



States Greffe

Deputy Lyndon Farnham
Chief Minister

BY EMAIL

10th April 2025

Dear Chief Minister

Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

P.15/2025 – States Assembly Debate

The Panel met on 8th April and discussed the States Assembly debate on the Draft Control of Housing and Work (Residential and Employment Status) (Jersey) Regulations 202- ('[P.15/2025](#)') that took place on 1st April. The Panel is writing to convey its dissatisfaction with events that transpired during the debate, and to highlight its concerns regarding the impact on the Panel's scrutiny of P.15/2025.

The Panel was briefed by Government Officials on the proposals on 14th February where it was confirmed that P.15/2025 would not result in any policy changes. The Panel believed that the information about P.15/2025 was provided to it in good faith and undertook a process of scrutiny of P.15/2025 in the normal way, which resulted in the Panel's [Comments Paper](#). As such the Panel's Comments Paper noted that no policy changes were being sought through the adoption of P.15/2025 (with the exception of the [Amendment](#) lodged) and evidenced the Panel's support for P.15/2025. At no point during the scrutiny process was the Panel made aware that it was the intention of the proposer of P.15/2025 to propose that Regulation 5 (the route used to support Control of Housing and Work applications from high net-worth individuals) be debated separately. The Panel feels that it was misinformed about the policy implications of P.15/2025 and that this misrepresentation does not demonstrate constructive engagement with Scrutiny and goes against the spirit of the [Scrutiny and Executive Code of Engagement](#).

The Panel is aware that any Member of the States Assembly can call for regulations to be debated and voted on separately during a debate on a proposition. However, during the States Assembly debate on P.15/2025, the Panel was surprised by the proposer's decision to call for Regulation 5 to be debated and voted on separately, considering the potential impact of that decision. Had the Panel been made aware of the proposer's intention to do this, the Panel would have approached its scrutiny of P.15/2025 very differently and its Comments Paper would have reflected a different view as, should Regulation 5 have been rejected by the States Assembly, it would have resulted in a major policy change. The Panel is of the view that the absence of transparency about the proposer's intentions for P.15/2025, meant that the States Assembly was not properly informed about the consequences of a rejection of Regulation 5 of P.15/2025.

The Panel has serious concerns about the lack of constructive engagement and transparency demonstrated by the proposer of P.15/2025 during the States Assembly debate and feels that the debate has undermined the proper function of the political system. The Panel urges that the situation be discussed by the Council of Ministers and that a process is put in place to ensure that the situation is not repeated.

The Panel would appreciate to receive a formal written response by no later than **Thursday 17th April 2025**. Please be aware that it is the Panel's intention to publish the response it receives on the States Assembly website. However, should the information provided be confidential, please can you inform the Panel accordingly and the response will not published.

Yours Sincerely



Deputy Helen Miles

Chair

Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel