

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS
BY DEPUTY T.M. PITMAN OF ST. HELIER
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 5th JULY 2011**

Question

Given that the Minister has stated that he was already aware - prior to my question in the States - of the alleged 'leak' to a UK journalist of material from a then uncompleted and unpublished confidential audit report into the financial management of the historic abuse inquiry, will the Minister outline how he identified the individual he alleges leaked the information; what action he took as a result; further still, why this information and that this serious incident had taken place was not made available to States members or the general public?

Answer

I am concerned that Deputy T Pitman is asking a question, part of which implies that he has formed an opinion that I should have taken certain action at a particular time.

I became aware in October 2009 that some confidential information had been provided to a UK journalist as the result of enquiries by a member of staff of the Home Affairs Department. Those enquiries revealed that, although a draft report existed at that time, it was most likely that what had been provided was information contained in the working notes of a former senior police officer from the UK, who had been employed by the States of Jersey Police to work alongside the accountants who were producing the financial review for the Minister of Home Affairs.

I regret that in an answer to an oral question from Deputy T Pitman on 6 June 2011 I failed to clarify this detail. That was partly because my answer focussed on the question of who had revealed information and not on the question of what was revealed and partly because I was then not clear as to what had been provided to the UK journalist.

The further enquiries also revealed that the person likely to have provided the information was the former Senior Investigating Officer who had left Jersey in August 2009. Prior to leaving Jersey, that officer had given extensive interviews to the press in Jersey which had led to very substantial publicity. This officer was seconded to Jersey from another police force and had retired from that force and therefore could not be made subject to disciplinary proceedings anywhere. Furthermore, it was already very well known in Jersey that this officer had provided extensive information to the press in Jersey and I did not view this matter as being a significant extension of that.

By the time the issue was raised with me in May 2011 I had completely forgotten that this incident had occurred, and I have had to refresh my memory by reference to the written record in 2009. Indeed, it is only as a result of preparing this answer that I have become aware of the detail of the situation.