

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 26th NOVEMBER 2025

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	3
1. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.84/2025) - resumption	3
1.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):	3
Mr. M. Jowitt., H.M. Solicitor General:	4
1.1.1 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	5
1.1.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	5
2. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct – States of Jersey Police Force) Regulations 202- (P.82/2025).....	7
2.1 Deputy M.R. Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs): .	7
2.1.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	9
2.1.2 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	10
2.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	10
2.1.4 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	10
2.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	12
2.2.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	12
2.2.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	13
2.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	15
3. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - Honorary Police) (Jersey) Regulations 202- (P.83/2025) - as amended (P.83/2025 Amd.).....	16
3.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):	17
3.1.1 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	18
3.1.2 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:	18
3.1.3 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	18
3.1.4 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	18
3.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	20
3.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:	22
4. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 202- (P.84/2025)	24
4.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):	24
5. Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment No. 2 Regulations 202- (P.87/2025).....	26
5.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):	26

5.1.1 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	26
5.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	28
5.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:.....	30
5.1.4 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	30
5.1.5 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	31
5.1.6 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	31
5.1.7 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	32
5.1.8 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	32
5.1.9 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:	33
5.2 Deputy S.G. Luce:.....	36
5.3 Deputy S.G. Luce:.....	36
5.3.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	37
5.3.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	37
5.3.3 Deputy S.G. Luce:.....	38
6. Draft Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Commencement No. 2 Act 202- (P.88/2025)	41
6.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):.....	41
6.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	43
6.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	44
6.1.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:	44
7. Draft Children and Civil Status (Parental Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.105/2025)	46
7.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):.....	46
7.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	47
7.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	47
7.1.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:	47
7.1.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:	49
7.1.5 The Connétable of St. Peter:	50
8. Breaches of the Code of Conduct: review of Standing Orders (P.101/2025) - as amended (P.101/2025 Amd.)	52
8.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:.....	52
8.1.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	53
8.1.2 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North:	54
8.1.3 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:.....	54
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	56
9. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	56
ADJOURNMENT	56

[9:30]

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter:

I was wondering if I might ask just to make a change to the order. I am presenting P.88 and I would like, if possible, to then present P.105, which is currently the last item of the sitting, if I could do that immediately afterwards simply because I would like to attend to some Parish matters, if possible, this afternoon. I am on a flight to the U.K. (United Kingdom) tomorrow and then to Australia, so I have to fit quite a bit in.

The Bailiff:

So P.88 is the Draft Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Commencement Act.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

That is right.

The Bailiff:

Which, in theory, should be short. Then the next matter you wish to raise is P.105, the Draft Children and Civil Status (Parent Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations. Those are the regulations you lodged late.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes.

The Bailiff:

You want them dealt with sequentially?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

If I could.

The Bailiff:

Yes. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the proposition? Are Members content to proceed as suggested by the Connétable? Thank you.

1. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-(P.84/2025) - resumption

The Bailiff:

We now return to the Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) Amendment Regulations, P.81, which we had reached in Third Reading. In my view, under Standing Order 103(2)(c) in the circumstances Members may speak again in Third Reading. I think only 2 Members did speak in Third Reading, the rest were questions to the Solicitor General. I call upon the Minister in Third Reading.

1.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

At this stage it would be appropriate for me to answer the question which was asked of me yesterday. The question that Deputy Bailhache asked was concerning the limitation of liability being provided for in new Regulation 2A(2) being amended into the States of Jersey Police Force (Chief Officer and Deputy Chief Officer) (Jersey) Regulations 2017. While our policing legislation needs to be effective for Jersey, we share a policing culture with the U.K. and have similar expectations of our police. While we develop our own structures, when required in many areas this new complaints legislation defaults to providing something comparable to the U.K. structure. In the U.K., by virtue of paragraph

15(1) of schedule 1 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, police and crime commissioners and their staff have protection from liability across all areas of their work, including any disciplinary actions they take in respect of a chief constable or assistant chief constable. So in our new legislation, this liability protection is provided to our Police Complaints Commission by paragraph 6 of schedule 1 of the 2022 law, and is also due to other parties who might be taking actions akin to those of the U.K. commissioners. As the panel, considering the behaviour of the chief officer or deputy chief officer, provided for new Regulation 2A will have such a function, they are similarly protected from liability. Just as the Commission staff are protected in the U.K., so are the advisers to the panel in Jersey, including any human resources professionals who are mentioned in the 2017 regulations. The intention is simply to provide a comparable environment. However, after detailed review, I have been advised that the U.K. legislation does not extend liability limitation to legal representatives in the same way that the amended 2017 regulations will do here. If that is the source of the Deputy's concern, then I would be happy to agree to make an amendment to those regulations to remove such limitation at the earliest opportunity, which is a fairly minor matter and so hopefully could be at least, if not by the end of the year, pretty much within the first month of 2026, if this legislation can move forward now without being delayed. I do apologise to the Deputy for not being able to answer his question yesterday and to the Assembly. These regulations are one of an extremely complex set of legislation which has been developed over the past 5 years. I am advised from a review of the files that the decision to include a limited liability was taken before August 2020 and has remained in these regulations ever since. This matter has never been raised before, either in connection with these amendments or the earlier Police Complaints Law in the Assembly, at Scrutiny or indeed at the recent Members' briefings. I do hope that Members will understand why I was not prepared for this answer yesterday.

The Bailiff:

Minister, just to understand your undertaking to the Assembly, just so I understand it properly, it is in relation to Regulation 5 of these regulations, the new Regulation 2A or Article 2A(1)(c), is it? It is simply that you are proposing to lodge an amendment which has the effect of removing the words: "a person who is advising, or has advised, a tribunal under Regulation 2(5)"; is that right?

Deputy M.R. Le Hégarat:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Does any Member wish to speak on this matter in Third Reading?

Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Sir, could we raise the défaut on Deputy Farnham, please?

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to raise the défaut on Deputy Farnham? The défaut is raised.

Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

It was my understanding that the Solicitor General had been asked questions in relation to the effectiveness or actually need for this wording, so I would be grateful if he could advise.

Mr. M. Jowitt., H.M. Solicitor General:

I think the topic has now become academic in light of the Minister's undertaking to remove lawyers from the indemnity.

[9:45]

I cannot see it will assist the debate in Third Reading for me to offer an entirely academic view on how, if at all, this indemnity would work in respect of a lawyer advising the panel who found himself being sued by a chief officer or deputy chief officer. I think we have moved beyond that now.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak in Third Reading on this matter?

1.1.1 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

May I just express my thanks to the Minister for her comprehensive answer to my question and to say that I am entirely content with the way in which she proposes to deal with the problem.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak in Third Reading? I call upon the Minister to reply.

1.1.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

I thank the Deputy and Members for their support yesterday. It was a challenging piece of question to answer and we have managed to get there. I ask for the appel, please.

The Bailiff:

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

Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

Sorry, Sir, can I ask a quick question on this? I am trying to ...

The Bailiff:

No, you cannot.

Deputy D.J. Warr:

I cannot.

The Bailiff:

If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 45		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				

Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

2. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct – States of Jersey Police Force) Regulations 202-(P.82/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - States of Jersey Police Force) Regulations lodged by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel, and I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - States of Jersey Police Force) Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Articles 8(1A), 9(6), 19(2), (3) and (4), 20(10) and 22 of the Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Law 2022.

2.1 Deputy M.R. Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

These regulations will provide a highly anticipated update to our current provisions for dealing with police complaints. It is worth just revisiting some of the background to this legislation. At the heart of any effective police disciplinary system lie these essential purposes. First, to maintain public confidence in our police service and to protect its reputation. Second, to uphold the highest standards of conduct and deter any form of misconduct. Third, to ensure the safety and protection of the public we serve. On 30th March 2022, we took a significant step forward by adopting the Police Complaints and Conduct (Jersey) Law 2022, which I will refer as “the 2022 law”. This legislation marks a comprehensive and modern update to our approach to police complaints. Once enacted, this framework will bring Jersey up to date with modern expectations and best practices. The 2022 law provides a clear and structured foundation for how complaints should be managed. It also brings us closer in line with similar legislation across the British Isles, which is particularly important when we consider the potential need for mutual aid where resources and services may be shared across jurisdictions. The 2022 law sets out that dissatisfaction with the police falls into 3 areas: complaints about an officer’s actions, conduct matters where misconduct or criminal behaviour is suspected, and the most serious cases involving a death or serious injury linked to police contact. A complaint is a written expression of dissatisfaction about a police officer’s actions submitted by those affected on all their representatives. It must relate to harm or risk caused but cannot challenge a Centenier’s charging decision. A conduct matter arises when there is any sign of criminal behaviour or misconduct. If that threshold is not met, the issue can be addressed informally through agreed resolution, reflective practice review or performance procedures. I will outline these in greater detail later. Serious injury or death refers to any case where a detained person dies or is seriously injured and there is an indication that police contact may have been a contributory factor. A notable feature of the 2022 law is the inclusion of designated persons. These are individuals who may be public employees assigned to perform police functions or employees of contractors designated under the Police Force (Jersey) Law 2012. All of these arrangements will be overseen by the Jersey Police Complaints Commission, “the Commission”, which will replace the existing Jersey Police Complaints Authority while retaining the same membership. The regulations will ensure that procedural and process matters will be brought together in a single coherent framework. The focus of these reforms is on resolving matters easily, reasonably and proportionately. We are shifting the emphasis towards learning and development rather than punishment alone. This approach recognises that the vast majority of officers serve with honour and dedication, and that when issues arise they should be addressed in a way that offers support and education. Where disciplinary proceedings are necessary, they will be conducted in accordance with the highest standard: reasonably, transparently, objectively and fairly. These principles are not just words, they are the foundation of a just and effective system. Importantly, the disciplinary procedures now align with best practices found in

other employment fields, while still recognising the unique and vital role that police officers play in our society. This balance ensures that officers are treated fairly while also maintaining the high standards the public rightly expects. Accountability will go beyond active service. It will also apply to former police officers and former designated persons, providing that the issue was raised before or within 12 months of their departure. It is important to note that the chief officer and deputy chief officer are governed by separate legislation, reflecting the unique nature of their leadership roles. Our objective is to ensure that complaint handling standards are consistently applied. This is not merely a matter of administrative efficiency, it is a matter of public trust. I will talk about the initial steps to be taken once a complaint is received. Written complaints about police officers go to the chief officer who records the complaint, secures any evidence and informs the deputy chief officer and the Commission. Copies are shared with both the complainant and the officer unless this would compromise an investigation or the public interest, and these decisions are reviewed regularly. If a criminal offence is suspected, the D.C.O. (deputy chief officer) must refer the case to the Solicitor General. The D.C.O. may decide not to pursue a complaint or to adjust how it is handled. Where it is clearly without merit, whether that is because it is unfounded, repetitive, anonymous, vexatious, or impractical to investigate, this can only be done with the Commission's agreement. This is particularly relevant where a complaint is over 12 months old and appears to lack any justification. In such incidences, the complainant will be informed of the decision and the reasons behind it, unless it is not practical to do so. These safeguards help ensure that the system remains fair and focused on matters that can be properly and meaningfully addressed. Where a complaint involves an unknown officer or designated person, the standard procedures such as notifying the person complained about or their opportunity to make a representation will not obviously apply. However, if the individual is later identified, the investigation may resume. The D.C.O. also has the authority to suspend serving officers or designated persons, excluding former officers, if they are charged, reported for misconduct or subject of a complaint. We are also introducing a more effective approach to resolving complaints where formal investigation or criminal proceedings are not required. The previous informal resolution process is now replaced by the agreed resolution of complaints. In these circumstances, where outcomes such as dismissal, resignation or formal warnings are not anticipated, a proportionate and structured process will be undertaken. This process will be overseen by an inspector or above, appointed by the D.C.O. Once concluded, the outcome will be formally recorded and submitted to the D.C.O. for review and assurance. The complainant retains the right to request a review by the Commission if they are not happy with the outcome of the agreed resolution. Where the agreed resolution procedure is not appropriate, the D.C.O. will assess whether the matter amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither. If the matter is not deemed to be misconduct or gross misconduct, the D.C.O. must decide whether it reflects a need for improved practice, a performance concern, or requires no further action. When deciding whether to refer a practice requiring improvement, the officer's line manager should be engaged in the process unless that would be prejudicial to the consultation. All relevant parties must be informed of the assessment outcome in writing at the earliest reasonable opportunity. This written notification must also outline the complainant's right to request a review of that decision by the Commission. If the D.C.O. decides that the behaviour is not suitable for agreed resolution and the complaint, if proved, would be misconduct or gross misconduct, they will appoint a suitable investigator approved by the Commission. That investigator can be an experienced police officer or civilian, providing they are not involved with the individual concerned or the case. The D.C.O. will then provide the person complained about, with a written notice detailing the relevant facts, outlining the disciplinary procedures and identifying available options for obtaining legal advice. Where the conduct, if proven, would constitute misconduct or gross misconduct, a misconduct investigation must follow. Accountability and transparency are the cornerstones of public trust in our police force. That is why we have clear expectations for the timely handling of disciplinary investigations. Officers have 10 working days to submit statements once an investigation begins. If an investigation is not concluded within the prescribed period, which is initially 12 months, and every 6 months thereafter, the D.C.O.

must report to the Commission, outlining the progress made, the reasons for the delay, and the steps being taken to bring the matter to a conclusion. When a misconduct investigation report is received the D.C.O. must promptly decide whether a police officer has a case to answer and refer it for the appropriate disciplinary process. No action can proceed until the Commission submits its statement of approval, and all relevant parties must be notified of the findings and next steps. If no case is found the matter may be closed or redirected to performance review, except where the officer is no longer working. Let me now turn to how we address that misconduct within the service. It is important to note that the Commission must supervise misconduct investigations and any death or serious injury matters. The Commission must also be notified about a number of criminal conduct matters, which are outlined later in Regulation 58. Cases of misconduct will be referred to a disciplinary meeting, chaired by a chief inspector or another suitably qualified individual appointed by the D.C.O. Outcomes at this stage may include either a written warning or a final written warning. However, where an individual has already received a final warning or been demoted within the previous 18 months, the matter must be escalated to a disciplinary hearing. In each case of gross misconduct a formal disciplinary hearing must take place. These hearings are overseen by a panel of 3 appointed by the Deputy Chief Officer to ensure fairness and independence. The panel has a range of sanctions at its disposal from demotion in rank to dismissal with or without notice, which is a compulsory termination of service, or a requirement to resign, which allows an officer to step down voluntarily though under clear direction. In some circumstances, where appropriate, the outcome may instead be a written or final written warning.

[10:00]

This structured approach ensures that disciplinary matters are handled fairly, proportionately and with the seriousness they deserve. The Commission plays a vital oversight role in our system. It may provide written input or attend hearings when invited, and the appointed investigator or qualified representative must be available to answer any potential questions commissioners have. Before any case is closed the Commission must be satisfied with both the process and the outcome. Let me now briefly address the appeals process and the use of reflective practice review. Appeals must be submitted to the Commission within 28 days, with extensions permitted. An appeal panel, comprising a Royal Court judge and 2 jurats would be convened, co-ordinated by the Judicial Greffe. I spoke earlier about reflective practice. This can be used for developmental purposes to learn from mistakes, where under the old law disciplinary action would have taken place. A reviewer, who would typically be a line manager or senior officer, will engage the officer in a structured process to identify lessons and improvements. A report is then shared with the D.C.O. and monitored over 12 months. If the officer does not engage, the matter will be referred to the D.C.O. for review. These measures ensure fairness, accountability, and continuous professional development within the service. This piece of legislation is not just about process, it is about the trust, it is about ensuring that our police service remains accountable, transparent, and worthy of confidence placed in it by the people of Jersey. These regulations present a significant step forward in our commitment to transparency, accountability, and fairness in policing across our jurisdiction. I propose the principles.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the principles?

2.1.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

In the course of a review I was conducting into the implementation of the States Assembly to bring forward a Public Services ombudsman I did have the opportunity to speak with the chair of the Jersey Police Complaints Commission about the way in which complaints are conducted, and I was very impressed by the work that the volunteers on the Commission have done and also the amount of thought that has gone into what needed to be improved in the complaints handling process. Indeed,

a lot of thought given in terms of the standards that are to be applied in handling complaints, the importance of having an appropriately qualified investigator, giving of reasons, and maintaining anonymity of the identity of the complainant, and all for good reasons. I am very pleased to see that progress has been made in this area and give my full support to these regulations.

2.1.2 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

The Minister has given a very comprehensive explanation of these regulations and I understand entirely the need for accountability of police officers, ensuring that processes are proper and comprehensive, and so on. I do have some reservations, I suppose, about the copying and pasting of United Kingdom regulations and incorporating them into our law in Jersey for one reason, and that is that we are a very small place. The States of Jersey Police consists of not more than 200 officers whereas the police forces in the United Kingdom have thousands of officers. When one looks at the detail of the processes which we are importing into Jersey, I do have some concerns as to whether we can cope with it. We do not want police officers to spend their entire time investigating each other on complaints which may or may not be serious. They should be engaged in investigating what I might call "proper crime". However, I am not going to oppose these regulations because I do understand - as the Minister has explained - that there are advantages in having regulations which are consonant with the regulations which apply to other police forces in the British Isles. But I do express, as I say, some reservations about the importation of these extremely comprehensive rules.

2.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

It has just occurred to me that this does seem to be far more involved than the previous law and regulations, and I do wonder whether consideration has been given to the impact on the officers involved. Because I know that when officers are under investigation and it does take a certain amount of time - quite a considerable time - then it can have a detrimental impact on their mental health and well-being. I do wonder what considerations have been given to the far more detailed process which we will probably be agreeing today.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

2.1.4 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

I would agree 110 per cent with Deputy Scott's view in relation to the role of what is going to hopefully be the Police Commission. I fully hear what both the Constable of St. Lawrence and Deputy Bailhache say. However, having spent a significant time in the rank of inspector and chief inspector, and having done the role of the inspector in the Complaints and Discipline Department for 12 months myself, even though this looks more complex I would say that the introduction of the element of the performance review I think is a good one. We had an informal resolution before which basically was a case of the complainant was happy with an informal resolution, the officer was told they were unhappy with this, you had no recourse and there was no development process put in place. So from my perspective the element of having somebody monitored for the period of 12 to 18 months I think is a good thing. I think the division of what was a number of different offences, lots of different pieces to the legislation, I think now that we have got 3 distinct areas people will be dealt with at a lower level in relation to their performance, which would have ended up potentially in the realms of a full hearing. I do understand that people do not like us bringing in law from the U.K., however, what people will see is that on a number of occasions we utilise U.K. forces to investigate on our behalf, particularly that would occur in relation to serious injury or deaths, and so I think from that element is always a benefit for some of the legislation to fit in side by side. As I said, having worked with the previous legislation I am quite confident that this is workable.

The Bailiff:

Is the appel called for?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				

Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy Catherine Curtis, does your panel wish to scrutinise this matter?

Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

No, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Minister, do you wish to propose the regulations in Second Reading?

2.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir, and I would like to propose them *en bloc*.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading?

2.2.1 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

I just want to apologise to the Minister. I meant to ask this the other day but I know she was rather busy yesterday after the hearing sorting out the question that was there. It is just Regulation 5 on suspension. Just wearing a previous role as a representative and a case worker for trade unions, whenever there is a suspension it is a really difficult time. I just want to confirm, in part (8) it says: "If a police officer is suspended or a designated person's designation is suspended, they are not entitled to be paid an allowance." It does detail afterwards some specific examples when pay will not be there, and I just wanted to check whether the allowance is their regular pay or it is additional allowances that may go in terms of overtime hours or particular roles they may have or whatever

allowances exist in the police force. I always had a problem when people were suspended from their workplace without an outcome without pay, unless there was a specific outcome in mind and there was a specific thing that had been proven in the workplace. So I just wanted to confirm what that was for that regulation.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak in second reading? Minister.

2.2.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

My apologies, can I just ask what part, did he say section 5?

Deputy R.J. Ward:

Yes, whenever we do regulations I always have trouble with this, because we have the bold number which I think is Regulation 5, the heading is, "Suspension".

The Bailiff:

It is Regulation 5, Minister, subparagraph (8) refers to a police officer who is suspended not being entitled to be paid an allowance while they are suspended. Minister, do you want to respond to Deputy Ward?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Sorry, Sir, yes, I can respond but I did not know if anybody else was wanting to speak.

The Bailiff:

No, we have closed the debate. You are now replying.

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

In relation to police officers there will be a standard pay which all police officers receive, however, they will be elements of pay which police officers will receive for some of the additional things that they do. Off the top of my head you would have - we do not have them anymore - dog handlers would get a certain amount of allowance. There used to be allowances in relation to specialisms, as an example an on-call allowance and all of those sorts of things. So those things would not be paid, it would be that they would be paid the normal basic salary. I call for the appel please.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and the Greffier is asked to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. Deputy Moore, you cannot vote because you are still en défaut, so the voting is in fact: 43 votes pour, no votes contre, so the matter has been adopted unanimously in Second Reading.

POUR: 43		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				

Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Minister, do you propose the ...

Male Speaker:

Sir, may I at this point then raise the défaut on Deputy Moore?

The Bailiff:

Yes, are Members content to raise the défaut? The défaut is raised. Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

2.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

[10:15]

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading? Those in favour, kindly show. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				

Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

3. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - Honorary Police) (Jersey) Regulations 202-(P.83/2025) - as amended (P.83/2025 Amd.)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - Honorary Police) Regulations, lodged by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct - Honorary Police) (Jersey) Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Article 8(1A), 9(6), 19(2), (3) and (4), 20(10) and 22 of the Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Law 2022.

3.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

In my previous speech I outlined the background and rationale underpinning the police complaints legislation as it applies to the States of Jersey Police. Rather than revisit that in full I will focus on the key distinctions within the Honorary Police complaints legislation, highlighting only where it differs from the proposed framework for the States of Jersey Police. You will recall that the States of Jersey Police, once the police officer has received the complaint, it is largely the D.C.O. who leads the complaints process. For the Honorary Police these roles will primarily be allocated to the A.G. (Attorney General) and the constable respectively. For example, in relation to complaints against unknown officers or where an officer needs to be suspended, it is the A.G. who would deal with it. If a criminal offence is suspected the A.G. must refer the case to the S.G. (Solicitor General). Written complaints about Honorary Police officers go to the relevant constable, who records the complaint, secures the evidence, and informs the A.G. and the Jersey Police Complaints Commission. In line with States Police procedures, with the Commission's agreement, the A.G. may decide not to pursue a complaint or to adjust how it is handled where it is clearly without merit. The agreed resolution and the reflective practice review is led by a constable appointed by the A.G., and the outcome is formally recorded and submitted. If that Constable declares an interest in the complaint or it involves the Chef de Police, the A.G. will allocate it to a different constable. If the conduct is assessed as misconduct or gross misconduct the A.G. will request the D.C.O. to appoint an investigator approved by the commission. This may be a senior police officer who is at least the rank of inspector, or a suitably qualified civilian, provided they have no involvement in the case or with the individual concerned. When a misconduct investigation report is received the A.G. must promptly decide whether a police officer has a case to answer, and refer it to the appropriate disciplinary process. The disciplinary process itself is slightly different for the Honorary Police as there is no provision for misconduct hearings, as you would have for a States Police officer, only a misconduct meeting. Cases of similar misconduct will be referred to a disciplinary meeting chaired by either the A.G. or someone suitably qualified and appointed by them. Possible outcomes include a written warning, a final written warning, or if a final written warning is already in place, dismissal with or without notice, or a requirement to resign. However, if the behaviour amounts to gross misconduct these outcomes may be applied even without a prior warning. Where gross misconduct occurs and a final warning is already in place, either dismissal or resignation will be required. This approach ensures that disciplinary action is fair, proportionate and consistent with the seriousness of the conduct. As with the States of Jersey Police, the Commission plays a vital oversight role in the whole process. The appeals process for Honorary officers is the same as that for the States Police. The reflective practice review would typically be led by the constable or Chef de Police, who will engage the officer in a structured process to identify lessons and improvements. A report is then shared with the Attorney General and monitored over 12 months. If the officer does not engage, the matter will be referred to the A.G. for review. As with the States Police complaints process, this legislation is not merely a matter of procedure, it is a matter of trust. It is about safeguarding the principle that our police service must remain accountable, transparent and deserving of the confidence entrusted in it by the people of Jersey. These regulations mark an important step forward in strengthening our commitment to openness, accountability and fairness in policing throughout our jurisdiction. I propose the principles.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]**

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I did not want to make a speech, it is just a request. For members of the public who are listening, when Members are speaking I was wondering if they could at least once when using acronyms refer to what the acronym means at the beginning of the speech rather than just going straight in. There was lots of A.G.s and S.G.s but I do not think there was a single explanation for the public of what the A.G. or S.G. is.

Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Just a point of procedure. Has the amendment been accepted or is it ...

The Bailiff:

We come to that on the regulations in Second Reading.

3.1.1 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I stand to support the proposition. I am sure the amendment will be discussed when we get to it but I think, in principle, one of the points which we need to ensure takes place, that any process as a result of the complaint is swift and to the point. We have experienced long, drawn out complaints processes which is really unfair on those involved; both parties in fact. So I would like the Minister to confirm that will be the case. Likewise, I think we have to take care in not being over draconian in our approach because we will put people off joining the Honorary Police. They are all volunteers and the way you deal with volunteers of course is different from dealing with paid employees such as States of Jersey Police. I am sure that will be reflected in the way the Commission approaches complaints, as it is by us Constables when we are faced with a complaint.

3.1.2 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

The chairman of the Comité has beaten me to it, but I rise just to endorse the words that he has said about the potential for delay. That is not what we want to see with these new regulations. I am sure most of us who have dealt with complaints against members of our Honorary Police in the past know of long delays, and the detrimental impact that has had; notwithstanding that they are elected to the role, they are volunteers. We just do not want to see that, and that really was the nub of the question that I asked the Minister in the previous debate, because I am aware of the impact that delays have on certainly the Honorary Police members. I was concerned about the impact potentially on States of Jersey Police officers. So I do hope that the Minister will be able to reassure us that these changes, particularly involving the newly named commission, will not have a detrimental impact on the well-being of our Honorary Police officers.

3.1.3 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Following on from the Constable of St. Lawrence's concerns, I agree that any complaint can have a detrimental impact on the person who is the subject of the complaint. I note that the Comité has itself proposed an amendment to Regulation 55, which refers to the police friend. This is I think a very important thing to consider about people who are the subject of complaints; if they are being properly investigated it may well be protracted and it can be a very lonely place. So the need to give support to people in these circumstances without judging them is really essential, because it is about the welfare of those people as much as ensuring accountability.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

3.1.4 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

From my perspective I genuinely believe that these new regulations will be better than what we have previously. As I have already said, I think previously if it was not an informal resolution it was a full investigation so now with the difference between the 3 different sections that will make a difference. In relation to the element of friends, I think this is exceptionally important that whether it is an

Honorary Police officer or a police officer, that they have somebody that they can make sure that they keep contact with them and ensure their welfare moving forward. These elements are exceptionally important.

The Bailiff:

Do you ask for the appel?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Apologies, yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been asked for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the chance of casting their votes then I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The principles have been adopted:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 1
Connétable of St. Lawrence				Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				

Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy Catherine Curtis, do you wish to scrutinise this matter for your panel?

Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

No, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Yes, we have seen your report. Thank you very much. Minister, there is an amendment lodged by the Comité des Connétable, do you accept the amendments?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to take the regulations as amended? Thank you. Minister, how do you wish to propose the regulations in Second Reading?

3.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

En bloc, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Regulations in Second Reading? All those in favour of adopting the regulations, kindly show. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all those Members have had a chance to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce that the regulations have been adopted in Second Reading:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 1
Connétable of St. Lawrence				Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				

Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

3.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the Regulations seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations as adopted in Second Reading in Third Reading? That concludes the debate in Third Reading. Is the appel called for?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and the Greffier is asked to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting and I can announce that the regulations have been adopted in Third Reading:

POUR: 45		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 1
Connétable of St. Lawrence				Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache

Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				

Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

4. Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 202- (P.84/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 202- lodged by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel and I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

[10:30]

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 202-. The States make this Act under Article 24 of the Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Law 2022.

4.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hégarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

Following the previous 3 pieces of legislation today, we arrive at the final piece of the jigsaw, the Draft Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 202-. This Act will formally bring into effect the Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Commencement Act 2022 on 5th December 2025. Together, these measures mark a significant milestone. They ensure that our police complaints system is not only fit for purpose but that it is fair, transparent and, above all, trusted by the public whom we serve. This is about strengthening accountability, reinforcing confidence and upholding the high standards in policing for the benefit of our community. I therefore commend this Act to the Assembly.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Is the Act seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Act? All those in favour of adopting the Act, kindly show. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all those Members have had an opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The Act has been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				

Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

5. Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment No. 2 Regulations 202-(P.87/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item of business is the Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) Amendment No. 2 Regulations lodged by the Minister for the Environment. The main respondent is the chair of the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel and I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) (Jersey) Amendment No. 2 Regulations 202-. The States make these regulations under Article 6 and 29 of the Sea Fisheries (Jersey) Law 1994.

The Bailiff:

I ask the Minister to propose the principles.

5.1 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):

Our scallop fishery is in a strong position. Landings and landings per unit effort have increased in recent years reflecting a healthy stock on our seabed. However, we must ensure that this success is not short-lived. The decisions we make today will help determine whether future generations can enjoy the same benefits. That is why I am proposing a small but important step forward increasing the minimum size of king scallops from 102 millimetres to 105 millimetres. This proposal initially came from the fishing industry itself, who were looking to safeguard their fishery. This adjustment may seem small, just 3 millimetres, but its impact is significant by allowing scallops a few extra months to grow, increase their reproductive potential and strengthening the reliance of our stock. Our data shows that this change will enable an additional 19 per cent of 2 year-old scallops to breed, contributing to the next generation, and safeguarding the long-term health of the fishery. Yes, this measure will mean 7 per cent of extra catch needs to be returned to the sea, but only for a short period of approximately 4 months before the growth compensates for the change. In return, we see a stronger fishery with a higher quality product for the market which, in turn, is worth more to the fishers. This proposal is not the end of the conversation. I will also explore a further increase in consultation with Jersey and French industry partners including other management measures. Larger scallops produce more and better quality eggs and harmonising our standards with neighbouring regions such as Normandy and Brittany will strengthen our shared commitment to sustainability. In 2026, I will be bringing forward the Sea Fisheries (Trawling, Netting and Dredging) Regulations to the Assembly, which is reviewing other technical measures such as the ring size used for catching scallops with dredgers. Officers in Marine Resources are currently working with Bangor University on a scallop stock assessment to ensure the stock remains sustainably harvested for the future. The publication is due in 2026 but, today, I ask for your support for taking this first step. By increasing the minimum size limit, we are investing in the future of our fishery and our environment. I propose the principle.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the principles?

5.1.1 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

This proposition I think is a good measure, and of course I fully support it, but it is not enough. The Minister alluded to that, but I would like to go a bit further. It is not enough if we want to have a sustainable scallop fishery and, indeed, a sustainable wider fishing industry. I think it is important to make this point because there is a risk that we will be seduced into thinking that, by passing this

proposition, it is a case of job done; but it is not. So I want to talk about the bigger picture because I think the situation is quite urgent, but I do want to start with some optimism. I do think there is a big prize for Jersey that is within our grasp and this proposition could be a first step on the way. We are ideally placed, if we wish, to become a beacon of sustainable fishing. I think we could be great at this and, in my view, how we approach fishing could fit into a bigger vision for the Island, but I do not think we are remotely in that place at the moment. Currently, we have, for the most part, a fishing industry that relies on high volumes and, unfortunately, a low price. We have historically supplied relative low cost lobsters to France and, recently, we have apparently been selling scallops in bulk to the U.K., again for a relatively low price. In my view, the transition we need to make is to a lower volume, high-value industry, and the basis of that high-value industry will be that it is sustainable and not just that we say it is sustainable, but that it is verifiably sustainable. For me, that fits into a wider vision about Jersey's future. In broad terms, I guess you could say we should not be aiming for a mass market. We are too small for that and it plays against our unique Island identity. The kind of words I would use to describe where we should position ourselves as an Island include words like "high quality", "boutique", "unique", "specialist", "curated", "well-regulated", "sustainable" and "high value". Whether that is in fishing, farming, finance, or tourism, our identity depends on identifying opportunities that fit within those kind of parameters and seizing them. Back to scallops and the state of the scallop fishery. As the Minister says, on the surface, scallop fishing is booming. Last year, the catch by the Jersey fleet was over 1,000 tonnes, but is it sustainable? Between 2007 and 2021, the Jersey catch was around 250 tonnes a year. In the space of just a few years, it has rocketed a 4-fold increase. The French fleet scooped up an additional 800 tonnes last year, which is also an increase on previous years. This dramatic increase in scallop catch might suggest that all is well, but it is not sustainable. It follows the same sad path that the overexploitation of every fish stock follows. In the past, we had a significant conger fishery and a flat fish industry, which is long gone, and if you dive into the Annual Fisheries Report from the Marine Resources Department, you can see the same story playing out again and again. Welks; a rise to a peak catch to 800 tonnes in 2018 and then collapse. It is virtually zero today. Brown crab; as recently as 2013, the annual catch was 500 tonnes. Now virtually zero. Lobster peaked in 2011 at 275 tonnes. Now virtually zero. There are species-specific factors contributing a bit to those declines but, overall, we have a fishery that has a built-in boom and bust. We find a profitable stock, we overfish it and then it collapses. It is no good blaming changes in sea temperature or the return of octopus. They play a small role at the margins, but if these were the causes of the collapse of stocks, then the pattern of decline would be very different. It is overfishing that is the problem. If we want any further evidence, can I recommend to Members a talk that is taking place at lunchtime today at the Société by the former head of Marine Resources? By remarkable coincidence, he is talking about the history of the Jersey fishing industry and, in particular, the collapse of the oyster fishery in the 19th century. The talk is relevant because Jersey has an unwelcome place in history. The collapse of the Jersey oyster fishery was in fact the very first recorded example of the complete collapse of a commercial fishery. It was the result of a frenzy of overfishing that led to conflicts with France and conflicts within Jersey too. For example, our forebears in the States attempted to stop oyster fishing in an area known as the Grouville bed to try and protect oyster breeding grounds. In fact, the States banned fishing in this area but the fishing industry was not happy and, in the end, they ignored the ban and went fishing anyway and of course the eventual result was the total collapse of the fishery. Maybe Members think it is too distant in time to be relevant but there have been many similar collapses since; North Sea herring in the early 1970s and the Grand Banks cod in the early 1990s. They all follow the same pattern of rapid ramping up of fishing and chasing quick profits followed by collapse. Right now with scallops, we are in the boom. It is virtually the only fish stock left in the Island's waters that is commercially viable at the moment, but a bust will surely follow unless we take additional measures, and then what will we be left with? I am not getting at fishers here. Members will be familiar with the concept of the tragedy of the commons. It is entirely rational for any individual fisher to seek to maximise their catch. The trouble is that the sum total of those individual actions are against the long-term interests of the

collective. That is why we need to regulate the catch. The biggest most important measure we need to take is to reduce effort. We need to catch fewer fish. Fewer scallops and not more. In this regard, I am heartened that, in an answer to a recent Written Question - and the Minister has just repeated it now - he confirmed that he is working on setting what is known as a total allowable catch, T.A.C, for scallops, and then I hope for other species. The total allowable catch is defined by independent scientific research and it is based on identifying the total tonnage that can be taken each year for the fishery to remain sustainable and what is known as the maximum sustainable yield. That is scientifically determined and it can be used to set the total allowable catch, and then quota is allocated on that basis. I cannot emphasise enough the importance of setting those catch limits. I just hope we get the total allowable catch in place before it is too late. There is one other positive step. Last year, we voted to create marine protected areas, and although the M.P.A.s (marine protected areas) are not as extensive as I hoped, they are nevertheless important and a vital positive step. There is still the possibility that the areas that the Minister initially declined to designate as M.P.A.s but designated for further research will be added to the M.P.A. network once the research is in. The more of that sensitive maerl habitat we can protect, the better for the long-term future of the fishery because these areas are nurseries for scallops and indeed for other species. I know that there is pressure from some parts of the fleet, and indeed the French fleet, to delay the introduction of the M.P.A.s, which is scheduled for September next year. All I can say is that I urge the Minister to stick to his guns, resist the pressure and introduce the M.P.A.s on schedule, and I would respectfully ask him to address that point in his summing-up. I started by saying that we have the potential to create a high-value sustainable fishery and, going forward, there is a way to get there. We will need to reduce the catch and support the fleet through that transition. We need the industry to coalesce in the way that farmers did with the Jersey Dairy to form a producer organisation.

[10:45]

We will probably need a fishery hub to process and store catch, and we need to work hard to develop a local market so we are not dependent on export markets, which constitutes a single point of failure. As an example, when it comes to hand-dived scallops, there is a real opportunity to establish a strong local market in hand-dived scallops, which are entirely sustainable and which is why I again lament the failure last year to protect one area of the fishery for the scallop divers. So if I may sum up, the increase in size limits is a good start but, on its own, it will not save the fishery. Without catch limits, the fleet cannot simply increase its effort compensating for any shortfall in catch that happens because of the size limits by simply fishing harder for longer. It is what always happens. So the outline of what we need is clear. First, increase size limits because it is important and it is a good step. Second, work to establish the maximum sustainable yield, which is used to set an annual total allowable catch because this is the absolutely vital measure to keep fishing within sustainable limits. Third, expand the marine protected areas to include all the areas and the most sensitive areas of maerl because they are so vital as nursery grounds for scallops and other fish and then, finally, get behind a sustainable fishing industry with relevant investment and marketing. So, yes, let us vote wholeheartedly for these regulations but please let us not stop there. We can have a sustainable scallop fishery and would it not be nice if, as well as a footnote in history in relation to the collapse of the oyster fishery, we had a more welcome place in history as the home of a really modern integrated and sustainable scallop fishery because, after all, they are jolly tasty?

5.1.2 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will not speak in such a technical or eloquent way as my St. Brelade Deputy colleague, but I do have very much the same principle, and I was motivated, even before the debate, to want to speak on this. I think it is the kind of debate where I think we do not often get a chance to talk about scallops and about dredging more in particular. I think this is a time where those of us in the Assembly who feel strongly, and are reflecting I think a wider concern in the general public about the sustainability of our fisheries, do put it on record to encourage the Minister for the Environment, because I think

he does need encouragement. I think he knows he also wants to do exactly what Deputy Renouf has mentioned, and what I may mention, but he is of course trying to balance economic needs along with environmental ones. I start this by being reminded - as we were reminded recently and as my Scrutiny Panel was reminded - that when Deputy Morel took over at Economy as Minister, he was at pains to make sure it was called Sustainable Economic Development. I think this does then bring into question of course ... and this is a step in the right direction absolutely. Increasing the shell sizes by a few millimetres is a positive step. But if we want to be really sustainable when it comes to both the economics, the stocks, the environmentalism and the longevity of our scallop fishing industry in Jersey, I think there is ultimately one thing that we need to do, which is quite radical. We need to ban dredging the scallops in Jersey waters because there is an alternative. If you go up to the likes of Bonne Nuit Bay, not just in the summer but at the few occasions during the year when my wife and I indulge in fresh scallops, we get them straight off the boat. You do not exactly know when they are coming in, but there is a sign there and it says: "Hand-dived scallops" and you know roughly when they are going to come in, and they do not get any fresher than that but also, more importantly, they are caught in a very sustainable way. There are a group of men who go out and dive for scallops, and they do not get any fresher than that. The question I had for the Minister is that there are going to be these new limits which are higher, but when one dredges of course, there are all sorts of things that happen. So even when the new dredging changes are coming in to change the diameters of the dredging equipment, there are things that happen. Stones can get caught in the dredging equipment when they are taking up scallops, which mean that smaller scallops will get caught up in the dredging equipment. Also the stones can lead to more damage occurring in the scallops themselves. The advantage of hand diving is of course you can see. I suspect they do not go around measuring them, but I suspect a skilled and experienced diver for scallops will know instinctively roughly which are the ones that are big enough and which are the ones that are small enough, and they will probably err to the side of caution. There is no point in bringing up a bag full of scallops if you have to get rid of 10 per cent or 20 per cent of them. It is just not efficient. So you may well only take the ones that are certainly going to be above the limits. My question to the Minister is, when scallops are dredged, in particular, is it fair enough to say that the smaller ones will be returned to the sea but where do they get returned to the sea? Do they get returned at the point at which they are fished and put back into the freshly dredged seabed or do they get returned nearer the port? So are they getting dropped over the side, at which point, they are not going to be in their normal breeding grounds and their normal foraging habitats? There are also some interesting papers that are out there on the internet, and one that I have been looking at is from an organisation from Project U.K., which did a review of alternative measures that minimise the mortality of unwanted catch and reduce habitat impact in the U.K. king scallop fisheries. It seems that they collated a whole load of studies that were done over a period of years in the last 20 years and there seems to be 2 factors on whether and how scallops survive when they get returned to the sea. The 2 main factors they looked at were (1) stress on scallops. It sounds like a strange thing to say, does it not, "stress on scallops"? They might need to have a couple of days off work so that they can get back to being a scallop. That is of course not what it means. Scientifically, the reason they talk about stress is because it is partly about how long it takes them to re-burrow into the sand or the seabed. But the other more important factor, which they did find was significant, was the level of damage that had occurred to scallop shells. So this idea that you just have a higher limit in terms of the size and, therefore, you can return them to the sea and the scallops will be all right and they will survive is not necessarily the case. What they found is that the majority of damage that occurred to scallops was during the initial impact with the dredge teeth. They tested batches of scallops which were undamaged, slightly damaged and badly damaged and what they found is that the density of scavengers at the stressed but undamaged scallops was equivalent to the density during the un-baited period. So what that is saying is that when healthy scallops are returned to the sea, they are much less likely to get attacked by scavengers - and stress was not really a factor in that - but the damaged scallops was where there was a significant increase in the density of scavengers; so lots of scavengers will be coming around. They found over the period

of 96 hours following their return that the badly damaged scallops were all eaten within just 24 hours for each of the 2 replica periods and that the scallops that were lightly damaged survived longer but the survival rates differed among replicates. So what this says to me is that we have got an industry in Jersey which is for scallops and my understanding - and perhaps this is something that the Minister could confirm in summing-up - is that most of the dredging that takes place for scallops in Jersey waters does not happen by Jersey fishers. It happens by European, i.e. French fishers, and that we really need to think about the sustainability of our markets. I think Deputy Renouf is right. I think Jersey needs to look towards a more premium product that says: "Yes, we have a sustainable fishing industry" at least when it comes to scallops, our premium product, and they will be sold locally and, hopefully, exported whether to the U.K. or to France. Okay there may be a premium to pay for that but you know that there is a brand that comes with that, which is that these scallops are not only caught with love and sustainability, but they are much more sustainable. I do question when will humans ever learn because we seem to have a lot of cognitive dissonance. It is very possible, I think, for Islanders and States Members to, on the one hand, promote the great work that Durrell do, for example, and people who talk about conservation, sustainability, protecting the environment, looking after the planet and looking after animals while, at the same time, not learning the lessons from history. One very good book that I read recently but is not that recent as it is from 1977 is simply called *Cod*, as in the fish, written by Mark Kurlansky. He goes through of course the history of cod and how important it was to the world and that when a particular fishing industry is booming that is probably the time that you need to be most worried because there is complete complacency. You think there is a stock that is almost limitless and, certainly when it came to cod, the ethos among the global community was that this was an endless resource and that there is no way that a small impact like fishing could ever stop mother nature from replenishing the cod stocks. Of course how wrong they were and we were on that. It is exactly the same when it comes to scallops. Deputy Renouf is absolutely right that with the oyster fisheries in the Channel between Jersey and between the French, we managed to wipe out completely the natural oyster in Jersey to the point that only later on, the slightly different cultivated oyster did make a return to our shores, but it was not an easy process and that was certainly inevitable. So I, for one, will of course be supporting this but I would like the Minister to give real consideration to whether or not a more radical approach can be brought forward. There will no doubt be big political consequences that need to be handled if Jersey were to be as bold in the future as to bring in a complete ban on scallop dredging in our waters. But I think we could do that on the justification that it applies to everybody equally, so it applies to Jersey, Guernsey and French fishers equally and that, ultimately, the prize will be one that is worth fighting for.

5.1.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

I need to be quicker off the mark. I have been trying to attract your attention to speak because this is the second time today that I have been beaten by another Member to say what I want to say. Deputy Tadier has effectively stolen my thunder, so my speech is going to be much shorter as a result of that. When the Minister spoke, I felt there was a tension in his words, because he referred to dredging and he referred to sustainability, and that always makes me feel uncomfortable. I do not want to repeat what Deputy Tadier has said but I think I just need to put a question to the Minister regarding this. I think the regulations that we have on dredging are probably quite tight compared to other jurisdictions. However, I would like to ask the Minister whether he is considering tightening, strengthening those regulations on dredging to provide sustainability not only for the scallop stock but for other marine life that is caught when dredging. If not, why is he not giving consideration to that?

5.1.4 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

I really appreciate this debate opening to just not about the size of a scallop but the wider concept about what our fishing industry should look like. The word that just keeps banging into my head all the time is "vision"; where is the vision for the future of this industry? I was really struck when we

were doing this under Scrutiny with the marine protected areas by the people who sat in front of us at Scrutiny. They were a combination of people. They were the dredgers, they were the hand divers. Well, there were not very many hand-diving people. It was just more the dredgers who had the biggest influence and what I came away with was it is not an industry as a whole. It is a really divided industry, so no 2 people seem to have the same view of what is going on. Subsequently, funnily enough, after that Scrutiny hearing I was in my café and there was a guy in his big boots and I said: “You look like you are in the fishing industry.” He said: “Yes, I am a hand diver. I go out.” I said: “Why did you not appear in front of the Scrutiny Committee?”

[11:00]

He said: “I do not have time. My day is spent out there getting the fish and not being able to spend time talking to Scrutiny. I have to make a living. I have to pay my mortgage. I have got to put food on the table.” Sometimes this is some of the problem. We do not connect very well with the people at ground level who are on the day to day, who could really inform this debate. I think there is a lot of theorising in here. I appreciate Deputy Renouf’s commentary around the environmental consequences and obviously the collapse and all of these things, but this is a big conversation about what is the future shape of our fishing industry going to look like. There is the exact tension between the economics and the environmental issues, which are very clear. I just want to encourage whoever is in charge - the Minister for the Environment is involved in this - to somehow work out what it is, if we talk about sustainable catches, what the heck is a sustainable catch? I have no idea but I am sure there are a few fisher people out there who do know what a sustainable catch looks like. They also want a sustainable living and they want a sustainable future as well. The industry, as I understand it right now, is as small as it has ever been in the number of boats out there. Why is that? Why are we having all of these issues? I absolutely agree with the idea of let us go with quality, let us lower the volume, but we have an export industry. I am sure there is an export industry there because it is that volume that gives you sustainability, so there is your exact tension going ahead between the economics and the environmental issues. I would just encourage a rethink. This is something I can see on Regen with agriculture, which is really good news and people are getting it, that Jersey is a small-scale environment, but we need that bigger conversation, that wider conversation. I absolutely agree with Deputy Renouf in saying this is not far enough, it is a step in the right direction. Absolutely, but the real vision is about talking to everybody in that industry and saying: “What is the shape of this industry going to look like? How do we make it sustainable for everybody and how do we make sure we are talking to everybody?” Those are all the things. I think too many times in this Island, and I talk to so many people, we are at a distance between the people on the ground who actually know, what I call the experts in the room, and finding their voice and getting that voice, that conduit through into this Assembly and making good informed decisions. I just want to encourage that wider debate, Minister, but I obviously will be supporting this proposition.

5.1.5 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I just rise to speak in support of the proposition and just emphasise the point that the department are in regular communication with fishermen on the sea, not on the ground. I would add that most fishermen are fully aware of the sustainability issue. It is in their interests to do that, and I would almost say that the less Government interference the better very often is the case. Referring back to mentions of the oyster fishery in the late 19th century, that was cleaned out by oyster boats from the east coast of England coming down and swiping our stocks, and I am sure we will not be letting that happen again. The management of fisheries is a different thing these days. I am very supportive of the move, which is supported by the fishermen, in keeping the size up to ensure preservation of the stocks and trying to ensure continual catches for future fishermen as time goes on, because that is of concern to the industry.

5.1.6 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Just following up on this whole lesson from history that we learnt, I did worry a bit about whether there could be some fishermen who are involved in the scallop industry who might find that discussion patronising because it is a bit like saying that we are going to go back to employing children in certain ways. The whole modern thinking is different and I believe that the people involved in this industry care just as much about sustainability, and indeed it very much is in their interest to have sustainability, as most of us. When people say this is a step in the right direction but it is not far enough, I would invite them to consider whether sometimes stepping in the right direction is what you need to do. You do not want to go too far either because that can have severe consequences for the industry. You have to do a certain amount of pacing and eventually something more in the way of leading, but the point is I do believe there has been lots of discussion in this area about what is the right balance and that we are where we are. It is in the right direction and, as with I suspect most people in the States Assembly, I will be supporting this proposition accordingly.

5.1.7 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

I will be supporting this proposition. I do think it is a step in the right direction and maybe we just need to take quite a few more steps to get us to where we should be. I thought that I would like to really praise Deputy Renouf for his very eloquent speech. I do think that we have to have more marine protected areas. We do have the M.P.A.s (marine protected areas) at the moment and in 2022 I met with Freddie Watson from Blue Marine, who was talking about protecting the maerl beds, which I really believe we have to do. I would like to see a reduction of dredging. I would like to see a complete ban on dredging, and I think we could sustain it. I agree that we need to have a gold standard for fishing and that if we have to charge slightly more then so be it. I am supporting this. I would like to see us take quite a few more steps forward but this is a step in the right direction.

5.1.8 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I thank everyone who has been speaking as well because I work closely with Deputy Luce with regard to the fishing industry, obviously Deputy Luce focusing on the regulatory side and then in the international affairs elements I work with the industry, speaking to the industry about the business side of it. There is no doubt in my Chamber of Commerce speech in September I raised the fact that there is a crisis in the fishing industry and that we do need to rethink in many different ways, but you have to put the bread on the table today, that is absolutely vital. I completely agree with the idea that one step is the right thing to do because we do need to take it step by step by step, because otherwise you can be destroying livelihoods very quickly. The principal reason I rise is to say that Deputy Luce and myself are commissioning work on the future of the fishing sector in Jersey. It is not easy. It was mentioned that there are many different views in that sector. It is true it is not cohesive as an industry. There is no one industry view and it is very complex. Even deciding scallop sizes, the complexity comes in there. Members will have noticed in Deputy Luce's speech he talked about French fishermen. You need to get buy-in from France on these things as well. It is not just Jersey, and listening to some Members I do worry that Members think we exist in isolation in terms of fishing. That is the mistake that was made by the fishermen who voted for Brexit. They forgot that they depend on markets and those markets are not in Jersey. It is wonderful to think that Jersey will consume more fish but today we do not. You cannot just change people's tastes overnight. That takes years and decades and decades to change. It can be done but it takes decades, because that is cultural and deeply difficult. It is also really difficult. Many of the issues that have been mentioned by Members today are issues that are brought up in matters related to U.K., E.U. (European Union) agreements. We cannot even as an Island operate on our own in that respect because things we do with regard to our waters pop up in Brussels and pop up in London and have an impact on what we can or cannot do. So it is very easy to opine in isolation in our little ivory tower, but what I do know is that Deputy Luce, like myself, is entirely committed to creating a sustainable fishing sector but it is a fishing sector that has enormous challenges right now, and the size of scallops is the least of those challenges. Deputy Renouf mentioned some of them and they are related to the environment, they

are related to geopolitics, they are related to just everyday life for the fisherman who needs to earn a living. In order to charge a higher price - again this is something that has been said today - you cannot just charge a higher price by saying to markets in Europe we want a higher price. That is not how it works because there are lower prices all around you, so your fish will not get sold, it will not be bought. The only way you can charge a higher price is by adding value, and that means adding processing and that is an area we will be looking into, but again these are things that businesses can do themselves as well. Businesses in Jersey are processing fish products and selling them outside the Island, but that is the only way you can demand a higher price. One person in the fishing industry recently said to me that they had been told that there was a buyer in Europe who would take as much spider crab as they could possibly take at market price, and this person was very pleased to hear this and was delighted and thought it was fantastic but then, of course, jolted into reality when—and this person knows very well, far better than me—the market price is set in St. Malo, the market price is not set in Jersey. Things such as the cost of wages in Jersey are not taken into account in the setting of that market price. The higher cost base in Jersey is not taken into account in the setting of that market price. Therefore, it becomes nigh on impossible with the product on its own to charge a higher market price. The only way to do it is to add value, and that comes through processing. I want Members to understand that Deputy Luce and myself are working with the industry but it is an industry that is feeling very fragile at the moment and we do need, as Deputy Scott said, to take it step by step. It is too easy to opine and believe we can snap our fingers and change all these things. That is not something that can be done. There are too many different pressures and too many different variables, so we do need to negotiate these powers carefully, and that is what Deputy Luce and myself are trying to do. This change to the regulations increasing scallop sizes is an important step forward, but it is one and we will be taking many others afterwards. We will be doing so at an appropriate rate that ensures that people's livelihoods are not destroyed at the same time as we move to a more sustainable and valuable, I hope, fishing sector.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

5.1.9 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

I thank all those Members who have spoken. It is encouraging to know that so many people take an interest in one of our most traditional of industries on the Island. If I might just work backwards and start with Deputy Morel and just reiterate to Members how he and I work together on all these matters. He is right that the industry at the moment is in crisis, it is fragile, and as a farmer I used to think every morning when I got up how happy I was to be working on the land and not having to go to sea. Working at sea and making a living at sea is a tough thing to do, and we need to bear that in mind as we make these changes because I will come to compromise in a minute. Can I just say, following Deputy Morel's speech, that he is absolutely right. All these regulations involve France, they involve the U.K., they involve the European Union and we, between us and the Minister for External Relations and the Chief Minister, will tell you we do extensive work in these areas. They are challenging, they are difficult, and we know only recently every time one of us sets foot in Brussels, fishing is a subject that comes up whether we like it or not. It is really important to everybody concerned, and it is mentioned a lot. Can I thank the Constable of St. Martin, Deputy Scott and my Assistant Minister for their interest, and I will cover the points they make in my response to the first 3 speakers, because lots of things have been said and I do not want to repeat myself. Deputy Warr, yes, there is a vision and I will come to that right at the end, if I may, but I want to emphasise - and I may as well do it now - in marine resources we are greatly, hugely fortunate to have a top team who are working on all the issues that I will talk about in the next 5 minutes or so. I cannot say how grateful I am to have such knowledgeable and hardworking people in the department.

[11:15]

The Constable of St. Lawrence mentioned dredging versus sustainability and she is right, there is a challenge there but I will in a minute just address some of those, because it is possible to do the 2; not everywhere but it is possible to do the 2. But the strengthening of regulations will come next year. This is a small step and I will be doing more. Next year, as I mentioned, I will be coming back with some netting and trawling regulations and modifying those. Deputy Tadier mentioned balance and compromise, and politics is all about balance and compromise, but looking to the future I share the vision of many here - Deputy Tadier especially - of plenty of fish in the sea, meaning that fishermen have to put in less effort to make a living and have a profitable business. It is not difficult to visualise how that might work where you go out for just literally a few hours instead of spending all day trying to catch the same number of fish, because we have got a sustainable fishery that has plenty of product there. The difficulty we have is getting from this point today to that point in the future and how we compensate fishermen, how we work with the stock, how we introduce those sustainable measures. Just getting to damage, and Deputy Tadier mentioned it, yes, absolutely. Hand-dived scallops come out of the sea in perfect condition, dredged scallops not quite so perfect at times, but we can work sustainably with dredging in the short term and medium term. In the right ground, mobile sandy areas, it is possible to not damage the environment overly and to catch scallops without damaging overly either by the stones that Deputy Tadier mentioned. The ring size is important and for those who do not know, when the dredge is pulled along the seabed, instead of you might have a net for catching fish, when you come to catch fish you have a series of metal rings in the bottom of your dredge, which allow stones, allow small scallops and other things to fall through, so hopefully you are left with large scallops. Varying the ring size is a very good way of making sure we do not do too much damage, the same as the fishermen burning a load of fuel dredging stuff that they do not need to. As regards to returning undersize scallops to the sea, obviously as I have just described, some will fall through the dredge as they are being dredged but those that find themselves on the deck of the boat would normally be returned within the first 10 minutes because the catch has to be sorted; so those scallops are going back to the area where they have been dredged. As for the Jersey-French amount, ratio of scallops, as Deputy Renouf said, in this last year or so Jersey fishermen have taken more scallops out of our waters than French fishermen have, which is quite surprising given that we only have 10 boats and they have 37 boats. But they are limited to 1 tonne a day and our boats are not limited to anything, and I will come on to that in the future if I may. I am going to come to Deputy Renouf finally, but many of the points I will say in addressing his questions apply to everybody who has spoken here. He said is what we are doing today getting the job done? No, it is absolutely not. It is a tiny small step in the number of steps that I want to take into the future to protect not just the scallop fishery but the lobster fishery and what we have left of the crab fishery. The M.P.A.s are a big subject. They are very on the radar of the French fishermen at the moment and Jersey fishermen, and some time next year there will be some announcements and some closures. We do enjoy a marine stewardship certification for our lobster fishery but I have to say that our lobster catches are declining; yes, we know that, but there is a reason. It is a bit like the crab fishery has almost disappeared; Deputy Renouf mentioned that and he is absolutely right. What is happening is climate change is raising the temperature of the water. The crabs that were in Jersey waters are now prolific in parts of the North Sea. They have moved up the channel and they have disappeared. The other thing, of course, which is starting to hamper the lobster fishery is octopus. Again, because of the rise in sea temperatures, we are now seeing a lot of octopus. I am sure Members will have seen that reported in especially the south-west of England. Fishermen are pulling lobster pots out of the sea where the shells of lobsters are there empty because they have been taken apart by octopus who have got into the lobster pots. That is unfortunate and that is another challenge that we are trying to solve within the industry. I want to talk about products, niche markets, traceability and sustainability, and those people who have mentioned that - Deputy Morel, Deputy Tadier, Deputy Renouf - are absolutely right. We have a wonderful brand in the word "Jersey". Whether it is Jersey milk, whether it is Jersey new potatoes, whether it is Jersey seafood, whether it is Jersey oysters, Jersey sells but it is important that we maintain top quality. I will just come back to that right at the

end, if I may. I want to talk just very briefly about the 1,000 tonnes that Deputy Renouf mentioned, and is that sustainable? I do not know but I did mention that we are doing the work at the moment with Bangor University about the total catch that we could take out of the water knowing that that would be a sustainable level. By the time we get to this time next year, I very much hope that we would have come in with some limits on T.A.C. (total allowable catch). Not very long ago I capped the number of boats that can go dredging to 10. I am not intending to extend that further. That is another small step. I take on board absolutely the talk about the native oyster industry. That was a very prolific industry that supplied the whole of the south of England with native oysters and, yes, it was overfished and annihilated to the point where there is very few left. I have spoken about lobsters, I have spoken about crab, but I just want to return to 2 issues. The first one is one that Deputy Morel mentioned when he spoke about he and I working together. We have taken steps in very recent weeks to start putting together some immediate work that we want to do about the future of the fishing industry and how we can try to show some hope, show some new initiatives, show how we can develop new markets. I can assure Members that is work that will be ongoing and that both of us are absolutely committed to working with the industry to see how we can help them see a future, a profitable future for them while also protecting more areas and making our fishery more sustainable. I would just like to finish with these few words. They may surprise Members, I do not know, but Jersey is the leader in the whole of the north-east Atlantic in marine protection. Our marine spatial plan, our proposed marine protected areas are way ahead of what others are doing. Even next year, even with some changes that I might make, we are going to have 20 per cent-plus marine protected areas that will pull us well ahead of the U.K. and the E.U. We are really leading the way in marine protection, but that does not mean we should be complacent, and I want to continue to do more to strive towards the sustainable fishery that we have spoken about. The 3 millimetres increase that we are speaking about here in this debate today is coming from a much larger debate about the whole of our fishery and our desire to make Jersey territorial waters a leader in sustainability and sustainable fishing. I will just finish with this. Yes, this is a small step but this is one of a number of steps that I and we will be taking in the coming months to make our waters more sustainable and protect those fish that are in them. With that, I ask for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 47		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				

Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy Coles, do the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel wish to scrutinise this matter?

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South (Chair, Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel):

No, thank you, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Minister, how do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

5.2 Deputy S.G. Luce:

Can I propose them *en bloc*, please, Sir?

The Bailiff:

Yes. Are they seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations? All those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much. The regulations are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

5.3 Deputy S.G. Luce:

I do, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations as adopted in Second Reading in Third Reading?

5.3.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

In deciding whether or not to adopt this in the Third Reading, I think we might also wish to consider the comments that the Minister made that this is a small step and the arguments that this does not go far enough. I think seeing what we are passing today in the wider context, that I know has been touched on already, that there is a tension, of course, when making legislation like this, that has been well aired between the economic and the environmental, if we can call it that simply, which is about sustainability. I do take exception when I hear about States Members being accused of being in ivory towers when what they are doing is looking with balance at the ramifications of whether or not what we are passing today goes far enough. That would be a pertinent consideration for Members in considering whether they can support it because, of course, we are in a situation where we have to support this because it is a very small step, but there is a question of whether that then becomes window dressing. I am reminded of the fact that whenever fish stocks or shellfish stocks have been depleted, either almost in their entirety or completely, it is because the economic arguments of the day have trumped the scientific and sustainable arguments. I did think briefly of the dodo, and I know it is not the best comparison but it is one that has a local connection. We have referred to Durrell already. Of course, when Deputy Morel said the immediate problem is that these people need to put food on the table, in I think it was 17th century Mauritius the colonists did need to put forward on the table, they needed to put dodo on the table, but they could not put dodo on the table for very much longer. The reason that is a flawed analogy is, of course, because one of the main reasons dodos are extinct was not because they were hunted necessarily but, sadly, because of the diseases that were brought and the animals that were brought to the Island, and the fact that the poor dodos did not know how to defend themselves. I think that brings us back to the scallops, that the scallops sitting there on the seabed are just sitting there of course waiting to be caught. What else would they be doing with their time? I think this argument then becomes binary, so I would again, in the Third Reading, encourage the Ministers to be bold. We either have control over our territorial waters ... and I am not naïve, I realise that there is a realpolitik in there, there is global politics, but we either have the ability to say: “We want to do this with our territorial waters and it will apply to everybody” and then of course we have the conversations to take people along with us. Whether it comes to small steps like this or more radical steps in the future, we cannot be held to ransom by bigger powers on our doorstep simply because we do not have the boldness to act. If that is the case, we might as well simply give up our territorial waters and leave the U.K. and the E.U. to legislate for us, but if we are not willing to do that, then I think we at some point have to take a step and say, no, we do have 800-plus years of not complete independence, but certainly a lot of autonomy, which has been fought for and defended for over generations, and which we all take an oath of office for, which is defend, I think, the privileges and the rights that have been given to Jersey. Not just an oath that you take, Sir, but of course all of us take on our oaths of office and really decide what that means when it comes to defending not just the integrity of our territorial waters, but also the meaningful sustainability of our fish stocks into the future. Of course, having said that, taking all of our local community with us, because there is a long-term view here that needs to be protected for the future, not just for today, to put food on the table. The last comment is that of course the poor octopus, who are stealing the lobsters from the pots, while that is an issue, the poor octopus, they do not have anything else to eat. They have to eat seafood. I would suggest that we do not have to eat seafood. We can eat hamburgers, chips, carrots and Jersey Royals and so on, so I think there is ... spare a thought for the poor octopus as well as the poor scallops in the future, Minister.

[11:30]

5.3.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Just a couple of brief points. I want to thank the Minister for his positive response to the debate and to some of the points I made, and indeed the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. I do think there is the potential to move forward together here. I would just say though to those who think that we can stop here because in the end the fishing fleet have the same interests, I dispute that, and I made reference to the tragedy of the commons. The truth is that a fisher who decides they want to help the fishing stocks by catching fewer scallops will simply encounter the problem that always happens in this situation, which is that the other fishers can take the scallops that they have decided, very helpfully, to leave behind. That is why the regulation has to apply to the whole fleet. It is because what is in the interests of one fisher is different to what is in the interests of everyone, so I maintain that we do need to think about that. I am grateful to the Minister for reinforcing the point about the work that is going on to develop the total allowable catches, and I hope very much that that will bear fruit, and that because that is based on science we will have the authority to enter into negotiations when we do have to discuss this our neighbours, because the T.C.A. (Trade and Co-operation Agreement) not only allows but I think mandates us to take measures to make our fishery sustainable. Therefore, armed with that information, I think we will be in a good position going forward. So all of that is simply to say that I maintain the support I gave originally for this. I think it is a very good measure, but I do also want to bolster the argument for that wider regulatory piece, because I think that is also important.

5.3.3 Deputy S.G. Luce:

I just thank Members for their further words. I would just say to Deputy Tadier that octopus are known as an apex predator, which sounds fairly serious to my mind, but they are very good at eating just about anything they come across.

Deputy M. Tadier:

They might steal my hamburger next time I am out at sea. [Laughter]

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I did speak about how they are managing to eat lobsters and crab inside lobster pots, but of course we are also finding areas where they are eating scallops on the seabed and they manage to take scallop shells apart, so they are pretty clever creatures. Deputy Tadier says: "Are we going far enough?" and my answer is, well, it is always going to be a compromise. We mentioned economics versus the environment. I thought about the stock and trying to maintain the stock versus the possibility of non-profitable fishing businesses, and of course the Deputy mentioned that as well. It is all about a compromise. We are doing a lot of work as well. As well as the stock assessment, we are also doing some work to analyse the economic data of the effects on the fishing fleet of the areas we propose to close next year because there is several hundred thousand pounds worth of product which will not be taken out of these areas once they are closed. The Deputy challenged me to be bold. I do believe we are being bold, but at the same time I am having to do some research areas where I want more data because all the decisions I take, I want them to be based on data and evidence, and to do that I need more information, but the M.P.A.s will come in next year. Quite how extensive they are is still to be decided, but they will come in next year. I am working with the industry; I am working to protect areas; I am working to protect the stocks; and I am working to try to protect the industry itself. I do believe there is a future for a wonderful, sustainable fishery here in Jersey, and at the same time a profitable fishing industry for those who still want to go out and make a living on the sea. It is a hugely traditional industry here in Jersey. I thank Members again for their great interest and participation in what could have been a very small item on the agenda today, and I certainly go away from here with Members' views on the sustainability of the fishery and the sustainability of scallops in particular.

Deputy J. Renouf:

Can I ask a point of clarification?

The Bailiff:

Are you prepared to give way for clarification, Minister?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Yes, I am.

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy.

Deputy J. Renouf:

When the Minister refers to M.P.A.s being brought in next year, but not being sure about how extensive they will be, does that refer to the further research areas or does it refer to the areas that have been designated as M.P.A.s and he might be considering not bringing them all in at the same time?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I think I can say that it probably concerns all those things that the Deputy has raised. Certainly I wanted to do more research on some of the areas that were proposed in the original Marine Spatial Plan. That work is nearly concluded. I have also been speaking to the fishermen about other ways that we might increase the areas that they dredge. Where there is little to protect - and certainly they have highlighted to me some areas that were originally identified in the Marine Spatial Plan that have very little to protect - I am looking at those as well, but I say to the Deputy I am working towards 2030 and looking towards 2030 and the targets we have set ourselves for that time. Between now and then we will have a big initial step up in M.P.A.s, but there will be a compromise solution or a compromise position proposed in the relative short term that helps some fishermen to maintain a profitable business and does not protect areas that do not need protection. I am keen to protect areas that do need protecting, but I am equally minded that I do not want to close areas to fishermen where there really is nothing there to protect, but there is still a catch that could be helping their business. Thank you.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Do you call for the appel?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I do, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 46		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				

Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				

Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

6. Draft Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Commencement No. 2 Act 202- (P.88/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Commencement No. 2 Act, lodged by the Minister for Children and Families. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel and I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Commencement No. 2 Act 202-. The States make this Act under Article 16(3) of the Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law 2022.

6.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):

This Act will bring into force the remaining provisions of the Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law 2022. This is the part of the law which relates to public authorities, and if Members agree, these Articles will come into force on 1st January 2026. The Convention Rights Law, as Members will know, is the means by which the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the U.N.C.R.C., is incorporated into legislation. The law is key to ensuring that children's best interests are at the front and centre when decisions are made which may affect them. This is a fundamental provision of the U.N.C.R.C. Members will also know that the U.K.'s ratification of the U.N.C.R.C. was extended to Jersey in 2014. From that date on, Jersey adopted the convention. It took 8 years to reach the stage of indirectly incorporating the U.N.C.R.C. into law, but we have achieved this milestone ahead of other parts of the U.K. and other Crown Dependencies. We should be rightly proud of this achievement, but we cannot be complacent. The Convention Rights Law has been in force for Ministers, elected Members and Assembly bodies for almost 2 years. Bringing the law into effect in 2 parts was a conscious decision. This ensured that the support was available to States Members as the first cohort of duty-bearers when the law was enacted. Secondly, it enabled us to reflect on how the law was operating and whether we needed to make any changes to the process before public authorities were brought into scope. The process of conducting the Children's Rights Impact Assessments, C.R.I.A.s, an Assembly proposition, is a good example of where we have learned from experience. Members will have noticed over recent weeks that new guidance has been issued which should ensure that no part of the impact assessment process will apply to propositions which clearly have no implications for children. This change has been implemented as a direct result of feedback from Members, and I am grateful to them, as I am to P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee), the States Greffe and my officers for their work to improve the C.R.I.A. process. Today the Assembly is asked to approve the enactment of the remaining Articles of law. This will see the due regard duty extended to public authorities from the beginning of 2026. Public authorities are defined in the law and additional public authorities can be added in due course. Indeed, I hope that more organisations will be added, but for the moment the list of organisations which will become subject to the Convention Rights Law is: Andium Homes; Autism Jersey; Family Nursing and Home Care; Jersey Cares; Jersey Child Care Trust; Jersey Society for the Provision of a Children's Resource Centre, whose members will know this better as Centrepoin; Jersey Sport and the Parishes. These organisations have stepped up during the development phases of the Convention Rights Law and agreed to become public authorities, which means they are named in the law and have undertaken to be bound by its terms. They recognise that by committing to having due regard for children's rights,

as set out in the U.N.C.R.C., the most important decisions will prioritise children's best interests. I believe the Assembly should congratulate these charities and arm's length organisations as well as our colleagues in the Parishes for taking this step. I hope they will be the first of many to take a similar approach to realising children's rights in Jersey. I said earlier that we cannot be complacent. There is still work to do before consideration of the children ...

The Bailiff:

Minister, I think you need to stop because we are no longer quorate, I understand, or at least may not be quorate. We are relying on people online to make up the numbers, but there is some uncertainty about our quoracy. Yes, you can proceed, thank you.

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I said earlier that we cannot be complacent. There is still work to do before consideration of children's rights becomes fully embedded in our decision-making. A few voices, thankfully, yet it is only a few, have questioned the value of taking a children's rights approach or listening to children's voices, and I have heard reservations expressed about the additional cost associated with implementing the Convention Rights Law. I would like to take a moment to address these concerns. First, why should we listen to children's voices? Article 12, one of the guiding principles of the U.N.C.R.C., says that every child has the right to express their views, feelings and wishes in all matters affecting them and to have those views considered and taken seriously. I think people sometimes get confused when we talk about listening to the voice of the child. We should remember that expressing a view does not give children decision-making responsibility and nor should it, but children will have a perspective, and it is right that we consider this perspective when decisions could affect them. It does not mean that we have to agree with children's views, but it does mean their views should inform our decision-making. Secondly, it is not necessary to engage directly with children over every proposed decision. I mentioned earlier the C.R.I.A. process for Assembly propositions has been revised to ensure that Members will not have to complete even the screening stage of a C.R.I.A. if they consider there are no impacts on children. Moreover, even if an impact is identified, unless the decision is highly significant or an impactful one, it is perfectly acceptable to use the relevant survey report and other published data as evidence of the children's views. We do not need to reinvent the wheel.

[11:45]

We should ensure the impact assessment process is proportionate to the decision at hand. Thirdly, on the question of resourcing, I would stress that support is available to all those classed as duty-bearers under the law. Members will be aware of the excellent services offered by the Members' Resources Team in the States Greffe, and support is available from the Cabinet Office colleagues too. I am aware that Parish secretaries have taken an active interest in the Convention Rights Law, including meeting with the Children's Commissioner, to ensure that the Parishes are ready to comply with the law once it takes effect in January. My officers have published C.R.I.A. templates, guidance documents and online training material, and any C.R.I.A.-related queries can be directed to a dedicated email address. Finally, I would like to stress that to be effective, consideration of children's rights must be proportionate. We are not talking about preparing C.R.I.A. for everyday activities or decisions that may be categorised as business as usual, but what the law does say is that decisions that affect children should be assessed for their likely impact, and this includes considering children's views. Research carried out by the O.E.C.D. (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and U.N.I.C.E.F. (United Nations Children's Fund) links children's participation in decision-making to more beneficial outcomes. It can strengthen democracies and aid social cohesion. It can be helpful for policymakers in designing policies that are better targeted to meet the needs of children. It has benefits to the education system, and there are numerous benefits for children themselves. For decision-makers, considering children's rights must be proportionate to the decision,

as I have said, but not tokenistic. Impacts must be properly evaluated and mitigations put in place to counter any negative outcomes. There is a balance to be found, but we have the systems and support in place to ensure this can be achieved. In conclusion, by enacting the remaining Articles of the Convention Rights Law, we are taking another step to ensuring that we give careful and balanced consideration to children's rights when making decisions that will affect their lives and that will ultimately lead to better outcomes for all our Jersey children. I propose the Act.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Is the Act seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Act?

6.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I rise to celebrate this final stage in this legislation that has involved many Ministers and Assemblies. It is a huge day for the children of Jersey and, like the Minister, I want to thank the Parishes and the charities who are being added to the law, especially those charities who, as the Minister said, I think came forward to ask to be added. I think that is very honourable and they should be applauded. I am very proud that our Parishes are part of this, and particularly of my own Parish of St. Saviour, which under the leadership of our Constable is becoming more and more child-friendly, and indeed there is a new Parish park coming before the Parish Assembly very soon. All of these changes are very positive and make me feel very hopeful for the children of our Island. I have a couple of questions for the Minister. He listed the bodies that come under this legislation. Are there any more that may need to be added, in the Minister's opinion? Were there any that were perhaps under consideration or declined to be added or that the Minister considered and then set aside? I would also like to understand how these ... well, the Parishes and the charities, how they are feeling about this legislation. Are they prepared for it and have they had enough support in preparing for it? I believe that they have because of course our original intention was phasing it to make sure that that support was put in place, so I believe that they would have had that support. But if the Minister could confirm that and whether any further or ongoing support will be provided to help with compliance. Yes, so even though this does look like a small thing on our Order Paper, it is huge for the children of Jersey and that children's rights are embedded across public life and in our policymaking and legislation. The Minister mentioned C.R.I.A.s. Now, my original intention with the proposition that I lodged - it was possibly 8 years ago, but maybe even as long as 10 years ago - was to have a statement on our propositions akin to what was then called the Financial and Manpower Statement. My intention was rather smaller than what we have ended up with and it is something very detailed with the C.R.I.A. What I want to say is I want to appeal to Members and to bodies that are complying with this legislation to not make it an afterthought. I think we are quite genuinely still in the middle of the culture change around children's rights. I think we are still quite close to the beginning. This is not the end of our culture change, and indeed I do not think it is the end of the legislation that we need that addresses children's rights in Jersey. I think we do need to be patient with each other and encouraging with each other, but also hold each other accountable for producing these C.R.I.A.s, for reading them, understanding them and using them as part of our deliberations and our decision-making, because they are important. Children are important, even though they are not present in our Assembly. I try to hold children in my mind when I am making all my decisions, and I would urge Members and anyone who is impacted by this legislation - and of course many of those charities, their whole reason for being is to serve the children of Jersey - to make that consideration of children's rights something that happens at the beginning of your thought processes and not at the end, as an afterthought. Finally, I am going to end by advocating for what I believe would be the next stage, and that would be full incorporation of the U.N.C.R.C. I think that is ... I was going to say Senator Mézec, but Deputy Mézec, who I know shares my passion for children's rights, as do many other Members who have been involved in this along the way, and as a former Children's Minister, he moved a lot of this work along. Along with the current Minister, I am grateful for that teamwork and that continuity. One of my sincerest hopes is that the next Assembly will continue in

the same vein, that we will not see any sliding back, but that we will see continued progress forwards in advancing children's rights and that Jersey will ultimately get to full incorporation of the U.N.C.R.C. So I would like to understand from the current Minister, is this something that there is a trajectory towards with his current department? Is that being worked towards? If not, could he please initiate that work so that the next Assembly is ready to continue the journey in that respect? I thank the Minister for continuing this work and for bringing this today.

6.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

The panel welcomes the extension of practices under the Children (Convention Rights) Rights Law. Children's rights, as expressed by the U.N.C.R.C., sets a framework for best practice. We must, however, be careful that we are not focused on box-ticking, but have to make certain that children's rights are really considered in all matters. I echo the Minister's comment, we must not be complacent. Jersey does not offer the same protections to children in all matters as some similar jurisdictions. Jersey needs to show it cares. It is not a good example today, for instance, that the Chamber became inquorate while debating this matter. The Minister and officers have worked hard on this, and so many charities do good work and organisations who are supportive of children's rights are willing to play their part. The panel supports the commencement of this Act, but again states that we must not be complacent. We still have a long way to go.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the proposed Act? Minister.

6.1.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:

I thank the 2 speakers for their input and questions. First, the Parishes. I am very pleased to see that the Parishes were enthusiastic about being part of this and are joined by a number of charities, but only one of our arm's length organisations. I think that is an area where I would like to see improvement. These are Government arm's length organisations and it would be nice to see more of them had opted to join at this initial stage. However, I would say that we did not have anybody who declined, in answer to Deputy Doublet's question. I think all those who have joined have been particularly enthusiastic. There has been training and support, and that is ongoing with the Greffe and the dedicated email address through which they can channel any issues that they have. Just like Members have been supported, these organisations will be supported. The C.R.I.A., as I say, that is a very good example of how we have learnt and changes have taken place and the way in which we now see children's views coming forward, particularly through bodies like the school council, where children meet regularly, they put forward their ideas, and these are taken into account when we bring forward legislation and propositions. With that, I maintain the Act and call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

Sorry, could the Minister clarify a point in his speech? Apologies if I missed this, but the full incorporation; is work already underway, heading towards the full incorporation?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

I do not know if the full incorporation is totally underway. However, I am sorry I missed that because I did have it in my thoughts. We certainly are not going to be complacent. I would very much like to be involved in taking this forward. Of course we have elections next year and it may well be somebody else who continues this journey, but no, this is not the end of the journey.

The Bailiff:

Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the Act has been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Connétable of St. Peter:

Sorry, I should have thanked everybody, but particularly Scrutiny for the part that they played in this. I thank Members for supporting this bit of legislation.

7. Draft Children and Civil Status (Parental Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.105/2025)

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the Draft Children and Civil Status (Parental Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations, lodged by the Minister for Children and Families. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel, and I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Children and Civil Status (Parental Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these regulations under Article 82A of the Children (Jersey) Law 2002.

The Bailiff:

The Minister will propose the principles.

7.1 Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter (The Minister for Children and Families):

I am seeking support for the Draft Children and Civil Status (Parental Responsibility) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations, which addresses an urgent and unintended consequence arising from the recent children and civil status reforms. These regulations address 2 connected issues. First, unmarried fathers of children registered before 2016 who subsequently married the mother and gained parental responsibility through the subsequent legitimisation of their child when read with the separate provisions in the interpretation of the Children's Law. However, the abolition of legitimacy removed this framework and the legal basis for this route to parental responsibility. This is clearly unacceptable and was never my policy intention. It is an unintended consequence. To resolve this issue we will include a saving provision within the Civil Status (Abolition of Legitimacy) (Jersey) Law 2025 to ensure that fathers retain this legal basis for parental responsibility, despite the abolition of legitimacy.

[12:00]

Secondly, after 24th November, fathers in this cohort who marry or enter a civil partnership with the mother will no longer acquire parental responsibility automatically. Instead, if we do not make this amendment, they would need to enter into a parental responsibility agreement, creating unnecessary complexity and an administration burden for families. We will amend Article 9C of the Children's Law 2002 so that going forward these fathers can gain parental responsibility automatically upon marriage, now including civil partnerships, as they would have done under the previous system. This is the inheritance of a historic inequitable system that is no longer fit for modern family life, and we are trying to put it right. The legal changes in 2015 went some of the way by allowing unmarried fathers to gain parental responsibility by registration at birth. These changes were at that time looking forward. The fact changes have been made incrementally over the years adds complexity, meaning multiple groups are impacted in many different ways. I would like to express my deep regret that this situation has occurred, despite extensive review and multiple levels of legal scrutiny applied to the legislation. I believe originally we had over 40 areas that were impacted or 40 other laws that were impacted and some hundreds of amendments in the consequential amendments. We found out early last week of this current issue, and we acted with urgency and instructed officers to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. I hope that Members will support our efforts by acting decisively. I would like to reassure families that this was an unintended consequence of trying to provide equality for all children by removing outdated legislation. This was certainly not the policy intention of the package of legislation and I apologise once again to the families for this oversight. I would like to reassure Members that these fathers will still have a baseline of responsibility for their children and it will not impact their ordinary day-to-day lives. However, where issues may arise, these will relate to family breakdown and dispute. There may be issues if a child is taken out of Jersey without

permission. This is why we are trying to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. This is a legal technical correction, not a policy change. It preserves and retains rights and prevents inequality. Overall, the Children and Civil Status Law has substantially modernised the position and improved the rights of all families. I accept for families that this oversight risks overshadowing the overall positive nature of changes. I thank Members for their continued support in ensuring that we act swiftly and responsibly to protect all families. If supported by Members, these amendment regulations would come in force tomorrow.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the principles?

7.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I think is a reminder, is it not, of just how broad this legislation is that is now in force? I am not surprised that something like this has arisen, given the massive scale of the project. I am not sure if the Minister was aware of it, when the Minister became aware of it, if he could let the Assembly know, but I do think that this has been done in the right order and that nothing was delayed in order to correct this. What I would like to ask the Minister is are there any further consequential amendments or any minor issues similar to this that the Minister may feel needs to be corrected in the legislation, or indeed in the policy and guidance attached to it? There is one that I have become aware of, alongside much joy in the L.G.B.T.Q.+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer or Questioning) community, with many same-sex parents already being able to access registration for both parents from Monday this week. There has been a huge amount of joy and celebration in my community with those appointments already being used by some parents. But an issue that has been identified to me is that when parents are registering their children with a new name, they are not then able to gain access to passport registration. Yes, so if the Minister could speak to that other consequence and any others that he thinks may need to be addressed either with consequential amendments or changes to policies and processes.

7.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

There was an oversight in the drafting of this legislation, which is not surprising. It is extremely complex legislation, which impacted on many other laws. The panel received a briefing and raised concerns on practical issues, which have been addressed, and addressed very fast as well. The panel supports the Minister in putting this right and asks the Assembly to keep in mind the overall aims of the Children and Civil Status Law, which has been such good news for so many families.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone wish to speak on the principles of the matter? No. Minister.

7.1.3 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Once again, thank you for those who have spoken and particularly to Scrutiny for their support in allowing us to get this through so quickly. In answer to Deputy Doublet's question about when did we become aware. It was a week Friday, so just 10 days ago, when officers and lawyers were looking at this once again and somebody thought of this scenario and realised that there had been an unintended consequence. So we have acted very swiftly on it and of course the law itself came into place on the 24th, so it is a matter of a few days where there could be an impact if we pass this today. I thank everyone for their input and for those questions. I am just looking at the issue of the passport registration, and I will ask for that to be looked at. I think possibly there has been a possible oversight there, but I think that is more procedure than the law itself, so we can get the process co-ordinated so that the registration and passport can be done at the same time. With that, as I have said, if the amendment to the regulations are agreed by the Assembly, this will quickly rectify this parental responsibility issue for unmarried fathers who registered before 2016. As we have said, it is a legal correction rather than a policy change. Once again, I do regret the need to bring this to the Assembly

and that it was not spotted earlier, but there was so many impacts from the new legislation that it was almost inevitable that perhaps one would slip through. Of course we will be keeping an open mind as to whether there might be something else. I hope not, but if that does occur, then again we will act as quickly as possible. So with that, I maintain the principles.

The Bailiff:

Is the appel called for?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

The appel is called for.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.E. Millar				

Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				

Deputy Catherine Curtis, does your panel wish to scrutinise this matter?

Deputy C.D. Curtis (Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

No.

The Bailiff:

Minister, do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

7.1.4 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes, *en bloc*. I would like to thank Members for their support and reiterate that it is regrettable that we have had to lodge this, but necessary. As I say, we have acted as quickly as possible. I maintain the regulations.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Thank you. Does anyone wish to speak about the regulations in Second Reading? Those in favour of adopting the regulations, kindly show ... the appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Second Reading:

POUR: 45		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Minister, do you propose the regulations in Third Reading?

7.1.5 The Connétable of St. Peter:

Yes, I do.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations, as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading? Is the appel called for?

The Connétable of St. Peter:

It is.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have now cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				

Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

8. Breaches of the Code of Conduct: review of Standing Orders (P.101/2025) - as amended (P.101/2025 Amd.)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Breaches of the Code of Conduct: review of Standing Orders, lodged by Deputy Kovacs. The respondent is the chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee. An amendment has been lodged by Deputy Scott. Deputy Kovacs, are you minded to accept the amendment of Deputy Scott?

Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to take the proposition as amended? I ask the Greffier to read the proposition as amended.

The Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee to review, with a view to amending, all Standing Orders in relation to breaches of the Code of Conduct, such review to include, but not be limited to, consideration of current procedures for the handling of complaints and disclosure of personal details, disqualification mechanisms and varying lengths of suspension (paid and unpaid), and to present a report to the Assembly no later than 31st December 2026 with its findings and recommendations.

8.1 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:

This proposition asks the Assembly to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee to review all Standing Orders relating to breaches of the Code of Conduct. The purpose is straightforward, to ensure that when misconduct occurs our system responds in a way that is fair, proportionate and clear. Recent events have highlighted that our current approach does not distinguish clearly enough between serious and less serious breaches, nor does it always provide guidance on what the proportionate response should look like. That lack of clarity risks unfairness, inconsistency and reduces public trust. The proposal does not limit on what the review could include. However, I

believe reviewing the recall mechanisms process as well would also have its merits, allowing us to understand how it might work in practice in Jersey and whether the right safeguards could be put in place to prevent political misuse. Other jurisdictions, including the U.K., have used recall to hold elected Members to account in a fair and controlled way. If a well-designed system can strengthen public trust, it is only responsible that we examine it, both to understand benefits and consequences. Again, it is up to the P.P.C. in what way they revise this. This review will, therefore, aim to look at the full range of sanctions, from minor matters to the most serious and ensure that any response is matched to the actual level of misconduct. Importantly, it will also consider how to prevent misuse or abuse of the system so that complaints and sanctions cannot be applied unfairly or used for political purposes. Deputy Scott's amendment expands the scope of the review to include how complaints are handled and how personal information is disclosed. I welcome and accept the amendment because it strengthens the work we are asking P.P.C. to undertake. Reviewing the complaints process and the protections around privacy is important if we want a modern and fair framework that gives confidence to everyone involved.

[12:15]

I also want to thank the chair of P.P.C. for our discussions and for indicating their willingness to accept both my original proposition and the amendment. By asking P.P.C. to look carefully at our existing rules, consider best practice and bring forward balanced recommendations, we can ensure that any future changes are robust, practical and able to maintain public trust. I hope Members will support the amended proposition so we can modernise our Standing Orders, promote accountability and strengthen confidence in our democratic process. Thank you, and I make the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Deputy. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]**

8.1.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

I would like to thank Deputy Kovacs for accepting my amendment and the Privileges and Procedures Committee for their comments. There have been 2 recent occasions where Members have not been fully aligned with the P.P.C. in supporting its own propositions for enforcement of the Code of Conduct. The reasons for differences have not been reported in mainstream media, while the bringing of amendments to the proposition with protracted and unsavoury debate. We cannot expect total alignment on all matters regarding enforcement of the code. But the more we can agree on matters in advance, the more alignment we can have. It is important that clear policies and procedures are developed and published by the P.P.C. in relation to the whole process of dealing with the identification of, consideration of and enforcement of breaches of Code of Conduct. It is significant that we should be debating this matter after approving changes to the disciplinary and complaints-handling procedures for the police. Statistically, the police, it is an institution that is more trusted than the States Assembly. I believe that we can learn from some of the principles set out in the regulations we approve today, without adopting the extent of their detail. Trust in the decisions we make as an elected body or as part of a body constituted under our Standing Orders depends on enforcement of our Code of Conduct and transparency and consistency in the way we apply it and handle complaints. The P.P.C. will be serving both the public and States Members by developing and publishing supporting policies in these areas. I have mentioned in an earlier debate that being the subject of a complaint can be a lonely place. The proposed Code of Conduct that has been lodged by the P.P.C. seeks to support confidentiality to assist investigations by the Commissioner for Standards. It will be helpful for the P.P.C. to reflect on the extent to which it is supportive to the subjects of complaints to be allowed to share complaint details with third parties, such as family and the equivalent of police friends. Concepts such as confidentiality and anonymity of the personal details of complainants also need to be addressed. It is important to have a policy that seeks the right balance between transparency and the human right of privacy. Parliamentary privilege regarding the

disclosure of personal details needs to be used judiciously of course. Parish, public authorities and Public Service ombudsmen generally are constrained from publishing details of complainants under data protection principles. When public disclose your personal details could reduce enforcement of the Code of Conduct. Fear or potential retaliation could deter the making of complaints, so could mishandling and lack of communication regarding the handling of complaints. It is important potential complainants are made aware of the processes and methodology of complaint-handling before they have brought complaints so that they know how those complaints will be handled, when the outcomes will be communicated to them and the reasons for those outcomes. I thank P.P.C. members for the time they have given me to articulate these concerns in a recent meeting with them, and hope States Members will support this proposition as amended.

8.1.2 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North:

I hope Members will have seen the comments from the Privileges and Procedures Committee. The P.P.C. has accepted the proposition and the amendment, as these are matters that we were already looking into. In light of practical experience during this term, the P.P.C. concluded it would be beneficial to review the provisions in Standing Orders that deal with sanctions for breach of the Code of Conduct. We have also been considering the disqualification provisions under the States of Jersey Law. Both Deputy Kovacs and Deputy Scott have engaged with the committee and provided their feedback to us, for which we are grateful. As Deputy Kovacs has highlighted, adopting this proposition will formalise an ongoing process and provide a clear expectation to P.P.C. that it will report back to the Assembly with its findings. The current committee will aim to complete its work during this term, but the proposition from Deputy Kovacs allows for the review to continue until the end of 2026. If work does carry on into the next term, the current committee cannot predict of course what the next P.P.C. might conclude. It will, ultimately, be a matter for this Assembly to determine what system should be in place.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the proposition? Deputy Kovacs.

8.1.3 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:

Thank you to Members for their contributions. I just want to very briefly underline again why this review is necessary and why the proposition with the amendment deserves support. Our current system needs clearer definitions of what constitutes a serious or a minor breach and clearer guidance on the appropriate response in each case. This is essential to ensure fairness, consistency and transparency for Members and the public. This review is not just about sanctions and disqualification does not mean just recall. It is about making sure our entire framework works in real life. There are clear examples where it currently does not. For instance, losing British citizenship for any reason could automatically make a Member ineligible to sit, yet we have no guidance on how such a disqualifying situation should be handled. Bankruptcy is another example, a Member previously lost their seat because of it in 2014, even though bankruptcy does not always reflect their own wrongdoing. Members can search the Pitman case if they want to see more details. I have personal experience on how easily such circumstances can arise. My family business opened in January 2020 with most of our savings invested in it, 2 months later lockdown began. Without Government support we could have gone under and under current rules I would have been disqualified through no fault of my own. This shows why our rules must be proportionate and reflective of the complexities Members may face. The amended proposition also asks the P.P.C. to review how complaints are handled and how personally those are shared. People must feel safe coming forward, and all parties involved must have confidence in a fair, balanced process. Once again I thank P.P.C. for their engagement and support. I hope Members will back this important work. Thank you and I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce that the proposition has been adopted:

POUR: 41		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 1
Connétable of St. Lawrence				Deputy K.F. Morel
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy M.E. Millar				

Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business for this meeting.

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

I ask the chair of P.P.C. to propose the arrangement of public business for future meetings.

9. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

The arrangement of public business for future meetings is as per the Consolidated Order Paper. Members will note that P.94 Management and Maintenance of the Havre des Pas Site has been added; that will extend the meeting slightly. Obviously it is the Proposed Budget (Government Plan) coming up. We will be starting at 9.30 a.m. on the 8th and I would expect that all continuation days will be used. I am expecting there may well be an evening continuation on the Thursday evening, which I have already forewarned Members about but there may be others, depending on progress that is made. Therefore, I propose the order of business.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, chair. Are Members content to proceed, as suggested by the chair of P.P.C.? Are Members now content to adjourn until 8th December at 9.30 a.m.? The States is adjourned until that day.

ADJOURNMENT

[12:24]