

STATES OF JERSEY



STATEMENT MADE '*IN CAMERA*' ON 2ND DECEMBER 2008: RELEASE OF TRANSCRIPT

Lodged au Greffe on 23rd May 2012
by Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –

- (a) to agree, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 160(4), that the transcript of the Statement of the Minister for Home Affairs relating to the suspension of the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police that was made *in camera* on 2nd December 2008 in accordance with the provisions of Article 9(4) of the Police Force (Jersey) Law 1974 (including the transcript of the questions to the Minister that followed the Statement), should be made public; and
- (b) to agree , in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 160(4), that, if any of the debate on this proposition takes place *in camera*, the transcript of this debate should also be made public.

DEPUTY M.R. HIGGINS OF ST. HELIER

REPORT

The purpose of this proposition is to right a wrong. Although this debate took place a week before I took my place in the States Assembly on 8th December 2008, I have reviewed the transcript of the debate in the States Greffe and believe, in the light of subsequent information, that States Members were misled by the then Minister for Home Affairs, Deputy Andrew D. Lewis of St. John, into the reasons why the Chief Officer of Police was suspended.

Because of the nature of an *in camera* debate I cannot set out in the report the reasons why I believe Members were misled – but I will be requesting the States to debate this proposition *in camera* so that these reasons can be revealed to members.

The purpose of the proposition is not to debate whether or not the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police should have been suspended later, on the basis of information obtained at great expense to the public purse after his original suspension, but to look purely at the original suspension itself.

Whether the former Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police should have been suspended later and ultimately disciplined is another matter which has never been fully tested before any court or tribunal. Nor has he ever had the opportunity to formally answer the charges made against him. In such circumstances the case against him has not been proven one way or another.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this proposition.