

STATES OF JERSEY



CONSTITUTION FOR JERSEY

**Lodged au Greffe on 5th April 2011
by Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier**

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

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

to request the Chief Minister to bring forward for debate a draft written Constitution for Jersey.

DEPUTY P.V.F. LE CLAIRE OF ST. HELIER

REPORT

“.....I hope that there are those in political life or with a political frame of mind who are of a similar view to mine. If so, it is time for them to do something; elections are only a year away. It could be, of course, that I am a lone voice, crying in the wilderness. If so, I will be rightly chastened by a complete lack of support. However, if there are indeed those that share my concern, I call for a public debate.

At the time of writing this letter, our political system is something of an embarrassment generally. Although I was opposed to much of the Harwood report, one of its more sensible aims was to try to achieve a more unified system of government. Clearly, that hasn't happened, and our 'ministers' (I still find it toe curling to use such a preposterous title) have behaved like spoiled children in an unsupervised playground, but I hope that whoever, over the next year, have their hands on the levers of power give some objective thought to the idea of a written, and somewhat changed, constitution for our island”.

Roger Perrot, Guernsey Lawyer, 2007

The recent 'In Committee' debate on the role of the Bailiff has convinced me that now is the time to begin to consider a written constitution for Jersey. During the debate, Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour commented upon and later circulated the Constitution of Gibraltar (THE GIBRALTAR CONSTITUTION ORDER 2006). Their new Constitution provides for a modern relationship between Gibraltar and the United Kingdom. Their Constitution does not in any way diminish British sovereignty. It establishes rights of individuals and the form of its jurisdiction in both administrative and social terms. It is one amongst many that we can consider. It was approved by the people of Gibraltar in a referendum.

Progression

The decision to progress a proposal of this nature has been some time in the making, as members will see from this report. I have been asking questions, both publicly in the States and privately at the highest levels, for years now.

It is in my opinion a matter of timing. I believe this is the right lead timing for such a debate and proposition as I feel we will need to be ready to present a more mature defence of our position internationally and with Europe especially in the coming months and years.

I felt the same way when I lodged the depositor compensation scheme giving the states some lead time to prepare for one. At the time I lodged my proposition requesting that the Minister for Economic Development introduce a depositor compensation scheme it was 19th September 2008. I requested it was brought back by July of the following year. By the time the proposition returned, the States and the finance industry, together with all Islanders who were anxious their savings would be protected, welcomed the fruits of my proposal with ardent relish.

I feel this proposition is similarly timed, and whilst it might meet with resistance in some quarters in principle, I believe that it too will be consumed with relish in the very near future. In my view it is inevitable.

Competence

Does anyone in the States feel incapable of such a debate? Perhaps that there should be a debate, but that the current elected Assembly is unworthy or incapable of making such a decision? Is there anyone within the Assembly that feels they are not capable themselves of such a debate?

I imagine there may be some members who are uncertain, but I believe we are well placed to make such a decision. We have a wealth of experience in all types of States members and a huge pool of experience in the current and past systems. This will not last for much longer as many members are due to retire, including the Chief Minister, Senator T.A. Le Sueur, who has a great deal of experience.

I believe we are all capable of such a debate and I also believe that the Island is capable and mature enough to have such a debate.

Importantly, I believe it is time for such a debate and that it is necessary.

This issue is also of need of a referendum, and with an upcoming election it will focus our minds on a collective future and direction that all can aspire to achieve and belong.

I have been asking about these issues for some considerable period now. Most recently in my written submission to Lord Carswell and his Panel, I summed up my views as set out below and in Appendix A attached.

'The Future, in part, identified by the Crown Officers, themselves

21. The Island is moving to adopt an international identity and with that will come the necessity to safeguard the rights and privileges of the citizens of Jersey through the office of an elected and accountable office holder. There is now a need for an elected head of the Island, either as a maturing Chief Minister's role or that of a President, within a republic. For us to have equal standing amongst nations, these privileges cannot be safeguarded by an appointed office holder, this is fundamental in any future rights to self-determination. The historical offices appointed by the Crown can no longer guarantee that the rights and privileges islanders have enjoyed can be safeguarded. This is highlighted on bullet point 76 of the Second Interim Report of The Constitution Review Group's report presented to the States Of Jersey on the 27th of June 2008 by the Council of Ministers. The membership of which was chaired by the then Bailiff Sir Philip Bailhache and the then H.M. Attorney General William Bailhache who concluded that;

“In those circumstances it would arguably be of greater importance to avoid any perceptions however misconceived, that the independence of the judiciary might be compromised by making provision for an elected or appointed speaker other than the Bailiff.”

22. The days of the Bailiff having a representational role and at the same time being the guardian of the island's constitutional privileges should end. They must make way for a written constitution guaranteeing rights that an appointee who can be replaced or dismissed can no longer guarantee.
23. I have attached the following question that I put in the States which highlights a further peculiarity within this Crown Peculiar¹. This is that of a Crown Appointee giving guidance and another advice to elected political office holders, in determining what the constitutional desires are of the Government of Jersey in external relations, which in this case includes Her Majesty's Government.
24. In relation to appeals to the Crown; would the States ever wish to be in a position where it would call upon the Privy Council to decide upon a matter that it had already decided upon? I would suggest that the Crown will never be asked to decide. So why should the Queen's appointees be placed in a position to facilitate that if they truly are the guardians of our island's constitutional privileges?

Appendix 1 and 2 from my submission have been removed for this report, but I leave Appendix 3 for reference purposes.

Full report available at this URL:

<http://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Government%20and%20administration/R%20Le%20Claire%20Submission%2020100330%20PLC%20v1.pdf>

'APPENDIX 3

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 1st MAY 2007

Question Time

Written

1.4 DEPUTY P.V.F. LE CLAIRE OF ST. HELIER OF THE CHIEF MINISTER REGARDING THE FORMAL PROCESSES EXISTING BETWEEN JERSEY AND HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT RELATING TO THE NEGOTIATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS:

Question

Would the Chief Minister outline the formal processes which currently exist between the States of Jersey, HM Attorney General and Her Majesty's

¹ Appendix 3

Government relating to negotiations on matters of jurisdiction, constitution or constitutional relationships?

Answer

I interpret 'matters of jurisdiction, constitution or constitutional relationships' to mean issues relating to the external relations of Jersey in respect of the United Kingdom or any other state.

Article 18 of the States of Jersey Law 2005, states that a function of the Council of Ministers includes discussing and agreeing their common policy regarding external relations. Furthermore, the Article provides that a function of the Chief Minister includes conducting external relations in accordance with the common policy agreed by the Council of Ministers.

However, this responsibility is always carried out within the authority of the States of Jersey. For example, in implementing a policy agreed as part of the States Strategic Plan, or in following adoption of a proposition in the States, the advice of HM Attorney General and guidance of the Bailiff will be sought where appropriate.

Following the agreement of a policy position by the States or by Ministers, the process for communications with Her Majesty's Government is either directly via Ministerial correspondence or through official correspondence via the Bailiff's Chambers after discussion with HM Attorney General.

Paul Le Claire

26th March 2010'

Financial and manpower implications

There are none. The Chief Minister has ample resources to deliver for debate a proposition such as this asks. If it is agreed, there will be a need for a referendum and that will then have financial consequences, but not that great in terms of what we are addressing. After all, we had one on changing our clocks to European time and that was deemed worth doing.

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 1st MAY 2007

Question Time

Written

1.4 DEPUTY P.V.F. LE CLAIRE OF ST. HELIER OF THE CHIEF MINISTER REGARDING THE FORMAL PROCESSES EXISTING BETWEEN JERSEY AND HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT RELATING TO THE NEGOTIATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS:

Question

Would the Chief Minister outline the formal processes which currently exist between the States of Jersey, HM Attorney General and Her Majesty's Government relating to negotiations on matters of jurisdiction, constitution or constitutional relationships?

Answer

I interpret 'matters of jurisdiction, constitution or constitutional relationships' to mean issues relating to the external relations of Jersey in respect of the United Kingdom or any other state.

Article 18 of the States of Jersey Law 2005, states that a function of the Council of Ministers includes discussing and agreeing their common policy regarding external relations. Furthermore, the Article provides that a function of the Chief Minister includes conducting external relations in accordance with the common policy agreed by the Council of Ministers.

However, this responsibility is always carried out within the authority of the States of Jersey. For example, in implementing a policy agreed as part of the States Strategic Plan, or in following adoption of a proposition in the States, the advice of HM Attorney General and guidance of the Bailiff will be sought where appropriate.

Following the agreement of a policy position by the States or by Ministers, the process for communications with Her Majesty's Government is either directly via Ministerial correspondence or through official correspondence via the Bailiff's Chambers after discussion with HM Attorney General.

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Bailiff:

We come next to a question by Deputy Le Claire of the Chief Minister.

2.9 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of the Chief Minister regarding the Island's existing relationship with Her Majesty's Government:

Is the Chief Minister satisfied that the existing relationship with Her Majesty's Government meets the Island's current and future needs, or would the relationship be strengthened through a written constitution, a concordat or other formal understanding in the future, and if so, how?

Senator F.H. Walker (The Chief Minister):

I am satisfied that the existing relationship with Her Majesty's Government currently, and for the foreseeable future, meets Jersey's needs. The relationship is entirely positive and works well on both sides. Whether a written constitution or a concordat would strengthen Jersey's relationship with the U.K. depends entirely on the content of such a document. I am sure that there would be a variety of views, both in Jersey and in the U.K., on what that content should be. There is a strong argument that an unwritten constitutional relationship allows for more flexibility and for greater development in the future. With regard to the future I will later this morning be making a statement on the conclusion of a formal framework for developing the international identity of Jersey, which I have agreed with the U.K. Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs. I am convinced that this framework will further strengthen Jersey's constitutional position by setting out the context of the U.K.'s responsibilities for Jersey's international relations, while recognising that Jersey is a responsible, stable and mature democracy with its own broad policy interests.

2.9.1 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

That is very reassuring to hear and I thank the Chief Minister that he is satisfied that the current arrangements do meet our needs and our future needs, and I am sure that most Members will agree with me that that is a wonderful position to be in. But I would like to ask the Chief Minister in regard to the statement that he is going to make, and as he brings it up in his question today, given the content of his answer to me in that any concordat would have to be considered by a variety of people for their views on the content, as any detail of the content might be significant in a constitutional perspective, does then it not also fall if that is the case – if that is good for the goose it should be good for the gander – if it needs to be considered with a variety of views, i.e. the States Members, in respect of a concordat or a written constitution, that any such framework as has been signed, we are about to be told, by the Chief Minister should also return to the Assembly for ratification and their consideration in respect of writing-up the framework of any such agreements in the future, because writing-up the framework stitches us up; it stitches us up to a playing field and measures us in. The question is, does not the Chief Minister agree that if those considerations have validity in respect of a written constitution and a concordat then they should also have had the approval of the States Assembly before they were drafted and signed by the Chief Minister?

Senator F.H. Walker:

There is a world of a difference between a concordat or a formal written constitution and the framework that I am presenting to the States today. The framework does not change Jersey's constitutional position, it is a statement which basically confirms the U.K.'s ratification of our constitutional position and strengthens our international position in a number of ways, and, it is entirely consistent with the decision of the States taken in the Strategic Plan when the States agreed that I should endeavour to agree a protocol with the Lord Chancellor, which will support further extension of the Island's international personality and independence of action. The way this has been handled is entirely consistent with the way that international agreements are normally handled, and entirely consistent with the way in which the States have previously agreed, and indeed set a precedent for in the signing of agreements with the E.U. on the Savings Tax Initiative.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Perhaps we could draw in other Members' attention to the Chief Minister's capable answers when we do get to the statement in respect of these questions, but I...

The Bailiff:

Deputy, you have the opportunity to question the Chief Minister on his statement when he has made it.

2.9.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Yes, Sir. What I was going to say, was rather than pose a whole bunch of supplementary questions at this stage, I will, if I am allowed to ask the questions, reserve those for the time that we address the statement. But may I ask at this point, just as a gesture of politeness, I do have a question for the Chief Minister in this respect, which I will set aside for later, that has to do with defining, in particular, agreeing to meet international standards when those international standards may have an impact upon our fiscal position. How can the Chief Minister agree to meet international standards? Should it not have been "agree to consider meeting international standards"? Setting up the wording of a framework like this stitches us up in my opinion.

Senator F.H. Walker:

It does nothing of the kind, and for the Deputy to suggest it stitches Jersey up misses the point and misses the whole basis of what is being presented to the States today. This is good news for Jersey; this strengthens our position, and to suggest it does anything to contrary suggests to me clearly the Deputy has totally failed to understand what is before him now, and I regret that.

2.9.3 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

The Island has always said that we will endeavour to meet, and that we will meet, international standards and we have prospered both culturally, economically and internationally as a result and we intend to continue to do so. Would the Minister not agree with me that in making the response that he has just made to me he fails to understand that I am applauding the work and the current and future relationship of the

United Kingdom, which has been developed by the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers? I am applauding that, but what I am saying is that it is difficult, if not impossible, for Members such as I to understand the impacts of agreements that have been negotiated without our involvement. If I have thoroughly failed to be able to be aware of these issues, then I am sure every other Member must be in that same boat too. I asked these questions prior to this information coming out. My questions were tabled prior to any of us knowing about these issues, and the consideration of these issues have been presented to us on the desk this morning, most Members have not read them and they have not turned to the framework of the understanding either. So, is it not really disappointing that the Chief Minister can rise to his feet to say that I am not on board; when the reality is nobody invited me?

Senator F.H. Walker:

I am intrigued by the Deputy's version of being supportive when he uses phrases like "stitches us up", it does not sound terribly supportive to me, so I am sure he will sympathise with my confusion. All international agreements which carry new obligations for Jersey are of course subject to the agreement of this House and have always come to this House, and will continue to come to this House. This is a framework statement of the international position in relation to the U.K., which does nothing other than strengthen Jersey's position, and I say again to the Deputy he should be warmly welcoming this as a significant move forward for Jersey and not damning it, I suppose I could say, with the faint praise that he seems to be doing in the phraseology of his questions.

The Bailiff:

We come next to a question by Deputy Power of the Minister for Treasury and Resources.

STATEMENTS ON A MATTER OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBILITY

5 Senator F.H. Walker (The Chief Minister):

Today is a significant date for Jersey. In accordance with the objective set out in the States approved Strategic Plan for 2006 to 2011, the Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs, Lord Falconer, and I have signed a document which sets out a framework for developing Jersey's international identity. It recognises quite clearly that Jersey has a unique identity separate from and different to the U.K. It also recognises that there will be times when our interests may differ and that while we will work together to resolve them, it is entirely justified for these differences to remain and to be recognised. The framework does not seek to change our constitutional relationship with the U.K. We agree that it works well and we are both committed to evolving methods to achieve our mutual interests. I think that the commitment to continue evolution is very healthy and very important. I am also pleased that we have agreed that Jersey and the U.K. will work together to promote a wider understanding and development of Jersey's international status and identity. I know this will provide a very strong foundation on which to enhance our standing in the international community which will benefit all Islanders. We have all been working hard for many years to counter the negative images that some would like to paint of Jersey. A clear

statement by the U.K. endorsing Jersey as a responsible, stable and mature democracy sends a message to the international community that our detractors will find hard to repose. I envisage that this will not only be good for Jersey's business interests but it should be something that every Islander can be proud of. Therefore, in conclusion, let me say that I believe this is an historic and important agreement for Jersey. Both Lord Falconer and I are fully committed to maintaining the open and valued relationship between Jersey and the U.K. and to work together in partnership. It will help Jersey to move forward confidently in the international arena and to engage positively with other countries as a responsible, stable and mature democracy which meets accepted international standards and obligations. The full content of the framework document which has been circulated to all Members is as follows: "Following the Statement of Intent agreed on 11th January 2006, the Chief Minister of Jersey and the U.K. Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs have agreed the following principles. They establish a framework for the development of the international identity of Jersey. The framework is intended to clarify the constitutional relationship between the U.K. and Jersey which works well and within which methods are evolving to help achieve the mutual interests of both the U.K. and Jersey. (1) The U.K. has no democratic accountability in and for Jersey which is governed by its own democratically elected Assembly. In the context of the U.K.'s responsibility for Jersey's international relations, it is understood that the U.K. will not act internationally on behalf of Jersey without prior consultation. The U.K. recognises that the interests of Jersey may differ from those of the U.K. and the U.K. will seek to represent any differing interests when acting in an international capacity. This is particularly evident in respect of the relationship with the European Union (E.U.) where the U.K. interests can be expected to be those of an E.U. Member State and the interests of Jersey can be expected to reflect the fact that the U.K.'s membership of the E.U. only extends to Jersey in certain circumstances as set out in protocol 3 of the U.K.'s Treaty of Accession; (2) Jersey has an intentional identity which is different from that of the U.K.; (3) The U.K. recognises that Jersey is a longstanding small democracy and supports the principle of Jersey further developing its international identity; (4) The U.K. has a role to play in assisting the development of Jersey's international identity. The role is one of support, not interference; (5) Jersey and the U.K. commit themselves to open, effective and meaningful dialogue with each other on any issue that may come to affect the constitutional relationship; (6) International identity is developed effectively through meeting international standards and obligations which are important components of Jersey's international identity; (7) The U.K. will clearly identify its priorities for delivery of its international obligations and agreements so that these are understood and can be taken into account by Jersey in developing its own position; (8) The activities of the U.K. in the international arena need to have regard to Jersey's international relations, policies and responsibilities; (9) The U.K. and Jersey will work together to resolve or clarify any differences which may arise between their respective interests; (10) Jersey and the U.K. will work jointly to promote the legitimate status of Jersey as a responsible, stable and mature democracy with its own broad policy interests and which is willing to engage positively with the international community across a wide range of issues.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

On a point of order, Sir, may I, before you open the floor for potential questions to the Chief Minister, just ask the Chief Minister if **[Laughter]** or ask through the Chair, in reading the...

The Bailiff:

If it is a point of order, you are seeking a ruling from the Chair.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sorry, a ruling.

The Bailiff:

It is nothing to do with the Chief Minister.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Right, Sir. In reading the statement of the Chief Minister, I believe he omitted the penultimate paragraph, Sir.

The Bailiff:

I understand the Chief Minister has slightly modified the statement and it was the modified statement that he read out to the Assembly.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

And no doubt will be circulated to the Members in due course. Certainly, it was different from the text which I have in front of me, Deputy. You are quite right.

Senator F.H. Walker:

Could I please just clarify that. I did understand that the modified version had been distributed to Members and I apologise if it has not.

The Bailiff:

Chief Minister, the Greffier and I understand that the text has been modified perhaps on more than one occasion; the text of the statement, not the Statement of Intent but Members should have on their desks the final copy. If not, any Member who does not have the copy which the Chief Minister read out, I am sure they can obtain one from the Greffier.

5.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Well, Sir, I did not read the statement word for word as the Chief Minister was making it, so I could not say whether I had got the old version or the new one. But, anyway, I would like to congratulate the Chief Minister on this initiative and I think reading it through, I am very happy with the terms of it. I would, however, like his confirmation that you, Sir, and the Attorney General were both involved in discussions on this document before it was completed. Thank you, Sir.

Senator F.H. Walker:

Yes, Sir, I can give the Connétable and the House confirmation that that was the case.

5.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Obviously I have already spoken about this in my questions previously to the Chief Minister but what I wanted to put across and put aside was any veiled criticism. I used the words “stitched-up” and I should have said “stitched-in”. My concern – and it is a concern – relates to the framework itself that has been presented at the back of this statement.

The Bailiff:

Deputy, please be concise because a number of Members wish to ask questions and there will not be time.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Right, Sir. Is this the actual written framework and does item 6 bind us or will the Chief Minister return to the Assembly for any formal binding agreement in the future?

Senator F.H. Walker:

Paragraph 6 does not bind us to any new specific international agreements or obligations and any such proposals would have to come to this House for approval.

5.3 Deputy J.B. Fox:

I think it is a very good document but I just wanted to know whether this has any financial commitments on the Island in addition to that which we already have. Thank you.

Senator F.H. Walker:

No, Sir.

5.4 Deputy P.J.D. Ryan:

First of all, I would like to absolutely heartily congratulate the Chief Minister and his team. I think they have done an absolutely superb job, Sir. We have been looking at it from afar as the Scrutiny Panel responsible. I would like to congratulate his team particularly on the highly skilled way and the subtlety that they have shown in negotiating this. I think it is absolutely excellent. That is the first point. The question, Sir, is twofold and I will be as concise as I can. This is probably a further small step on the road towards Jersey developing its own foreign policy. Slowly but inexorably that is the way we are going. Would the Chief Minister agree that in a non-party political system, it is going to be important for him to communicate perhaps a little bit more effectively than has been necessary in the past with other States Members? Would he be prepared to commit to that and perhaps through the Scrutiny Panel’s regular 6-monthly meeting, we could set a small period of time aside for general communication on this particular area of policy?

Senator F.H. Walker:

I thank the Deputy warmly for his congratulations and those too of the Constable of St. Lawrence. This is a very significant step forward in developing Jersey's international identity and status and I am pleased that the Deputy recognises that. There is a need to communicate freely matters of such importance effectively and I know some Members are concerned that this agreement did not come to the House before being signed but the fact is that had it in effect been the matter of a public negotiation, then the Lord Chancellor simply would not have signed it because that is not the way that governments traditionally enter into such agreements. So I am more than happy to meet with the Deputy's Corporate Affairs Scrutiny Panel to discuss international agreements, as I think he knows, and of course as we have done on a number of occasions already. So I would just, for the record, like to confirm that the Corporate Affairs Scrutiny Panel were aware and did receive a copy of the framework some time ago.

5.5 Deputy K.C. Lewis:

While I welcome this signing of the agreement between the Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs, Lord Falconer, my question is regarding our relationship with Guernsey who appear to be treading a slightly different path. There have been discussions of the possibility of changing from Crown Protectorate to Dominion status even. How does the Chief Minister see the development of our relationship with Guernsey? Thank you, Sir.

Senator F.H. Walker:

Can I firstly make it clear there was some reporting in both Jersey and Guernsey that almost smacks of me crowing that Guernsey were not in a position to sign a similar framework as we are. They are not but those reasons are for Guernsey and the U.K. to resolve and the comment certainly should not have been attributed to me but that is an issue for perhaps some other discussion. Sir, I am meeting for the first time, together with my Treasury and Resources Minister, with the Chief Minister and the Treasury and Resources Minister of Guernsey on Friday and I look forward very much to that meeting. I can say that all the preparation for that meeting has been conducted in a very amicable and positive way and I hope very much that the meeting will continue in that vein and our future relationship with Guernsey will continue in that vein because, as I have said on many previous occasions, it is of the greatest importance that it should.

5.6 The Deputy of Grouville:

First, other than signing an agreement, could the Chief Minister explain if the situation differs from what we have at present and, secondly, are we or the U.K. ever minded to develop a charter with the U.K. Government?

Senator F.H. Walker:

I think the differences from the previous position to where we are now following the signing of this framework are some very important indeed obligations and statements made by the U.K. Government. There is a formal commitment to consult Jersey on

international matters which we did not have before and of course there is a statement that the U.K. has no U.K. democratic accountability for Jersey and we have not had that statement before but there are no specific new obligations for Jersey. As for a written constitution, I think I covered that point in my response to Deputy Le Claire's earlier question. There are pros and cons for any written protocol. There are pros and cons and if we were to try to negotiate such a formal statement, then some of it might work in our favour; some of it might work against. The general view at the moment – and I put this to the Assembly on a number of occasions in the past – is that the unwritten constitution agreement that we have is more flexible and gives us more opportunity to develop our own position in the future. So we are not currently pursuing any form of written protocol at this stage.

5.7 Deputy S.C. Ferguson of St. Brelade:

I would, firstly, congratulate the Chief Minister that perhaps Westminster will understand a little better the position of Jersey as a Crown peculiar. In paragraph one, it states that the U.K. has no democratic accountability in and for Jersey which is governed by its own democratically elected Assembly. Given the necessity for precise language in international agreements, does the Chief Minister agree that this reflects the true constitutional position?

Senator F.H. Walker:

First of all, I thank the Deputy for her congratulations as well and I do agree with her that this framework will – certainly I am very confident – result in a better understanding in Westminster of Jersey's true position. Yes, Sir, this would not have been included in the framework if it did not reflect the true agreement between us and the U.K. and the true democratic accountability position.

5.8 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I did ask before and I rise again to ask again, is this the actual framework? That is the first part of the question because it has not got any signatures on it and, secondly, what process will now follow in respect of Lord Falconer circulating that framework to the U.K. Government? How will it be put to them?

Senator F.H. Walker:

It is the true framework and it has, I can confirm, been duly signed. I do not know what Lord Falconer's plans are to circulate or communicate the framework to Members of the U.K. Government or Members of the Houses of Parliament. That is very much a matter for Lord Falconer and the U.K. Government.

5.9 Deputy J.A. Martin:

Yes, that follows on nicely, Sir. I should offer my congratulations that we have got this in writing. The U.K. commit to do very many different things in this understanding of agreement. Would the Minister undertake to keep us informed as to what they carry out to promote the Island and to commit themselves and what they are doing in, say, the next 12 months? Thank you, Sir.

Senator F.H. Walker:

Yes, Sir. I do not think the U.K. has committed to doing anything at a certain date or anything of that nature. This is more of a general position as and when the necessity arises, but I will happily keep the Deputy and the House informed. In fact, I would suggest it probably is a very good idea if I report back to the House certainly within a year, and maybe at the end of 6 months, on how the relationship has developed and evolved on the back of the signing of this framework and I am more than happy to do so.