

Privileges and Procedures Committee

(8th Meeting)

6th October 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present with the exception of Deputy K.L. Moore, of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter, from whom apologies had been received.

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, Chair
 Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair (for a time – via Teams)
 Deputy M. R. Ferey of St. Saviour
 Deputy L. K. F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South (for a time)
 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade (for a time)

In attendance -

W. Millow, Deputy Greffier of the States
 Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support (for a time)
 J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement (for a time)
 M. Gladwin, Education Manager, Digital and Public Engagement (for a time)
 E. Patterson, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
 C. Tucker, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
 K.M. LARBALÉSTIER, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Parts A and B.

Minutes.

A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 8th September 2025, having previously been circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Hansard
survey
responses.

A2. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A8 of 16th June 2025, of the Committee as previously constituted, and with Ms. J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement in attendance, considered the results of a survey designed to gauge the opinion of Members in relation to Hansard in its current format.

The Committee noted that the survey had been circulated to States Members and States Greffe staff and it was hoped that the responses received would inform consideration of improvements.

The Committee noted the following summary of the survey results –

66 percent of respondents reported rarely using Hansard;
 91 percent of respondents used Hansard for reviewing the speeches of other Members;
 41 per cent of respondents found it difficult to locate Hansard on the new States Assembly website;
 58 per cent of respondents found the transcripts easy to read with accuracy levels being rated as good;

Responses indicated general dissatisfaction with the existing search functionality and a desire for improvements. Some Members preferred to use a new website known as digitalStates.je, which had been developed by Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement. It was understood that digitalStates.je aimed to improve accessibility and included transcripts of States meetings with enhanced search functionality and breakdowns of Members' contributions. However, it was noted that the site had not been updated recently and the Committee recognised the resourcing challenges associated with maintenance. The Committee also noted requests for a more user friendly format for mobile devices; breaking up speeches for easier reading and linking speeches and subjects to individual Members.

On a related matter, the Committee noted that one respondent had stated that transcripts of Scrutiny Hearings were difficult to navigate.

Having considered the survey results, the Committee requested that the States Greffe provide details of the resource implications of improving the search functionality associated with Hansard and transcripts of Scrutiny Hearings.

The Head of Digital and Public Engagement was requested to take the necessary action.

Highways
(Jersey) Law
1956: display
of election or
referendum
advertising
materials.

A3. The Committee received Mr. W. Vogt, Senior Operations Manager, Infrastructure and Environment Department, in connexion with amendments to the Highways (Jersey) Law 1956, which had introduced an exemption to allow the display of election or referendum advertising materials on or above the highway without the need for a licence. The Committee also welcomed Messrs. M. Swan and J. Martinson and Advocate R. Morley-Kirk, Judicial Greffier, all of whom were members of the Jersey Electoral Authority (JEA), which body provided independent oversight of the electoral process. It was noted that the JEA did not have any statutory powers in respect of election advertising materials

Attention was drawn to the draft Highway (exemption for campaign advertising material) (Jersey) Order 202-, which would facilitate the above and attention was drawn to the relevant conditions, which focussed on highway safety. The Committee noted that condition No. 11 of the Order stipulated that campaign advertising material **must not** be put up or taken down before sunrise or after sunset. Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade pointed out that candidates usually erected campaign material in the evening when traffic volumes were lower. He also referenced the difficulties which could arise in the event of a by-election during the winter months when daylight hours were reduced. Whilst Mr. Vogt initially suggested that discretion existed subject to a risk assessment, it was pointed out that the wording of the Order was explicit and indicated otherwise. Mr. Vogt agreed to raise this issue with the Legislative Drafting team. Attention was also drawn to typographical errors in the Order. In terms of specific penalties for non-compliance with the conditions of the Order, Mr. Vogt was unaware of the specific nature of any sanctions. However, he advised that, in general terms, where campaign material was removed for safety reasons, recovery of costs was likely to be pursued. Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter advised that it was important that the rules were properly enforced.

Deputy Tadier highlighted the challenges faced by candidates seeking to display campaign material in urban areas. He understood that, in some jurisdictions election campaign signage was erected in approved locations. Mr. Vogt advised that designated sites in the Island were used to advertise charity events. Deputy Tadier

recalled that a 'vote for change' banner had been displayed outside Rouge Bouillon School in the run up to the 2022 election. It was recalled that Deputy T. A. Coles of St. Helier South had previously requested a list of street lamps (all of which were coded) which could be used for the display of election advertising materials. Mr. Vogt advised that it had been considered unreasonable to survey all street lamps for this purpose and maintain such a list.

The Committee noted the position with regard to the draft Order and requested clarification in respect of the matters raised.

The delegation withdrew from the meeting.

Code of
Conduct for
Elected
Members/
accompanying
guidance.

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A1 of 5th August 2025, considered a report prepared by the Greffier of the States in connexion with the draft revised Code of Conduct for Elected Members.

The Committee recalled that following extensive consultation with Members, the Commissioner for Standards and the wider standards network, the revised Code and guidance had been lodged "au Greffe" (P.35/2025 refers). However, the Committee had subsequently agreed to withdraw the proposition in response to comments from Members at 2 briefing sessions held in June 2025, and on receipt of a comprehensive submission from Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade. The Committee noted that initial discussions with Deputy Scott on the provision of training on Ethical Standards had informed the decision to revise the Code.

A rules based approach had been adopted in respect of the revised Code in order to make it more accessible. The Committee noted that the House of Commons, the Northern Ireland Assembly and the Welsh Senedd had also adopted rules based Codes, which were succinct and allowed related areas to be grouped together logically. In this context, the Committee recalled the 5 headings within the draft Code, as follows –

- Behaviour
- Register and declaration of interests
- Relationship with the Civil Service
- Confidential Information
- Commissioner for Standards

The Committee considered the revisions proposed by Deputy Scott and those arising from the briefing sessions with Members. It noted that Deputy Scott had suggested grouping rules together under different headings and increasing the number of rules from 26 to 34, altering the definition of certain behaviours and removing definitions attached to the Nolan Principles (as established by the UK Committee on Standards in Public Life). The most significant change proposed by Deputy Scott required the Privileges and Procedures Committee to consider complaints made by Members against other Members in the first instance and determine whether the complaint should be considered by the Commissioner for Standards. The Committee was reminded that the establishment of the Office of the Commissioner for Standards arose from a clear desire to remove political bias and for absolute impartiality. Consequently, Deputy Scott's proposal could be perceived as a retrograde step and ethically questionable.

The Committee considered (1) whether to revise the Code in the manner suggested by Deputy Scott and (2) whether to amend Standing Orders and the Commissioner for Standards (Jersey) Law 2017 so that the Committee was required to consider complaints from Members against Members in the first instance before a referral to

the Commissioner. Whilst the Committee agreed some revisions to the wording of the Code it did not, in the main, support the amended wording suggested by Deputy Scott. Neither did the Committee support Deputy Scott's proposal for an initial review of complaints made by Members against Members by the Committee, on the basis of the perception of political bias and partiality.

The Committee requested that the draft Code of Conduct be revised as agreed in preparation for lodging.

Jersey Youth
Assembly –
amendments to
Standing
Orders.

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 8th September 2025, received Deputy I. Gardiner, Vice Chair of the Public Awareness and Education (PAE) Sub-Committee and Mesdames J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement and M. Gladwin, Education Manager, Digital and Public Engagement in connexion with draft amendments to Standing Orders designed to facilitate direct interaction between the Jersey Youth Assembly (JYA) and the States Assembly. An accompanying report prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in this connexion was also noted.

The Committee recalled that the previous Committee had been briefed on a refreshed approach to the JYA which aimed to increase opportunities for young people in Jersey to engage with democracy, as follows –

- establishing a closer relationship with the Assembly to enhance visibility;
- combining the work of the Jersey Youth Parliament (JYP) and the JYA;
- renaming the JYP as the JYA, to reflect its renewed focus and closer working relationships; and
- adjusting the age range of participants from 12-18 to 14-19 years old.

The Committee as previously constituted had endorsed the new format and supported the principle of amendments to Standing Orders to facilitate the same. A new Standing Order had been drafted which would allow the JYA to present reports to the Assembly in its own right and Ministers would be required to present a response. JYA reports could be considered at in-committee debates with Members of the JYA being able to participate in accordance with Standing Order 972(b), which allowed any person in the Chamber for an in-committee debate to speak during the debate.

In considering the proposed amendments to Standing Orders, as detailed above and, in particular, the reference to in-committee debates, Members had been mindful of the level of public dissatisfaction with the lack of a tangible outcome in respect of e-petitions (Minute No. A3 of 8th September 2025, refers). The likely frequency of in-committee debates arising from JYA reports had also been raised and Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade had suggested that the proposal could be perceived as prioritising the views of one group over another. The Deputy had also questioned whether the JYA was truly representative of the views of all young people, with specific regard to the manner in which its members were selected. Ultimately, the Committee had requested a briefing from officers with operational responsibility for the JYA.

The Committee received further contextual information in connexion with the revised approach to the JYA. The desire for a direct connection with the States Assembly was highlighted and it was noted that, with the exception of Mont à l'Abbé and La Passerelle Schools (it was anticipated that these schools would participate in future), all other schools were represented. Turning to the frequency of in-committee debates, it was proposed that this be limited to 3 per year, with

topics for debate being considered in the first instance by the PAE Sub-Committee ahead of consideration by the main Committee.

Having considered the proposals, the Committee concluded that one in-committee debate each year would be appropriate, with Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South remaining concerned about the lack of a tangible outcome arising from the in-committee debate mechanism and the potential for disengagement. It was suggested that a maximum of 3 members of the JYA should participate in the debate. The Committee also agreed that the number of reports presented by the JYA should be limited to 3 per year. The Committee requested that amendments to the relevant Standing Orders be made for its consideration ahead of lodging.

The delegation withdrew from the meeting.

Risk-based
exclusion
policy.

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A6 of 7th July 2025, of the Committee as previously constituted, received Mr. Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members Support and considered a report in connexion with feedback on the draft risk-based exclusion policy.

It was noted that the Committee as previously constituted had approved the draft policy in principle, subject to consultation with Members and staff. It was noted that the policy would also have to be considered in the context of the Codes of Conduct and Practice for Ministers and Assistant Ministers (R.31/2024 refers).

By way of context, Members were advised that the previous Committee had supported a proposal from Ms. K. Wright, Chief Executive Officer of Freeda, who had led the Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce, to introduce a Risk Based Exclusion Policy for Members following the introduction of the same by the House of Commons. The Committee noted that under the House of Commons risk based exclusion policy, a risk assessment was undertaken by a panel of MPs appointed by the Speaker. This approach was not proposed in Jersey.

The Committee noted the nature of the feedback received and considered a number of proposals arising from the same, as detailed within the report. Opposition was noted in respect of a proposal which would see excluded Members being accompanied at meetings of the States Assembly. Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour advised that he was particularly uncomfortable with the prospect of a Member who had pleaded not guilty to a serious offence being subject to the policy provisions and he suggested that consideration be given to an alternative. In support of this argument, he cited the accepted legal presumption of innocent until proven guilty. Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade suggested that consideration could be given to the neutral act of suspension on full pay. However, it was recognised that this would preclude Members from participating remotely in States meetings. Turning to the question of constituency work and risk based exclusion, it was noted that whilst this work was not currently covered by Standing Orders, the Committee could review this. Deputy Ferey suggested that the Committee consider establishing a sub-group to undertake risk assessments, as per the House of Commons model. Finally, in response to a question from Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter, it was confirmed that the Law Officers' Department had advised that the offence of Riot and Affray fell within the same category as other offences cited in the policy.

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the policy pending further consideration of the matters raised above.

Provision of lunches for States Members during States meetings.

A7. The Committee considered a report prepared by the States Greffe in connexion with the provision of lunches for Members during meetings of the States Assembly.

The Committee noted that Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour had requested that the Committee consider the above matter with a view to reinstating the provision of lunches for Members on the basis of the benefits in terms of Member engagement.

The Committee recalled that a successful amendment to the Annual Business Plan in 2010 had reduced the net revenue expenditure of the States Assembly and its services by £11,300 for that year. This reduction was targeted towards the discontinuation of the following –

- a. the provision of lunches for States members on States meeting days; and
- b. the provision of sandwich lunches during meetings of Scrutiny Panels, the Public Accounts Committee and the Privileges and Procedures Committee

In late 2014, the Committee as previously constituted had agreed to reintroduce working lunches for States Members on Assembly days/during Committee meetings on the basis that the reinstatement of communal meals enabled Members to share information, engage in productive political discussion and develop working relationships. In arriving at this decision, the Committee had agreed that Members could, if they wished, pay for their lunch. However, no means of charging Members had been established and gradually, over time, fewer Members partook, preferring to make their own arrangements over the lunchtime adjournment. Separately, the States Greffe had been requested to ensure that briefings during the lunchtime adjournment were not arranged on the basis that attendance prevented Members from leaving the States Building and accessing the health benefits associated with being outside in the fresh air.

The Committee was advised that, from time to time, the States Greffe arranged for the provision of lunches during States meetings at the request of Members. For example, during the week commencing 8th September 2025, lunches were provided on 9th, 10th and 11th September at a cost of £191.70 per day (35 covers) and a total cost of £575.10 for the 3 days. Uptake varied over the 3 days, with fewer Members partaking of the lunch provided on 9th September 2025. Lunches continued to be provided during Committee and Panel meetings at the request of Members where meetings were held over the lunch period or where only a very short break was possible.

The Committee noted that it was for Members to consider whether the potential benefits of providing lunch on States meeting days outweighed any criticism associated with the cost. Funding from within the States Assembly budget would need to be identified at an estimated annual cost of £5,367.60 based on lunch being provided on 2 consecutive meeting days.

On a related matter, the Committee was reminded that the lunchtime adjournment on States meeting days commenced at 12.45 pm and ended at 2.15 pm, allowing sufficient time for Members to leave the building for fresh air and to purchase lunch, which could be consumed in the States Building whilst engaging with colleagues.

The Committee discussed the above matter and rejected the proposal on the basis that the absence of paid lunches for Members did not preclude them from engaging during the lunchtime recess. In arriving at this decision, the Committee noted the view of Deputy L.F.K Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter that Members attending Scrutiny Hearings or Committee meetings which ran over the lunchtime period should not be provided with lunch and should make their own arrangements.

Deputy Ferey requested that consideration be given to the provision of lunch for Members during the lengthy Government Plan debate at the end of the year. In this connexion, the Committee agreed that the Government Plan debate should commence on Monday and not Tuesday and that Members would be forewarned of the potential for extended meeting days on Thursday and Friday that week.

Standing
Orders 16/67
and 103:
review.

A8. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A13 of 8th September 2025, considered a report which had been produced by the States Greffe in connexion with Standing Orders 16 – leave to make a personal statement, 67 – personal statements and 103 – procedure for debates.

The Committee recalled that the Bailiff had granted Deputy P.C.F. Ozouf of St. Saviour leave to make a personal Statement at the States meeting on 8th September 2025, in accordance with Standing Orders 16 and 67. The statement directly related to the Committee's proposition which sought Deputy Ozouf's suspension for breaching the Code of Conduct.

The Committee noted that Standing Order 67 merely stated that '*a Member of the States who makes a personal statement shall not be asked any questions, nor shall any debate ensue upon the statement*'. Standing Order 16 stated that '*the content of the statement must be personal in nature*'. By convention, the text of a personal statement had to be provided to the Bailiff in advance so that the personal nature of the statement could be confirmed. In July 2013, the Bailiff and Deputy Bailiff of the day had agreed guidance in respect of personal statements and the Committee noted a copy of the same. Whilst this guidance had not been circulated to Members, it could be provided on request to explain the rationale for decisions regarding personal statements. Standing Order 103 dealt with the procedure for debates and stipulated that a Member could not speak twice in a debate, in accordance with Standing Order 103(1), save for in the following circumstances, as set out in Standing Order 103 (2) –

- (a) the proposer of a proposition may reply at the conclusion of a debate on it;
- (b) a member of the States who has seconded a proposition by rising in his or her place without speaking may speak at a later stage of the debate upon the proposition;
- (c) a member who has spoken in a debate on a proposition which, in the case of a draft enactment, was suspended or, in any case, was the subject of a reference back or a decision to move to the next item, may speak again when the debate resumes;
- (d) a member may, with the leave of the presiding officer, speak again in a debate in order to explain any material part of his or her speech which the member believes may have been misunderstood but, when speaking again, must not introduce any new matter;
- (e) in a debate upon a proposition of no confidence in or to censure or suspend a member of the States, the member who is the subject to the proposition may speak

again before the proposer replies at the conclusion of the debate;

(f) in a debate upon a proposition of no confidence in or to censure the Council of Ministers or any committee or panel established by standing orders the Chief Minister or the chair or president of the committee or panel, as the case requires, may speak again before the proposer replies at the conclusion of the debate.

Given the existing procedural context, as set out in Standing Order 103 (2)(e), the Committee was asked to consider whether it wished to amend Standing Orders 16 and 67 to preclude personal statements which directly related to suspension/confidence/censure propositions, given that the Member who was the subject of the proposition could speak twice in accordance with Standing Order 103(2)(e). Alternatively, broader provision could be made within Standing Orders for the Bailiff to refuse leave to make a personal statement if it was considered that granting leave would constitute a breach of other Standing Orders (such as Standing Order 103). Guidance along the lines of that which was produced in 2013 could be developed and circulated to support the application of any revisions to Standing Orders.

The Committee considered the above matter and requested that draft amendments to Standing Orders which encompassed the options set out above be prepared for its consideration. The Committee also agreed to consult the Bailiff on the proposals.

Selection of an
elected
Member to
preside at
meetings of the
States.

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 8th September 2025, considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States and a draft proposition which sought to establish the convention of selecting an elected Member to preside at States Meetings.

The Committee recalled that, having expressed support for the above, it had requested that a draft proposition be prepared which was less prescriptive than P.86/2024, which had been lodged “au Greffe” (and subsequently withdrawn) by Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter. The Committee had also requested that the Bailiff be consulted on the proposal and correspondence dated 23rd September 2025, from the Bailiff in response was noted. A number of questions had been raised in the letter, such as whether elected Members presiding in the absence of the Bailiff/Deputy Bailiff would be selected from a ‘pool’; what training would be provided for Members in advance of presiding; whether Members would receive prior notice of the requirement to preside so that they were not precluded from voting in debates on topics of particular interest/constituency matters, for example it was assumed that all Members would wish to participate in Island Plan/Government Plan debates; what plans were in place for situations where a conflict of interest arose (it was recalled that the Committee had previously agreed that the proposition would not seek to preclude the Greffier/Deputy Greffier from presiding); and, whether the Greffier/Deputy Greffier would continue to cover impromptu ‘comfort breaks’ when the Bailiff/Deputy Bailiff stepped out of the Chamber. Whilst the aforementioned issues were not considered to be insurmountable, clarification was sought as to the practical application of the proposal. The Committee noted that the Bailiff had suggested that it might be helpful to meet to discuss these matters in more detail.

Turning to the draft proposition, the Committee noted that this did not define the number of elected Members who could preside, nor how they would be selected. Such details would be confirmed as part of the implementation of the proposal.

The Committee requested that arrangements be made for the Chair to meet the

Bailiff/Deputy Bailiff to discuss the proposal in more detail.

Draft Treaties
(Jersey) Law
202-.

A11. The Committee noted the draft Treaties (Jersey) Law 202-, the purpose of which was to provide for the States Assembly to approve treaties.

The Committee recalled that the aforementioned legislation had been developed in response to P.6/2023, which requested that the Legislation Advisory Panel, in consultation with the Privileges and Procedures Committee, bring forward legislation by which all Treaties and International Agreements signed by a Minister under entrustment from the United Kingdom Government or which were to be extended to Jersey under the United Kingdom Government's ratification process, were subject to ratification by the States Assembly before they come into force.

The Committee requested that arrangements be made for a briefing on the draft legislation from the Chair of the Legislation Advisory Panel at the next scheduled meeting.

Forthcoming
business.

A12. The Committee considered propositions which had been lodged 'au Greffe' for forthcoming meetings of the States Assembly and concluded that it did not wish to comment on any of the propositions.

Action list:
Privileges and
Procedures
Committee.

A13. The Committee noted the actions and outcomes arising from previous meetings.

Minutes and
action lists:
Privileges and
Procedures
Sub-
Committees.

A14. The Committee noted the Minutes of the meetings of the various Sub-Committees of the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the actions and outcomes arising from the same.

Date of next
meeting.

A15. The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on 10th November 2025, at 9.15 am in the Blampied Room.