

STATES OF JERSEY



DRAFT ANIMAL WELFARE (JERSEY) LAW 202- (P.97/2025): SECOND AMENDMENT (P.97/2025 AMD.(2).COM) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 20th March 2026
by the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

The Environment, Housing & Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel notes that the Minister's amendment to Article 34 of the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202- ([P.97/2025](#)) has been brought forward as a direct result of the Panel's Animal Welfare & Control Review. However, requiring Scrutiny Panels to be informed before an Order is made does not address the substantive concerns raised by the Panel.

The amendment does not alter the Minister's ability to use Order-making powers to establish new licensing schemes for animal-related activities, including dog walkers, groomers and other service providers.

As the Panel has set out in its own amendment ([P.97/2025 Amd.\(3\)](#)), Article 18 as drafted continues to permit a Minister to create licensing schemes for any activity requiring a licence, without any statutory limitation restricting such schemes to commercial operators or ensuring public or Assembly oversight. During the Panel's Animal Welfare & Control Review, the Panel received clear evidence that these powers could, in theory, extend far beyond current policy intentions, creating significant regulatory and financial impacts for individuals and businesses without democratic scrutiny or public consultation. The Panel's amendment therefore proposes that only the States Assembly, through Regulations, should determine which activities require a licence, with the Minister retaining flexibility to set operational details by Order.

Crucially, the Minister's proposal that the Panel simply be informed of Orders before they are made does not provide any mechanism for Scrutiny to meaningfully challenge, influence, or review such decisions. While notification offers awareness, it does not create a formal opportunity for engagement or input. As a result, the level of oversight falls short of the assurance that the Panel expects for powers of this scale and potential impact.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Minister's amendment does not resolve the underlying issues and therefore invites the Assembly to reject the Minister's amendment and instead support the Panel's amendment, which provides more proportionate democratic oversight.