which is perhaps more comprehensible: the Beast of Jersey. Some Members in the Assembly will be old enough to remember and be around at that time. They may have been young children at the time, they may have been slightly older, and they would have known the fear that prevailed in the Island - my father was around at time - and we had this remarkable situation. How was the Beast of Jersey allowed to get away with it for such a long time? Thankfully he got caught in the end, but that was largely by chance, was it not? The reason that he was allowed to get caught, despite the best intentions of the police, the work that went on, is because the only man in Jersey who did not have his fingerprints taken - and I have said this before - was the Beast of Jersey. It is quite remarkable, the only individual man. All other men of a certain age were told that they had to go to the police station, give their fingerprints in, my father included, get the ink on the hand in those days: "We have got you on record." The only individual who did not have to do that was the Beast of Jersey, and why did he not have to do it? Because he was friends with somebody in the Honorary Police force. That does not mean that the whole of the Honorary Police force is corrupt; it does not mean that the system in itself is wrong, but it does mean that we have a system which allows these things to happen. As far as I can see, nothing has changed. This is where the fear comes into it, because I do not think this is simply about money. I think people are genuinely concerned about what are the consequences if we have to change our system. The point is change will come sooner or later. It will not come from the likes of myself or the usual radicals from the 1700s who have been going on about the need for change and these changes in our institutions. Deputy Labey touched on it yesterday, about it boils down to culture, it is all about culture. Ironically, we had the Bailiff yesterday and today who has recused himself because he realises that in a system where you have got a dual role, or 3 roles in a lot of cases, perception is important. He also realises, no doubt, that he was in his past life an Attorney General and we are coming up to the point of the Committee of Inquiry, which is going to look at the prosecution cases - I think it is term of reference 12 or 13, offhand - which we agreed, which I lodged, to make sure that we can look at whether the processes were fair and impartial and taken in a professional way without any political or other undue interference. That is the critical part. A lot of people have said this abuse inquiry is about giving a voice to the victims, and that is certainly true to a part, but it is by no means the most important part of the inquiry, in my opinion. I say that not to detract from the experiences that they have had and also the cathartic process that they are going through, but it has to be said that they can and already have had recourse to therapy where they need it and we need to carry on supporting them in that now and in the future, but the key thing is - and they are free to talk of their experiences anyway, that is not the problem - we need to learn what went wrong. Those of us in society who have not been abused, but who have an interest in decent and good governance in Jersey need to have the

answers. It looks very bizarre to be stopping an inquiry just at the point at which those areas are going to be looked into. There is an elephant in the room as well, because if one is party to abuse, either directly because one has been an abuser in the past, or because one has been implicated to cover it up, *et cetera*, and we know that there be people in our society who are in that position who may be in positions of authority, who may be in positions of care at the moment.

[9:45]

We have that certainly alleged in the abuse evidence that has been coming forward so far. They do not want this inquiry to carry on. That is a given. Anything that they can do to shut this down, they will be doing it, and any influence that they can have in this Assembly, any ear that they might have of Assembly Members to try and shut this inquiry down, they will be pulling those strings, we can be absolutely sure of that. They do not want their day to be able to give evidence, those abusers. Similarly, there will be those who need to clear their names, who feel that they have allegations made against them falsely. We know that the former Head of the Education Service over here has had very serious allegations made against him. I, for one, want to hear what he has got to say in response. He has been the head of one of the departments which is in charge of safeguarding in the Island for the last X amount of years and we need to know what he has got to say, if there are any lessons that can be learned. Whether he has got anything to answer or not, we certainly need to hear that as a Government. It would be completely ludicrous to stop this inquiry at this point ostensibly on cost grounds. Has anybody seen the film *Hot Fuzz*? It was released in 2007, Edgar Wright directed it, co-written with Simon Pegg. It is about a small village in the U.K., a very proud village, very pristine, it has got beautiful scenery and then suddenly one of the police officers comes back from London with newfangled ideas and all sorts of things start going wrong in the area. Essentially it is a story about a very small village which is very protective about its way of life: "We have got a certain way of doing things here." Paradoxically, they end up tearing themselves apart because they do not like change and they do not like people coming in from outside changing things, and they are trying to keep their way of life intact so much that they tear their beautiful small little village apart. I often see it as a good metaphor for Jersey in some cases and other people have corroborated that theory. The Bailiff, I am told, talked about the Jersey way and talked about the fact that we must claim back the Jersey way and give it some kind of positive meaning, because certainly at the moment it does not. But certain things that I have heard yesterday from senior Ministers, who frankly should know better, hark going back to the old Jersey way. Sark has the Barclay brothers; Jersey has the Bailhache brothers. Stop me if I say anything which is factually incorrect. In Sark, the Barclay brothers are deeply unpopular, and in my opinion...

Senator L.J. Farnham:

It also has the Farnham brothers. Myself and my 2 brothers live here, as do many other families with brothers.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Is this a point of order, Sir? Is this a point of order?

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

No. Carry on, please, Deputy.

Deputy M. Tadier:

No. I can only presume that the Senator is doing somebody else's bidding. I will be watching how he votes at the end. Sark has the Barclay brothers; Jersey has the Bailhache brothers. The Barclay brothers I believe have done no favours to the island of Sark. I think they have brought disrepute on to the Island of Sark and it only goes to show what is happening, they are tearing the island

apart. Let us get back to the point in hand. Yesterday we heard some spurious and some specious arguments. We were told the reasons we could not do this: money needs to be spent elsewhere. We know, quite frankly, that £14 million will not be spent anywhere else. We have heard very good intentions: "Oh, this money could be spent on the victims of abuse." Senator Bailhache yesterday told us that the victims had been already compensated quite generously. I take exception to that. They have not been compensated generously at all. If we look at the actual funding, you can work out the average given to each survivor is in the region of £19,000. Of course some would have received much less than that, some would have received more than that. £19,000 for a ruined life from childhood because somebody did not take care of you and that when you were put in the confidence of the State, your life was ruined, often psychologically all sorts of problems, and those are the ones who survived. The ones who died before their 40th birthdays through suicide, drink, drugs, *et cetera*, because they could not cope with the system and they were maladjusted, they got nothing, they essentially got a pauper's grave. Do not tell me that £19,000 on average per victim is generous compensation. Those are, frankly, sick words from an individual who should know better. Incidentally, I did not hear anybody really, apart from the usual suspects, when talking about the compensation questioning it before. We know that the lawyers in the scheme have got the lion's share of the money that was allocated. It would have been, in hindsight, much easier to have a very simple triage system and just: "Were you abused?" some basic checks: "There you go, everybody £40,000." It would have been much cheaper in the long run to do that, even if it might have been objectionable for some individuals. We cannot afford it: we are being told by some Ministers that we are in a position where Jersey is on the verge of bankruptcy. Let that sink in. Let that message go out to the rest of the world: Jersey is now on the point of bankruptcy, that we cannot afford to do this. We can afford other capital projects presumably, such as the incinerator, which I do not think we needed. There are other projects which we will argue the toss about which have been massive capital projects. We also know that our Criminal Offences Confiscation Fund has been used as little more than a slush fund for looking for money and diverting it through there. We can seem to fund anything now from the Criminal Offences Confiscation Fund, but it is questionable as to whether we can take money for this purpose, which would seem the most appropriate, from that fund, but also the point is there is nothing left in the fund anyway, it is only a couple of million, and that has probably been earmarked already. We have been told that if we take money from the Strategic Reserve, it will threaten the Island's stability. Is that the best we can do? Has it really come to that, we are going to threaten the Island's stability? I would suggest it is the opposite. If we do not do this today, then we are threatening the Island's reputation and stability. We have heard that we do not like lawyers all of a sudden, but we have got some very eminent lawyers in the Assembly. Someone else has said that if there is a problem with lawyers, if you do not like lawyers, if you think they are getting paid too much, then simply there is an Access to Justice Review going on, which is chaired by the Assistant Minister or the Chief Minister's Department - and Senator Routier and I am on it - make submissions to that, come up with some ideas about how we can improve access to justice in Jersey, talk about the culture change that needs to take place in Jersey. Do we need to open up our very closed shop of advocates? Do we need to find a legal aid system that works? Do we need to get the industry to contribute to their own fund for legal aid, *et cetera*, or do we just need a communist system? Is that the problem? Are Members saying that the free market does not work and that lawyers are getting paid too much, like footballers, and it should be nurses who are getting paid more, teachers who are getting paid more and that lawyers should do everything out of the kindness of their hearts? That is a really interesting and philosophical debate to have, but it does not help us now, because that is not the situation we are in. We live in the real world, where legal fees are high and where the States departments, who are also building-up and racking-up legal fees, as was alluded to by the Constable of St. John yesterday, are also paying high fees for their costs. The other argument we heard is that it will not achieve anything: "Oh, this will not achieve anything." We have heard it: "It will just go

on.” That is really down to us. Certainly if we do not have the Committee of Inquiry, if we stop it now, then it will not achieve that. We know that; that is a given. It has been said that the terms of reference are very broad, too broad perhaps. I think there is a reason for that. The terms of reference are very wide and cover a long period of time. Why is that? It is because the child abuse was very wide and it covered a very long period of time. That is why. It is because it was not picked up in 1965. No States Member came to the States and blew a whistle and said: “There is a problem with Haut de la Garenne. People are being abused there. The police are not picking up on it; we cannot get any prosecutions. We need to look into this.” It has taken 70 or so years, not to mention anything that may have gone on before that period. Of course the terms of reference are wide, and that may be problematic and that is why it is expensive, but we cannot get away from the fact that there are real consequences. If you want to have a Committee of Inquiry, then you have to pay for a Committee of Inquiry. We cannot employ window cleaners to do the Committee of Inquiry for us. We have to employ lawyers to do that. That is no disparagement to window cleaners, because often their contribution to transparency is a lot more tangible. The real consequences are that if we do not go ahead with this, we have started a piece of work, but we will not be finishing it. Those who have had allegations made will not be able to give their input. There will be consequences nationally. We have heard about the headlines and I do not need to repeat that, but I will emphasise the fact that U.K. are in the throes of a general election and, quite frankly, like war during a political campaign, truth is one of the first victims. They will not necessarily care about the nuances or the exactitudes of what goes on in our Island, they will report it as they see it and no doubt we will have to deal with the consequences. While Senator Bailhache might say we should be prepared to stand up to the U.K. newspapers and deal with their false headlines *et cetera*, in many cases, let us be honest, it is their true headlines. If they say: “Jersey has just voted to cover-up and end a child abuse inquiry just as it is getting to the juicy bits” we are banged to rights on that one - that is exactly what we will have done anyway - then we need to deal with the consequences of that. Much better to not do that and to do the right thing in the first place. Jersey is a place which is run by the rich and powerful in the interests of the rich and the powerful. In that sense, Jersey is no different to most places in the West, but it is much more pronounced and obvious because we market ourselves as that way. We have also got very strange institutions, and essentially what we need - and this is why I was talking about change before - change can either happen 2 ways, we are told, by evolution or by revolution, or perhaps another way to look at it in the Jersey context is that change can either be imposed on us or it can be done with our initiation and we can initiate our own change. We have not been very good at that historically. Quite frankly, the words that come to mind are unparliamentary, so I will not use them. We do not have a glowing track record when it comes to reforming ourselves. Certainly from a reformist point of view, if we wanted to instigate change in Jersey, if we wanted a proper independent Prosecution Service, which I think has to be one of the inevitabilities of the outcome of this whether or not the inquiry continues, it will be imposed upon us. The U.K. will have to step in and say: “Look, guys, you cannot be doing this any more. You are a semi-feudal backwater. You are starting to embarrass us, quite frankly. We are dealing with our own Committee of Inquiry in the U.K. We cannot have you and your Mafia types” their words, not mine: “in Jersey embarrassing us further. We are just going to impose home rule for a period of time and then we are going to sort you out with a system that fundamentally works for you.” For too long we have had institutions which have been unaccountable. This has necessarily led to arrogance and it has facilitated a cover-up, because we know the adage: “Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely” and there is a risk when there are multi-roles that are combined into one, where there is not accountability, when things are done behind the scenes, when somebody does not have to give the reasons for their deliberations and their decisions. Inevitably mistakes get made and if you put the reputation or the supposed reputation of an idea of the Island - which is perhaps fantasy - before the reality of what is going on on the ground, then there is where the problems arise. Let us look at the terms of

reference which the Committee of Inquiry is just about to get to, because this is the really interesting part. They have completed phase 1 and they are going to move on to phase 2, which take in term of reference 13: “To establish the process by which files were submitted to the States of Jersey Police and the prosecuting authorities for consideration and establish whether those responsible for deciding on which cases to prosecute took a professional approach and whether the process was free from political or other interference at any level.” Who are they going to need to call in to look at this? In order to look at the prosecution, they need to talk to those who were doing the prosecutions at the time.

[10:00]

They will need to talk to former Law Officers, they will need to talk to former Attorney Generals, they may need to talk to former Bailiffs and former Deputy Bailiffs as part of their inquiries. Senator Bailhache acknowledged this yesterday. I think he was acknowledging the fact that that is an issue, but that is okay, because he gave us an assurance in this Assembly that he had always acted in a professional manner. I could probably end my speech now and just sit down: Senator Bailhache has given us his word that he has always acted in a professional manner and that is okay, the Jersey way continues, we do not need to verify that. Senator Cameron is shaking her head, which is strange, because I do not take things on face value, and I think that even if somebody has done a good job - and we will look at that in a moment, will we not - things are still open to interpretation and other individuals may have a different opinion and processes may need to change anyway. We voted yesterday that the Committee of Inquiry should look at documents that are already in existence, look at reports that have already been commissioned and use those without having to necessarily reopen lines of investigation which may be costly. That is fine, that has been passed now. One such report that was made available and is in the public domain was to do with the Honorary Police Officer Roger Holland. This is in the public domain. It is worth that everyone should read it, because it tells us some of the systemic problems that you have when you have very powerful individuals left to make decisions on their own, to all intents and purposes, which are completely unaccountable. This can be found quite easily. I used the link, Tony’s Musings blog, and you just type in: “Roger Holland” and it will come up with a blog which is from 4th October 2011, which is entitled: “Philip Bailhache and the Roger Holland Affair.” In that, it quite clearly states that there were massive mistakes that were made. This was in the 1990s, it was at a time when the Senator was an Attorney General. It was a time when it became apparent by another Member of this Assembly ...

Senator P.M. Bailhache:

Can the Deputy give way?

Deputy M. Tadier:

If it is a point of order, Sir, I will give way. If it is not, I will not.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Would you both sit down, please? I understand that this is an important debate. It is an emotive debate and feelings are running very high. Nevertheless, I think it is important that we maintain a high standard of debate and follow Standing Orders as best we can. Now, I have been as flexible as I possibly can, but could I remind all Members, not just the current speaker, that during a speech a Member of the States must not use offensive or insulting language about any Member of the States or impute improper motives directly or by innuendo to any Member of the States. I would remind Members of that part of Standing Order 104 before we continue. Senator Bailhache, did you want to make a point of order?

Senator P.M. Bailhache:

No, I did not want to make a point of order. I wanted to ask the Deputy if he would give way, but he has apparently said no.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Is that the case, Deputy?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I accept that ruling. One presumably is allowed to read from a document which is in the public domain and which deals with something which is very germane to this issue of child protection. It also deals with the fact that yesterday the Senator told us that he did not ... essentially what he was saying is we did not need the Committee of Inquiry to go on to part 13 because, as far he is concerned, he has always acted in a professional way. I have evidence which suggests that the Committee of Inquiry might still need to do that, because of that note.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

I must ask you, Deputy, to sit down, please. I must ask you not to impute improper motives directly or by innuendo to any Member of the States. That is the Standing Order and I would ask you to stand by it. This is an important and emotive debate and we must maintain the highest of standards. Can you please continue your speech?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I am not intending to do anything other than that. I think this is part of the issue that we have, because in the real world, none of us is perfect, but it seems that when we become a States Member, we are all perfect and so one cannot even refer to real events that have happened and real reports, it would seem. I have got no intention of impugning - is that the word, Sir - or implying improper motives.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Have you finished your speech?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Chance would be a fine thing, Sir. If I can provide a summary of the report, which as I have said is in the public domain, and it is interesting how difficult it is, notwithstanding parliamentary privilege, that we are in a forum where the truth is supposed to be able to come out, people are supposed to be able to speak in a way which is unencumbered from fear, and it is quite difficult sometimes to do that, especially when one's train is interrupted. The point is there is a document in the public domain which says that during the time when Senator Bailhache was Attorney General, he made decisions which allowed a known sex offender to remain in the Honorary Service, and rather than remove him, which was within his power to do, he decided to leave that individual in power because it would have been too difficult and complex to do that, to remove him, and also because the event of having been sworn in was a solemn affair. That is written there. That is not meant to be impugning in any way. That is just simply fact and Members can read that document themselves. I do not make any apology for saying that. In fact, I would not have even had to bring this up were it not for the fact that the Senator himself has mounted such a robust attack on this proposition to try and get his allies around him, because let us face it, the only people who are going to vote against this proposition today are the hardcore Senator Bailhache supporters; we know who they are. We have seen the cracks in the Council of Ministers, and I do very much feel for the Chief Minister, because I know that the Chief Minister, despite our political differences, economic differences to do with Conservative and perhaps Socialist policies, and on most sides of the debate, we will be not aligned. But in this debate, it transcends the political divide, because we know that this is about fairness, it is about openness and it is about secrecy. It is about tackling the

malaise and something which is rotten at the heart of Jersey society, the institutions which have been there for too long, which may have worked during a certain period of time, but are no longer fit for purpose in the modern complex and cosmopolitan Jersey that exists. Does that mean that we throw the baby out with the bathwater? No, it does not mean at all, but it means that if we are not mature enough to be able to do this ourselves and decide what changes need to be done, then this will be done for us. I am looking at Members: Members do not like this speech for some reason. I do not know why they do not like this speech. It is not comfortable. I have not come here today relishing giving this speech. It was a speech that was necessary. I thought the Committee of Inquiry, as I said earlier, was done and dusted. I want these individuals to be getting on and doing their job, but it seems we are going to keep on reopening the wound. It was the Senator himself, when he stood for election the first time, saying: "The States just waste so much time. They keep on debating things that they have already decided to do" and a lot of people say: "Yes, that is right." But now we are seeing that in some cases he is the culprit himself for bringing these things back to the Assembly. Completely within his right to do that, but it has consequences. It has consequences for the individuals sitting up there; it has consequences for us and the time that we take to debate this. What happens if we switch it off now, apart from the obvious consequences, is that we do not learn the lessons and that in another 20, 30 years' time, we find that there has been some other massive problem. It may not be child abuse, it may be something else which is quite severe, and we realise that there is a systemic problem, there are consequences in 30, 40 years' time and somebody else has to come back to the Assembly, institute another Committee of Inquiry at great cost and there will be a big contentious debate around that. This debate did not need to be contentious. It could have quite simply been brought by the Chief Minister, there could have been talks that happened previously and we could have said: "Yes, we do not particularly like spending money. We accept that this needs to be done." We cannot draw a line in the sand on this issue until we have allowed the Commission to do what they need to do. I think it is apparent that I have made all my points. I do not think there is anything new. Invariably there might be things that I think that I have missed and I can kick myself afterwards, although I am sure there are lots of other Members who will queuing-up to do that for me. It is not about money, it is about doing the right thing. Jersey is not a poor place. It is true that the wealth is not shared equally in our Island, but if we cannot afford a relatively cheap Committee of Inquiry in the grand scheme of things if we look at our overall spending, then I do fear for us as an Island, not economically, but morally.

1.1.1 Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour:

Deputy Tadier covered one of the points which I wanted to raise, which was around the importance of looking into the criminal proceedings, because certainly being in this Assembly and going through the process of the initial Committee of Inquiry and the terms of reference, some of the victims or survivors - or however you want to phrase it - that got in touch with us very much felt strongly that they wanted those questions to be answered of: "When I approached those in authority, why was I not listened to? Why was something not done?" Some Members have suggested yesterday that because some submissions had been read out therefore that these people have notionally had their day in court and therefore we can quash it now and not continue. I would just like to reinforce that point there. I will move on to my next one, which is the inquiry has received hundreds of submissions, and what has not been mentioned and what seems to be forgotten is that inquiry itself has the ability to receive submissions in private, so while there might be some of those submissions which are in our local media, which we might be made more aware of, I do not know how many States Members have sat down, gone on to the Committee of Inquiry's website and read through all the submissions that are there which may not have received the media coverage. I think that might slant some of our perspectives; not just us, but the wider community. But the point about the private submissions is that they still have value and they still have worth. While some who have contributed those submissions may not necessarily want them to go out into

the wider community for their own reasons, they will still have an impact on the recommendations that the Committee of Inquiry needs to be able to make. Therefore, if we do not provide the funding in order for the Committee of Inquiry to complete its work, we are denying those individuals the ability to have their voice heard in that way. I think that that has been forgotten, and I think very much for me through this whole period I have been very much focused on the victims - the survivors - supporting them as much as I possibly can. Because I thought that point had not been made, I think that should be borne in mind, and that is one of the reasons why I will be supporting the Chief Minister's proposition today.

1.1.2 Deputy T.A. McDonald of St. Saviour:

Yesterday I heard the Minister for Treasury and Resources making reference to a matter of costs directly associated with the inquiry to date, but the one thing he failed to make reference to is what price can one put on justice? I suspect that we will all find out in the not too distant future. I also heard the Connétable of St. Martin make reference to another important point, namely the word "reputation," Jersey's reputation. He made reference to the damage that has already been caused to it so far, and not only on a regional, national or even on an international level, but on a worldwide stage. He also pointed out that an awful lot more damage could be caused to our Island if we fail to allow the inquiry to continue and complete its work unhindered and in a totally independent way. He also made mention of the banner headlines that could - and in the real world, would - adorn the front page of every newspaper in circulation.

[10:15]

Those headlines and their supporting articles would not carry the message that we are struggling to convey to the outside world, and nor would they do anything whatsoever to maintain and in fact strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the States of Jersey. I have heard the words "openness, honesty, accountability and transparency" used many times since I joined the States of Jersey, and now we have a golden opportunity to show that they are not just words, and more now than ever before we really need to display the leadership qualities required to act in what we believe to be the best interests of Jersey as a whole. That I feel we can best do by allowing the inquiry to continue uninterrupted. Deputy Bree made reference to our duty of care as a Government, and I would enhance that vitally important observation by adding the words "our corporate responsibility." We are all a part of the corporate sole. The one word that I was waiting to hear being used yesterday was, in my opinion, the most important word of all appertaining to this matter, and that word was "closure." Deputy McLinton was the first person to use it, together with a brief but very thorough explanation of exactly what it meant from a psychological perspective to the individuals who are sadly embroiled in this sad affair. Unless the inquiry is allowed to continue and totally within its new financial parameters and terms of reference, then there will be no closure, not for us, not for some of the accused, not for the families of those who are already deceased, and most importantly of all, of course, not for any of the victims. The Deputy of St. Martin made reference to finding it hard to sleep while thinking about this debate and I suspect that applied to many others of us, but I managed to sleep last night knowing that I had made a decision that the only correct thing to do was to vote to allow the inquiry to fully run its course. If we fail to do this, there will be no closure for anyone, not now or in the future, and worse still, I firmly believe it will not only haunt all of us, but it will return to bite us and bite us very hard. Finally, I need to make mention of a very old saying: "Those that care do not matter and those that matter do not care." I do care, especially about people, and I am sure that there are many others in this Chamber that do too. [Approbation]

1.1.3 Deputy G.J. Truscott of St. Brelade:

I believe many Members are finding this decision very hard to make, and I am not an exception. I, like everyone, want to see an end to the whole affair, and we do need to provide closure. Lessons have been learned, victims have had the opportunity to voice their experiences. We have said sorry and apologies and we have paid compensation, albeit I agree with Deputy Tadier that it could have been more. We do, however, still need to uncover the truth, expose the cover-ups, examine the conspiracy theories and let the accused defend themselves and their reputations and face prosecution, if necessary. I agree in principle that our investigation should continue. However, I find it hard to come to terms with these alarming and escalating costs. The previous Assembly had agreed to a figure of £6 million, but it would now appear that they had effectively handed over a blank cheque. I would like to remind Members that this is hard-earned taxpayers' money that we are dealing with here. I am mindful that we need a new Les Quennevais School, which will cost in excess of £40 million. We are also making plans for a new hospital, which will cost well in excess of £350 million. I am very aware that the Island is facing considerable financial pressures, emphasised even more by Senator Maclean earlier in the debate, stating that things financially are getting worse than were originally estimated. A Member during the debate reminded the Assembly that we are the protectors of the youngsters' safety and that is undeniable. I would also like to add that we are also the protectors of the public purse. There would be no need for this debate today if once and for all we had managed to negotiate a contract and deliver a project within or on budget. Were the full facts presented to the previous Assembly and were they made aware of the open-ended cost implications of this inquiry, and if not, why not? I would like to wind the clock back to the original debate and ask the Assembly today if they would have voted then for the proposition to engage a panel to carry out a public inquiry into the historic child abuse with an estimated cost of £20 million to £50 million, because that is effectively what you are doing now if you vote pour today. I am of the opinion that we have started this process and we should finish it, but not necessarily with this current panel and format, which is quite frankly bleeding us financially dry. Senator Bailhache suggested setting up a truth and reconciliation type hearing. In my opinion, this would provide a perfect alternative forum to enable the process to continue and it would be a far more economical way of delivering justice for all. I will be voting against this proposition, as I strongly believe we could provide a more cost-effective alternative process that could deliver the same end result: justice and closure.

1.1.4 Senator L.J. Farnham:

I am encouraged by the letter from the Independent Care Inquiry chair stating that they are fully committed to examining how costs can be contained, because the concern - for me, anyway - is not necessarily about the cost of seeing this through, it is just making sure that the money is being used sensibly and is not being wasted. It is not unreasonable to expect the Care Inquiry to be prudent with the funds we give them, but to be clear, I do not want to be part of a legacy that does not deal with this issue once and for all. To create a better future, we have to understand the past and the better future starts with the decisions we make today. We simply cannot stop it.

1.1.5 Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier:

We are not writing a blank cheque, are we? We are not even writing a cheque for £50 million. It is not an open-ended agreement. It is a £14 million cheque, is it not? The Chief Minister, in his opening speech, he said we are not alone, and apart from Deputy Tadier, he is one of the few to consider the situation outside our borders. I think it very pertinent to do that, because the game has changed. Let us look at the reasons why it has taken over a year and 3 goes to put Justice Goddard in place for that inquiry. It is to do with Savile, but it is also to do with research, a book published in 2014 called *Smile for the Camera: The Double Life of Cyril Smith*, where Simon Danczuk, M.P. (Member of Parliament), and his researcher and campaigner, Matthew Baker, uncovered the story of Cyril Smith. During their research, they were told countless times: "Oh, everyone knew about

Cyril” and everyone did know about Cyril. Lancashire Police knew about Cyril; Greater Manchester Police knew about Cyril; the Thames Valley Police knew about Cyril; the Special Branch, as it was then; the Metropolitan Police; the Director of Public Prosecutions; one of the Prime Ministers. They all knew about Cyril, except for the public. I will not go into all the details, but clearly they have uncovered a cover-up, and when they started to talk about this cover-up, of course the accusation then thrown at them was that they were conspiracy theorists. The police, by the way, are not the bad guys here. They were told - given orders from on high - to drop their investigation and to never talk about it again under pain of prosecution under the Official Secrets Act. It is true, it is now known that there was a monstrous cover-up. I am not saying the same thing has happened here, I am just trying to explain why it has taken a year and 3 goes at it to put Justice Goddard in place, because it will not wash with the public any more, any kind of inquiry that is not absolutely thorough and has every stone upturned. That is why this information, Savile, Cyril Smith, others, has rendered redundant the child abuse investigation in Islington, the one in Lambeth, the one in Westminster, because they never touched on this. Now is not the right time to end prematurely, in the middle of it, a child abuse investigation. It would be folly. Some actions have been taken, I think misguidedly, by our leaders in the past with this issue to try to perhaps contain reputational damage, but that, I think, is folly and misguided and it would be totally wrong here. Deputy Luce said earlier the size of the bill has repercussions for everyone in Jersey. Well, the scale of abuse in childcare homes in Jersey has repercussions for Jersey, because it is life-long lasting damage and devastation. We are already seeing those repercussions, and let us nail once and for all this thing about ... of course Deputy Lewis and other speakers would like to see more money going to the victims. Deputy Noel, in a noble speech - and I am not having a go at him - advances a theory that would it not be nice to slosh all this money into the victims as opposed to the child abuse inquiry, but that is not on the cards, that is not going to happen. You cannot pay off the victims. They do not want to be paid off. They want justice. Some of them have not had their day in court, and Members are very fortunate if they do not have a constituent like I who is listening to this debate, catatonic with fear that we might stop this inquiry before he or she has found out why their close family relative - and I am being deliberately opaque for obvious reasons - why this person in the care of the State was allowed to be abused over an extended period, which has caused catastrophic problems for this person. People have spoken about having a heavy heart and not knowing what to do about this. For me, the way is clear, and I say to those Members who are troubled and with a heavy heart, Minister Pinel and Luce and Noel and Constable Refault, it is not too late to change your mind. You know what, clearly here the right thing to do is support the Chief Minister, and doing the right thing will lighten your burden and lessen your load a little bit. I think we have to support the Chief Minister. **[Approbation]**

1.1.6 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

In my short time in this Assembly, this has been one of the best and most interesting debates with some very compelling speeches on both sides. I too have thought long and hard about this matter and it concerns me greatly that if we close this inquiry now, the message that it sends out will do untold damage to internal relationships and our external reputation. We should of course think of the victims of abuse and have sympathy with their suffering, but we should not lose sight of the duty we now owe to those who have been accused and let them have the opportunity of having their say. This Assembly cannot be seen to commit £6 million plus already expended to the bin and have nothing to show for it. If we do not complete this task, we will inevitably get suckered into other ongoing inquiries over which we will have less control over the cost. Let us not allow the Jersey way to be tarnished still further by claims of cover-up. Let it be seen that the Jersey way leads the way in achieving openness and justice. The cost will be painful, but I am afraid the hare is out of the trap and this race must be run.

[10:30]

Let us not kid ourselves that the pain will stop if we close the inquiry down. It will have only just started. I will be supporting this proposition. **[Approbation]**

1.1.7 Deputy R.G. Bryans of St. Helier:

I, like many of the Members, have already stated that we have lost sleep over this subject. It is very close to me and I understand the difficulties that everybody has discussed. This debate seems to be described in binary black and white terms and of course it is not. On one side we have individuals whose lives have been subjected to the most awful of circumstances at a time when they were most vulnerable, now hoping that they will finally be listened to and the perpetrators of those crimes exposed and brought to justice. If I were one of them, I would feel doubly abused, initially let down by the very people who were supposed to protect them, their lives broken, every utterance in the media another reminder of what happened, and now this Government is proposing to cap the cost. I would be angry at those past governments who chose to ignore, not believing what they were being told, and angry with this Government, daring to contemplate halting proceedings just as we reach another stage in the process. They want our community to recognise the cost of looking the other way, the cost of supporting corruption at any level. This is their time to have their voices heard, no matter how difficult it may be to listen to or believe. They want the truth uncovered and debts to be paid, both financially and most importantly emotionally, and most of them would like it to be over. For them, it is a living nightmare. On the other side, we have Members focusing on the spiralling cost. It was forecast at £6 million, but later projections, no matter what the source, show a figure above £20 million and rising; £20 million at a time when we are attempting to carry on business as usual, keep front line services alive in all areas, accommodating the rising cost of living and all on a diminished budget. In education, I have further worries. Putting aside the aspirations of addressing the current issues we have identified, we have concerns about our children's mental health, the lack of nourishment they receive, the emotional well-being of their early years and the support they and their families desire for higher learning. Let us remind ourselves that this inquiry is about abuse, and all abuse, whether physical, sexual or mental, is about power. One of the reasons we are all struggling with this debate is we feel powerless: powerless to rectify the wrongs done, to go back in time and make it all better; powerless to stem the profligate spending on lawyers at a time when we are cutting support to organisations like the Women's Refuge, whose sole existence is to care for victims of abuse; powerless to explain how it happened and why it continues to happen. Rather than listen to the synthetic rhetoric, the claims of all of those who vote against are heartless, soulless individuals with no care for the victims. We need to explain that our struggles with how we have debated this proposition are borne out of high levels of compassion, of a desire to see justice done while mindful that our reserves are limited. So, as the Minister for Treasury and Resources said yesterday, what is the price? I, like him, am heavy-hearted in the choice I must make. I think it was brave of the Chief Minister to remove collective responsibility. I think it was brave of my colleagues to bring the concerns of rising costs and diminishing budgets into an emotional debate. But most of all I think it is brave of all those who have cruelly suffered at the hands of powerful abusers to come forward and tell their stories. Some will remain silent and I will respect their wishes, but as a Government and as has clearly been illustrated by both Deputy Truscott and Deputy McDonald - I think it was the first speech he made and I thought it was an excellent one and I hope he makes more - we need to spend wisely where our responsibility is to complete the task that we started. So, finally, I am sure this proposition, if I have done my maths correctly, will be carried, but in my role as Minister for Education, Sport and Culture, aware as I am about our financial position and the potential implications this carries, I will be voting against this proposition.

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

Does any other Member wish to speak? If not, I call on the Chief Minister to sum up.

1.1.8 Senator I.J. Gorst:

Can I start by thanking Members for what I think obviously has been an extremely important debate, but I think that Members' contributions have been thoughtful and have generally been good natured. Interestingly, if we look at other parliaments around the world who have had to consider the issues that we are considering today, I think we will see that the issues that Members have raised are common issues around the globe. I do not think it is overstating it to say that probably our debate over the last 2 days has been, I think, more thoughtful and better natured than many in parliaments elsewhere, and I want to come back to that point later. I understand that for some this debate today has been difficult and it has been frustrating and the decision still before us for some is difficult. Some have made their mind up and I respect them, but others I suspect in a debate like this are still not quite certain which way they will vote. It is to those that I hope I address my comments. This debate has been a debate which is above party. This debate has been a debate which is above personality. This debate has been a debate which is above ideology. I believe that we have shown that in the comments which have been made. It is absolutely right that the issue that we are considering should be above party, personality and ideology. I would like to break my comments down. I am not going to go through every single Member's comments, I do not think that is useful, but I would like to break my comments down into 3 broad areas. They are comments about victims, comments about costs and comments about reputations. I could spend the next 10 minutes saying why I disagreed with Deputy Southern and his ideas of deficit and expenditure, but I am not going to do that because I do not think today is about that. I think the M.T.F.P. (Medium-Term Financial Plan) is the day to talk about that. I personally did not mention victims in my opening remarks and I wanted to talk about them at this point. Since the inquiry began hearing evidence in July last year, we have heard terrible stories of physical, sexual and emotional abuse suffered by vulnerable children at the hands of people who should - who should - have been protecting them. In doing so, this inquiry has given a voice, in some cases for the first time, to the voiceless. I said when we agreed the terms of reference that it would be difficult for us to listen to and I believe thus it has proved. It has, indeed, been difficult for us to listen to, but I hold firmly that listen we must, just as we have listened today to those who have concerns about the funding. That speaking out has taken courage on the part of those victims. They have been let down in the past by those in authority and it can, therefore, and is, therefore, difficult for them to put trust in any authority again. That includes this independent Jersey care inquiry. Therefore, on behalf of victims I ask Members to think very carefully about the impact upon survivors of abuse if they decide today to stop the funding. The impact upon survivors who have so courageously come forward to give evidence I believe would be unimaginable. It is important, of course, for us to understand how far we have progressed. At the conclusion of the first phase of the inquiry, evidence has been heard from 203 individuals. Yes, some evidence has been read in from statements from the historic redress scheme and some Members have made comment about the cost of that reading in. I at the first hearing of such processes asked that very same question: was it a good use of resource? Have other public inquiries done the same? The answer to that is yes, they have. It is a process which has been used in other public inquiries elsewhere where statements have been read into the official record. Some of that is around us hearing what has happened in our community and that listening and that hearing is an important part of the process that we are going through. The next phase will hear from those who worked in services and aims to identify why abuse remained hidden for so long. Following this phase, of course, the authorities' response to allegations will be considered and it is anticipated that those hearings will continue throughout 2015. I want to spend some moments now talking about cost because one or 2 Members wanted further information and felt that I should either go away and provide further information or that they were not going to support the proposition because of the costs on the States side. I wish just to address some of those issues. It is important that we understand why this inquiry has cost more than was originally anticipated. That is because the scope of the inquiry in terms of witnesses and

documentation far exceeded the assumptions set out in the original budget. I am grateful to Deputy Martin for reminding Members that those who initially considered the budget were open enough to say at that briefing for Members that in actual fact once you start you do not know what you will uncover or what you will hear and the costs will be driven by that. Perhaps, rather than seeing that as a negative, we can see it as a good indicator of the growing faith in the inquiry that so many witnesses have, indeed, come forward to tell their story, one of the reasons I think that Members in the first place agreed to undertake a public inquiry and agreed to the terms of reference unanimously. The £1.8 million which has already been spent by States departments, which some Members were concerned about ... and if I could just correct; one Member suggested that it was £1.8 million plus £6.5 million that the States were going to spend. The £6.5 million is the total budgeted expenditure, which includes the £1.8 million, not on top of. But I think it might be helpful for those Members if I just simply detailed briefly the £1.8 million spending.

[10:45]

That is largely spent on lawyers, and I will come back to that point later because it is important that we understand the way that the money is being spent. So, lawyers have been instructed by the States of Jersey Police. Of that £1.8 million, they have spent £470,000. Health and Social Services has spent just over £700,000. Education, Sport and Culture has spent just over £20,000. My own department has spent £21,000, just over, on lawyers. The Law Officers' Department have spent £347,000. The Home Affairs Department, on top of the legal costs, has spent £113,000 and my own department, which is largely spent on the costs of civil servants, £129,000, taking us to just over £1.8 million. The projected budget into the future, of course extrapolates out costs to date for various departments with an increase, as one would expect, considering the next 2 phases of the inquiry with a greater increase for the States of Jersey Police legal costs and the costs to the Law Officers' Department. So, I do not think there is more detail that needs to be required. The cost of an inquiry, yes, is based upon the lines of that inquiry, but it is largely driven by time. So the longer it takes, the more costly it will be. To date, we have had a complex but necessary redaction process and there has been communication between States lawyers and Eversheds, who are acting as administrators of the inquiry, to see if that can be improved, therefore reducing costs going forward. That has now been agreed and we expect that that more streamlined redaction process will help to manage costs into the future. I think it was the Deputy of Grouville asked have any of these costs been audited, and there has been an audit lately by the Treasury Department with recommendations about how costs can be managed more effectively into the future. I am grateful for a number of Members who have suggested other processes that I could instruct, particularly around cost analysis or legal costs analysis and I intend to do that as well. I am of the opinion that there is more that could be done in the instruction of the States side of lawyers to help reduce the costs into the future or help to manage the costs into the future. But that is one of the reasons why this debate is so important so that I have a steer from the Assembly because it is not right for me or for any Minister or politician to be involved or to be making requests without the support of this Assembly. That involvement otherwise would be inappropriate because I believe that everyone has said that the inquiry must be allowed to continue to act independently without involvement in where it looks, who it hears from, I suppose metaphorically which stone it decides to look under, and how it does that review. A number of Members have suggested that they perhaps felt that the money was too excessive and that we will not be able to curtail the cost at £20.2 million. We have heard figures as high as £50 million and I have to be honest with Members as I was when we set up the original terms of reference. That is that the £20.2 million is based on the best estimates that we have before us today, the inquiry side coming from the panel itself and the other budgets coming from various departments, but with the caveat, as Members will see from the chairman's letter, that should other issues arise, should other lines of inquiry be necessary, then they will inform Members of this Assembly that those budgets will need to be redrafted and decisions then will have to be

made by this Assembly into the future. I do not think that that is a problem. I think that is the appropriate governance for the spending of this public inquiry and I think it should be considered openly and in the public domain. Because that is not how things have been in the past, but that I think will continue to give confidence. So I cannot say with certainty that this is what it will cost, but equally I would say ... and I was grateful to Senator Bailhache for saying yesterday in his speech he cannot say with certainty that it will cost £50 million. I want to come back to certainty with regard to my final group of comments, which is about reputation. I think that the Assembly over the course of the last 2 days has shown itself rightly to be a mature, thoughtful and, if I may use the unparliamentary term, a grown-up Assembly. We sometimes think of ourselves as being a local government or equivalent of county council government and very infrequently do we think of ourselves as being the equivalent of a sovereign state government. I make these comments not because of any constitutional issue but because that knowledge that we are the national government of Jersey I think is important and I hope that it is in that knowledge that Members, those who are not sure which way they are going to vote, will frame their decision. We said to the electorate, some of us, about the policies that we were going to pursue if we were voted to this place. This debate is not about policy, ideology or dogma. All of us, I believe, said to the electorate that we were the right people to sit in this Assembly to make the right decisions for this community. We are all independent with the 3 honourable exceptions on the back row over there and, therefore, what we are as individuals is an important part of our proposition to our community. I say that because with that comes a responsibility to make what are often difficult decisions about what is best for our community. This is one of such decisions because I believe the decision we make today, if it is against my proposition, will not only reverberate locally but will do so also internationally. I ask Members to consider that. Of course, like those who think the inquiry will cost £50 million, I cannot say with certainty whether we will be on the front page of every international media outlet. I would be misleading the Assembly if I said otherwise, but in my experience to date I believe that that would be the case. I do not want to rehearse what those lines of communication might be. Other Members have done so. None of us actually know, but I think we can give our best estimate of how this place, the Island that we love, would be misrepresented around the world. Therefore, I ask Members to consider whether that really is what they would wish for when making their vote today. In fact, I am of the view that it would have been better never to have started this inquiry than it will be to now stop it because, be in no doubt, if we do not accept this proposition before us today, that would be the result. I cannot see any other outcome. I cannot see the panel saying: “Of course, Chief Minister, we will carry on and produce a report to you, even though we do not know the full picture, even though those who have had accusations made against them have not been able to respond, even though we have not been able to understand fully the institutions and the role that they played in why this abuse was allowed to continue.” If it were me, I would not continue and they themselves have their professional positions to consider. I believe in this Assembly. I believe that at times of difficult decisions this Assembly and its predecessors have made the right decision in the best interests of Jersey, whether it was easy or whether it was difficult. Today is one of those difficult decisions and I ask Members to vote in unity supporting the victims to continue to have a voice. I ask Members to think about the international reputational issues that would be caused if we were the only place in the world to stop a public inquiry into historical child abuse. On that, I maintain the proposition and I call for the appel. **[Approbation]**

The Connétable of St. Clement (in the Chair):

The appel has been called for. I ask all Members to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting.

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| POUR: 35 | | CONTRE: 6 | | ABSTAIN: 1 |
| Senator P.F. Routier | | Connétable of St. Peter | | Senator P.M. Bailhache |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Senator I.J. Gorst | | Deputy E.J. Noel (L) | | |
| Senator L.J. Farnham | | Deputy S.J. Pinel (C) | | |
| Senator A.K.F. Green | | Deputy of St. Martin | | |
| Senator Z.A. Cameron | | Deputy R.G. Bryans (H) | | |
| Connétable of St. Helier | | Deputy G.J. Truscott (B) | | |
| Connétable of St. Lawrence | | | | |
| Connétable of St. Mary | | | | |
| Connétable of St. Ouen | | | | |
| Connétable of St. Martin | | | | |
| Connétable of St. Saviour | | | | |
| Connétable of Grouville | | | | |
| Connétable of St. John | | | | |
| Connétable of Trinity | | | | |
| Deputy J.A. Martin (H) | | | | |
| Deputy G.P. Southern (H) | | | | |
| Deputy of Grouville | | | | |
| Deputy J.A. Hilton (H) | | | | |
| Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré (L) | | | | |
| Deputy of Trinity | | | | |
| Deputy K.C. Lewis (S) | | | | |
| Deputy M. Tadier (B) | | | | |
| Deputy of St. John | | | | |
| Deputy J.M. Maçon (S) | | | | |
| Deputy R.J. Rondel (H) | | | | |
| Deputy S.Y. Mézec (H) | | | | |
| Deputy of St. Ouen | | | | |
| Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (S) | | | | |
| Deputy R. Labey (H) | | | | |
| Deputy S.M. Wickenden (H) | | | | |
| Deputy S.M. Bree (C) | | | | |
| Deputy M.J. Norton (B) | | | | |
| Deputy T.A. McDonald (S) | | | | |
| Deputy of St. Mary | | | | |
| Deputy P.D. McLinton (S) | | | | |

[11:00]

2. Draft Amendment (No. 28) of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey (P.24/2015)

The Bailiff:

We now come to P.24/2015 - Draft Amendment (No. 28) of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey - and I ask the Greffier to read the citation of the draft.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Amendment (No. 28) of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey. The States, in pursuance of Article 48 of the States of Jersey Law 2005, have made the following amendment to the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey.

2.1 Senator I.J. Gorst (The Chief Minister):

This is a minor amendment to Standing Orders and I am grateful to the support from P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) in allowing me to bring this forward. It would, in effect, enable any Minister to act as rapporteur for any proposition lodged in the name of the Chief

Minister and this is quite important because the Chief Minister is the one currently who has to lodge any proposition which recommends that an Act of the United Kingdom Parliament should apply, or an Order in Council be extended, to Jersey. I maintain the principles first and then the ...

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? Members in favour of adopting the principles kindly show? Those against? The principles are adopted. Deputy Le Fondré, do you wish to scrutinise?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence (Chairman, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel):

No, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Chief Minister, do you propose the amendments to Standing Orders *en bloc*?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

I do and I will endeavour to answer any questions as they may arise.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak? All Members in favour of adopting the Standing Orders kindly show? Those against? Adopted. Do you propose them in Third Reading?

Senator I.J. Gorst:

If I may, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Oh, we do not have a Third Reading. We do not, no. I am getting carried away. **[Laughter]** Well, we can read them several times but I am sure they are still adopted. The Standing Orders are adopted.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

So we now come to the arrangements for the next meeting. Chairman.

3. The Connétable of St. Clement (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

Yes, the arrangements for public business is as per the consolidated Order Paper with the addition on 28th April of P.32/2015 in the name of Deputy Southern, the revision of gas tariffs by the J.C.R.A. (Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority). I would suggest that on 14th April the meeting will take no more than one day and I propose the arrangements for public business.

The Bailiff:

Does any Member wish to speak or address the Assembly? Very well, then that settles the agenda for the next meeting and the States now stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on 14th April.

ADJOURNMENT

[11:02]