

PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

(17th Meeting)

19th September 2003PART A

All members were present. Deputy C.J. Scott-Warren was not present for items A1 to A3.

Senator C.G.P. Lakeman  
 Connétable D.F. Gray  
 Deputy F.J. Hill, B.E.M.  
 Deputy C.J. Scott-Warren  
 Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier  
 Deputy J-A. Bridge  
 Deputy J.A. Bernstein

In attendance -

Mrs. A.H. Harris, Deputy Greffier of the States  
 D.C.G. Filippini, Assistant Greffier of the States (for a time)  
 Mrs J. Marshall, Senior Executive Officer  
 Miss F. Agnès, Executive Officer  
 R.W. Whitehead, Principal Legal Adviser (for a time)  
 Ms. P. Staley, Law Draftsman (for a time)  
 M.P. Haden, Committee Clerk.

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

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Minutes         | A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd August 2003, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.   |
| Matters arising | A2. The Committee noted the following matters arising from its meeting held on 22nd August 2003 - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Act No. A2 - Members' remuneration</b> - that the Comptroller of Income Tax remained adamant that he was not prepared to raise the current level of expenses allowable to States members without any formal expenses claim unless there was strong evidence to show that members routinely spent more than the current amount on expenses. Currently, few members made formal claims over and above the allowable amount. He suggested that an alternative would be for members to pay up front and to claim back all expenses from the States Treasury. In this way expenses would be properly scrutinised, However, this would be a very bureaucratic and time consuming process for all involved. <b>The Committee requested that the view of the States Auditors be sought on whether the current level of the round sum allowance for States members was reasonable. The Senior Executive Officer was requested to take the necessary action;</b></li> <li>(b) <b>Act No. A4 - Draft Public Finances Administration (Jersey) Law 200-</b>: noted that the Committee had been invited to attend the Finance</li> </ul> |

and Economics Committee meeting on 1st October 2003 to discuss its comments on the above draft Law. The Committee requested that the paper considered at its previous meeting be updated and that an advance copy of the Finance and Economics Committee paper, prepared by the Deputy Treasurer of the States, be requested so that members attending this meeting might be fully briefed on the points to be discussed;

- (c) **Act No. A5 - Machinery of Government Reforms Timetable** - that the Principal Legal Adviser had confirmed that his advice regarding the possibility of curtailing the length of office of elected members of the States remained valid;
- (d) **Act No. A6 - States members accommodation and facilities** - that it was not possible to create direct access from the Media Booth to the Media Room due to the different levels of the rooms; and
- (e) **Act No. A7 - Royal Court/States Building - disabled access** - that a report had been prepared for submission to the next meeting of the Environment and Public Services Committee.

New Standing  
Orders of the  
States of Jersey.  
1240/4(138)

A3. The Committee considered a paper, dated 3rd September 2003, from the Greffier of the States in connexion with a proposed approach towards the work of preparing new Standing Orders for the States of Jersey.

Ex.Off.

The Committee noted a table of subject areas for which it was proposed to assign 'lead officers' to undertake the necessary research and consultation with members.

**The Committee endorsed the approach set out in the Greffier's paper. It suggested that the working group which had looked at the new States of Jersey Law be reconvened for this purpose. It authorised the Greffier to act as instructing officer for the Law Draftsman and requested that a prioritised timetable be produced for dealing with the work.**

On a related matter, the Committee noted the Bailiff's recent statement on members' conflicts of interest and requested that any comments on this be transmitted to the Senior Executive Officer. The Assistant Greffier of the States was requested to renew contact with an officer in Scotland in relation to this issue

States members'  
accommodation,  
services and  
facilities.  
1060/5/1(18)

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A6 of 22nd August 2003, considered a report, dated 9th September 2003, from the Executive Officer in relation to the recommendations of the Consultation Group set up to consider the use and furnishings of the States members' areas of the States Building.

Ex.Off.

**The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Consultation Group and noted, in particular-**

- (a) **Meeting Room (formerly designated 'Common Room')** - that this room would be set up as a multi-use meeting room capable of use for larger informal business meetings and as a dining room for States members' lunches during States sessions;
- (b) **Communication Centre (formerly designated 'Library')** - that this room would be furnished with desk pods, telephones, network points, ICT facilities, photocopier and fax machine;
- (c) **Members' Common Room (formerly known as the Smokers' Room)**

- that this room would not be used as an office for Privileges and Procedures Committee officers, as previously suggested. It was considered more suitable as a Common Room for members rather than the Meeting Room which had previously been designated for this function. This room would have an audio link with States chamber. (It was noted that the Committee's officers would remain in Morier House. In addition, an office had become available for the President adjacent to the Peirson Room).

The Committee recalled that it had requested the Executive Officer to negotiate with the Bailiff's department and the Judicial Greffe for the former Law Library Room and the Photocopier Room (off Coffee Room 2) to be transferred to the tenancy of States members. The Committee was advised that the Judicial Greffe required the Law Library for office use. Access to this room through the Gallery to the Old Library would not then be part of the States members' tenancy. The Judicial Greffe also required the Photocopier Room as a waiting room for witnesses. It had been agreed, however, that there could be 'shared' use of this room, with the Judicial Greffe as priority user with an agreement that it might be used by States members when not in use for the Court. **The Committee authorised the Executive Officer to write to the Bailiff formally setting out this proposal to seek his approval to the arrangement.**

Policy and Resources Committee - proposed 'Question Time' in the States. 1240/4(155)

Ex.Off.  
C.E., P&R  
P.R.E.O.  
P.R.C.C.

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A3 of 10th January 2003, welcomed Senator F.H. Walker, President of the Policy and Resources Committee, to discuss his Committee's proposal that a regular 'Question Time' be introduced in the States during which the President of the Policy and Resources Committee could be questioned with or without prior notice on aspects of his Committee's policies.

Senator Walker acknowledged the special interest States members and the Public had in the Policy and Resources Committee with its overall co-ordinating responsibilities. He recalled that the proposal had arisen from the successful experiment in which candidates for the Presidency of the Policy and Resources Committee had made a statement on their policies and responded to members' questions. His Committee felt that the proposal would compensate in some measure for the decision no longer to circulate Part B Minutes routinely to States members. In his opinion, it would enable members to hold the President to account in an effective way. He suggested that the President might make a short monthly statement to the House (maximum length 10 minutes) and then take questions for a defined period (maximum length 15 minutes). He agreed that members should not be confined to only asking questions based on the said statement. Senator Walker felt that the President of the Policy and Resources should be able to respond to any questions on matters within the remit of his/her Committee. He said that the focus of this 'Policy and Resources Question Time' should be on imparting information to the public. There would be no place for 'planted' questions or 'spin', as currently occurred in Prime Ministers Question Time in the House of Commons. Members would soon become aware of any major issues not covered in the President's statement as they continued to have access to Policy and Resources Committee Part B Minutes, if they chose, by approaching the States Greffe and in this way would be able to track developments for themselves. He proposed that the 'Policy and Resources Question Time' should be introduced for a trial period.

The Committee expressed some reservations regarding this proposal. It was suggested that the Committee statement would be 'packaged' information and, in association with the Policy and Resources Committee's appointment of a press officer, would add to the public perception of 'spin'. It was feared that 'Question Time' would become predominantly a point scoring session, reinforcing emerging

divisions in the States. An alternative proposal was made for the Policy and Resources Committee to have an open, public session as part of its scheduled Committee meetings, where the Committee could be questioned on its policies in the presence of the media. It was pointed out, however, that a Committee session would not have the same status and public impact as Questions in the States. There might be a tendency for such a Committee session to become the domain of a few regular attendees rather than the full complement of members in the States.

The Committee also suggested that 'Question Time' should not be limited to the Policy and Resources Committee but that other Committee Presidents, and future Ministers, should be required to make periodic statements to the House and take questions on their current policies. A schedule of such question sessions might be drawn up by the Greffier of the States.

The Committee acknowledged that the 'Question Time' proposal was outside current Standing Orders which did not allow questions to be put following a statement to the House. **It requested that a paper be prepared for consideration at its next meeting on how Standing Orders might be revised to enable the proposed trial to take place.**

The Committee discussed further issues with the President of the Policy and Resources Committee, namely -

- (a) **Working Party on Arrangements for Public Business** - the Committee advised that it was currently asking Departments to provide information on their plans for Public Business in the States. It was becoming apparent that States Business was expanding and the Committee intended to produce proposals to rationalise current procedures;
- (b) **Timetable for introduction of Machinery of Government Reforms** - The Committee referred to the advice from the Principal Legal Adviser regarding the possibility of curtailing the length of office of elected members to enable the next public elections to be brought forward to the Spring of 2005, if this was considered appropriate. The Committee reiterated its view that the introduction of ministerial government should be combined with a General Election. Senator Walker said that he would have no problem with this link but had previously been led to believe that it was not possible to change the date of the elections currently scheduled for the Autumn 2005. It was recognised that this was properly within the remit of the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly. **The Committee requested that a draft Plan be prepared setting out how a Spring Election might take place in 2005.**

It was agreed that the priority was to have a fully agreed timetable for the introduction of ministerial government. To this end, officers of the Privileges and Procedures Committee and officers from the Machinery of Government team were requested to continue to develop close working relationships, to avoid duplication of effort, and to co-operate in the development of a single agreed Strategic Plan for the introduction of the new system of government.

The Committee thanked Senator Walker for his contribution to the discussion before he left the meeting.

The Committee agreed that the proposed 'Question Time' merited careful

consideration but **confirmed its view that it should be seen in the broader context of general review of Standing Orders and in particular the procedures relating to the conduct of Questions in the States and the arrangement of Public Business.** It was also of the view that the reason given by the Policy and Resources for ceasing to circulate its Part B Minutes to States members (namely, that its Minutes now contained sensitive personal information due to its Human Resources function) could be overcome by blanking out individual names and any identifying information. **The Committee agreed to request the Policy and Resources Committee to revisit this particular decision in the interests of providing States members with full information on the development of its policies.** The President undertook to write to the President of the Policy and Resources Committee to explain the Committee's views.

The Greffier of the States was directed to send a copy of this Act to the Policy and Resources Committee for information.

Shadow Scrutiny.  
465/1(31)  
502/1(6)

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A5 of 21st March 2003, received a report from the Senior Executive Officer regarding the practical issues to be considered in the implementation of Shadow Scrutiny.

Ex.Off.  
T.O.S.  
C.I.Aud.  
F.E.C.C.  
C.E., P&R  
P.R.E.O.  
P.R.C.C.

The Committee recalled that, in adopting P.79/2003 on the establishment of Scrutiny Panels and Public Accounts Committee, the States had approved a trial period of 'Shadow Scrutiny' in advance of the introduction of the new system of government. It confirmed the purposes of Shadow Scrutiny, as described in P.79/2003, as follows -

- (i) **To create opportunities for training both members and officers – in particular developing new skills;**
- (ii) **To include a wide range of members in the Shadow Scrutiny process;**
- (iii) **To provide a learning experience for officers supporting the Panels.**

The Committee agreed that these purposes should be extended to also include the following -

- (iv) **To develop the practical arrangements for a system of Scrutiny appropriate for Jersey. This would include introducing a programme that will incorporate all elements of the Scrutiny process including elements of present and future policy, individual subject areas/reviews (including matters of public interest), ministerial decisions, draft/subordinate legislation;**
- (v) **To develop guidelines governing the Scrutiny Process. This would include setting out the responsibilities of the chairman, members and officers, together with rules for engagement with departments and the public;**
- (vi) **To assessing the resource requirements for Scrutiny in more detail in light of the experience provided by the Shadow process; and**
- (vii) **To develop awareness of the Scrutiny function.**

The Committee agreed that its role should be to agree and implement the framework within which the Shadow Scrutiny processes would operate. It would be responsible

for developing guidelines, ensuring adequate resources and monitoring effectiveness. On the other hand, the programme of work for the Shadow process would be for the Panels themselves to decide, bearing in mind the objectives of the Shadow process which was essentially a training exercise. To this end, the Committee agreed -

- (a) **that, at the end of 2004 and before the introduction of ministerial government, it would formally consult with the Shadow Scrutiny Panels and report to the States on the effectiveness of the Shadow Scrutiny process and the formal arrangements for Scrutiny in its live context.**

The Committee agreed that the process for the appointment of Shadow Scrutiny Panels should reflect, as far as possible, the normal States procedures for the appointment of Committee and approved the following steps -

- (b) **that all States members would be invited to declare an interest in participating in the process by serving on a Shadow Scrutiny Panel.** The Committee took the view that any member could join a Shadow Scrutiny Panel so long as they did not participate in any review pertaining to States Committees to which they already belonged;
- (c) **that members be asked to nominate two Chairmen for the Shadow Scrutiny Panels from the list of those who had declared an interest in participating in the process.** The Committee was conscious of the crucial role to be played in the success of the process by the two Chairmen. It considered whether it might be advisable for the Committee itself to invite two members to act as Chairmen; however, it agreed that it was more appropriate to rely on the democratic process. In the long term, this would give Shadow Scrutiny greater credibility;
- (d) **that membership of the Panels should be nominated by each of the Chairmen and presented to the States for approval.** The Committee was anxious that all members who wished to participate in Shadow Scrutiny should have the opportunity to do so. The Committee wished to get away from the image of Scrutiny as some form of 'second-class' function in comparison with the Executive function. To ensure that all members would have the opportunity to take part in the learning process, the Committee agreed that, depending on the numbers of interested members, a succession plan should be devised to enable members to serve for a defined period of time or for a particular piece of work;

The Committee considered whether Scrutiny Panels should be 'generalist', that is, allowed to select issues from across the whole Public Sector, or dedicated to particular subject areas. The Committee agreed -

- (e) **that, for the purposes of the Shadow Scrutiny process, it should not be prescriptive regarding the topics for Shadow Scrutiny.** Topics should be selected by the Panels on the basis of what would best deliver the objectives of the Shadow process. It was of the view that the Panels should still adopt a themed approach, where practical, and that the respective Chairmen should co-ordinate their programmes, with the Privileges and Procedures Committee providing a monitoring role to ensure that Panels were not over-ambitious to start with and selected studies of an appropriate size for a training process.

The Committee acknowledged that the Shadow Panels would not possess any powers to require attendance at meetings and that proceedings would not be covered by privilege. The Committee explored the possibility of providing privilege to Scrutiny Panels by making them Sub-Committees of the Privileges and Procedures Committee but was advised that this was not a solution as Sub-Committees were not covered by privilege. The Committee was optimistic that States Committees and their respective Departments would embrace the process provided that the topics selected in this interim training period were not overly confrontational inducing Committee and Departments under scrutiny to become defensive.

To ensure that the training process was enhanced, the Committee agreed, as follows -

- (f) that the Privileges and Procedures Committee should comment on the appropriateness of the programme selected by the Shadow Scrutiny Panels in delivering the objectives;**
- (g) that, for each piece of work undertaken by a Shadow Scrutiny Panel, a Review Group should be set up to assess the effectiveness of the process and identify any problems encountered either by the Panel or the department providing information.**
- (h) that reports produced by the Shadow Scrutiny Panels should be presented to the States and published;**
- (i) that a website should be set up for the purposes of making the record of formal meetings and hearings publicly available and of publishing the Panels' reports;**
- (j) that protocols/guidelines for Shadow Scrutiny should be developed by the Committee's Officers and presented to the States for agreement at the same time as they were asked to approve the membership of the Shadow Panels.**

The Committee was conscious that a system of recording Executive decisions had not yet been agreed. It noted that the Senior Executive Officer and the Manager of Machinery of Government Reforms were to visit Whitehall in the next month to investigate the recording of Cabinet decisions with a view to developing a system appropriate to the Island. In the meantime, for the purposes of the Shadow Scrutiny exercise, it was agreed -

- (k) that Committee minutes should be used as the basis for scrutinising Committee decisions in the short term; and**
- (l) that any proposed system for the recording of ministerial decisions should be trialled as part of the process.**

The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A3 of 11th July 2003, recalled that it had agreed that the States Audit Commission should act as a Shadow Public Accounts Committee. In order to progress this transformation the Committee agreed -

- (m) to request the Finance and Economics Committee -**
  - (i) to seek to amend the terms of reference for the States Audit Commission which related to membership to allow the appointment of additional States members to fill the current vacancies and to replace the current representative of the**

**Finance and Economics Committee with a Shadow Chairman; and**

- (ii) to agree that two of the vacancies should be filled by the Chairmen of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels.**

The Committee also agreed -

- (n) that the Shadow Chairman of the Shadow Public Accounts Committee should be appointed by the States from among those who had indicated an interest in participating in the Shadow Scrutiny process.**

The Committee agreed that each of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels should be supported by two Scrutiny Officers (in line with the staffing envisaged in P.79/2003), with a shared Administrator a total of five staff in total. It was agreed that the direct management of the function should be the responsibility of the Greffier of the States. The Committee's Executive Officers would undertake a close monitoring role to ensure the effectiveness of the arrangements and develop the detailed proposals for the full Scrutiny process based on outcomes. The Committee accordingly agreed -

- (o) to prepare a report to the Finance and Economics Committee recommending the approval of 5 temporary posts to support the Shadow Scrutiny process;**
- (p) that administrative support to the Shadow Public Accounts Committee would be provided by Shadow Scrutiny Officers;**
- (q) to charge the Greffier of the States with setting up an independent appointments panel to appoint staff to support the Shadow Scrutiny process, possibly involving the States Appointments Commission to ensure transparency.**
- (r) that the training programme for Scrutiny Officers should be determined by the States Greffe in liaison with the Executive Officers;**
- (s) that the training programme for Shadow Scrutiny Panels and other members should be determined by the Executive Officers in liaison with the States Greffe;**
- (t) that the training programme for Chief/Senior Officers should be determined by the Executive Officers in liaison with the Chief Executive of the States, States Human Resources Department and the States Greffe.**

The Committee was advised that the Gallery to the Old Library would make an ideal area to base Scrutiny Officers, Scrutiny Panel members requiring desk area for Scrutiny business and the Scrutiny Panels themselves when meeting informally. This would allow informal training and learning together to develop both staff and members. Formal meetings and hearings might be held in the two recently refurbished Committee rooms in the States Building. However, there was currently no dedicated budget for furnishing these rooms. The Committee was advised that, as the budget allocated for 2003 for Scrutiny had not been utilised, a maximum sum of £60,000 could be allocated for furnishing these rooms to a high standard and in a flexible format that would allow for either meetings and/or hearings with public access. An estimated additional £20,000 (maximum) would be required for audio



equipment to record the formal sessions. The Committee accordingly agreed -

- (u) **to the use of the Gallery of the Old Library, subject to States agreement, to accommodate Shadow Scrutiny Officers and Panels;**
- (v) **to the allocation of funds to equip and furnish the Gallery of the Old Library and to furnish two Committee rooms for Shadow Scrutiny use.**

The Committee recalled that the budget allocated for the implementation of Scrutiny was £250,000 for both 2003 and 2004, a total of £500,000. It noted that little of the budget for 2003 had been spent to date, although it was intended that most of the funds required to set up the Shadow process would be committed before the end of the year. The Committee accordingly agreed -

- (w) **to seek in principle permission for any surplus in the funds allocated for 2003 to be carried forward to 2004 on the basis that the Shadow process had only been approved in July 2003 and therefore could not be implemented until late 2003/early 2004.**

The Committee received a draft timetable for the implementation of Shadow Scrutiny with a commencement date at the beginning of January 2004. The Committee, having noted that the deadlines were tight but achievable -

- (x) **approved the draft timetable accordingly.**

The Committee requested that the above report be transformed into a form which might be presented to the States as a *Rapport et Correspondence* in order that States members and the public might be fully informed about the plans for the Shadow Scrutiny process.

The Senior Executive Officer was authorised to take the necessary action. The Greffier of the States was directed to send a copy of this Act to the Policy and Resources to gain its support for the Shadow process and to the Finance and Economics Committee to gain its support for the proposed Shadow Public Accounts Committee and for the use of the budget.

States of Jersey  
Law 200-:  
revised draft.  
450(1)

L.D.  
Ex.Off.  
A.G.

A7. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. B1 of 11th July 2003, received Ms P. Staley, Law Draftsman, and Mr. R.W. Whitehead, Principal Legal Adviser, to discuss the latest revised draft of the new States of Jersey Law.

The Committee considered a memorandum, dated 11th September 2003, from the Law Draftsman and agreed, as follows -

- (a) that the definition of 'week' should remain as any period of seven days;
- (b) that the following grounds for disqualification for office as Senator or Deputy should be added to the draft list (Article 8(1)) -
  - (i) if that person ceased to be a British citizen; and
  - (ii) if that person ceased to be ordinarily resident.
- (c) that the rule for the disqualification of part-time workers required further clarification (Article 10);

- (d) that the power to change the dates of elections (Article 6), as well as the cut-off date (Article 13(5)), should be included in the Regulations;
- (e) that reference to the Chief Minister and Ministers collectively as the Council of Ministers should be reinstated (Article 18);
- (f) that the selection and appointment of a new Chief Minister or Minister would not be required for a period of up to eight weeks prior to the triennial selection and appointment that would always follow the ordinary elections for Deputies. The States should have discretion in this matter depending on the circumstances (Article 19). Similarly, the power for a Minister to act in the temporary absence or incapacity of another Minister should be limited to eight weeks (Article 26);
- (g) that a Chief Minister designate should not be able, when bringing forward nominations and proposals for Ministerial appointment, to propose transfers of functions and amalgamations and splits of Ministries (Article 19);
- (h) that, in the event of the States deciding they had no confidence in the Council of Ministers, the Council should, by convention, act only to the extent necessary for essential administration and discharge of ministerial functions until it ceased to hold office (Article 22).

The Committee was minded to decide that the dismissal of a Minister might proceed on a simple majority of the Council (Article 23). However, it requested that the position agreed in the States debate on this matter be checked.

The Committee recalled that it had not yet been decided how Ministerial decisions would be recorded. It was advised, however, that this was not relevant to Article 34.

The Committee noted that the Law Officers were working on a paper as to the meaning and implications of being a corporation sole within the Jersey context (article 25).

The Committee discussed the principle of amending Orders in Council (Article 46). The Committee agreed that it was important to clarify this matter with a view to reaching a common understanding with H.M. Attorney General.

The Committee noted the useful summary, provided in the above memorandum, setting out the arrangements, under the draft Law, in the event of the resignation, disqualification, dismissal, incapacity or death of a Chief Minister or Minister.

The Committee received a copy of the Statute of Westminster 1931, which set out in its Preamble the constitutional relationship of Dominions with the Crown. The Committee agreed to consult H.M. Attorney General on his views in relation to the suitability of a Preamble to the States of Jersey Law.

The President undertook to meet the Law Draftsman to discuss in detail the next draft of the Law.

Code of Practice  
on Public access  
to Official  
Information -  
measures to

A8. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A6 of 30th May 2003, considered a draft Report and Proposition, prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States, regarding proposals to improve the implementation of the Code of Practice on Public access to Official Information.

improve  
implement-ation -  
draft Report and  
Proposition  
955(30)

The Committee approved the draft Report and Proposition in principle, subject to a number of changes in the wording of the report which were delegated to the Vice President and the Deputy Greffier of the States for finalisation. The Committee decided to request the comments, prior to lodging, of the Policy and Resources Committee, as the Committee with responsibility for co-ordinating the work of Committees.

C.E., P&R  
P.R.E.O.  
P.R.C.C.  
T.O.S.  
C.I.Aud.  
F.E.C.C.  
D.G.O.S.  
Ex.Off.

The Committee was conscious of the important role of the media in ensuring that information reached the public domain, particularly under the new scrutiny arrangements. It requested accordingly that the media be consulted with regard to the proposals. The Executive Officer was requested to take the necessary action.

The Committee noted the financial and manpower implications indicated in the report and agreed to send the comments of the Finance and Economics Committee.

The Greffier of the States was directed to send a copy of this Act to the Policy and Resources and Finance and Economics Committees.

Televising States  
sittings.  
1240/10(34)

A9. The Committee, with Mr. C. Rolfe of the BBC Radio Jersey, in attendance, considered correspondence, dated 22nd July 2003, from Mr. A. Watts, News Editor, Channel Television, regarding a proposal to trial the televising of selected States debates or Committee statements.

Ex.Off.

The Committee agreed, in principle, that televised coverage of the States would enhance public awareness of the political process. It requested the Executive Officer to prepare a report, in liaison with the BBC and Channel Television, on the various scenarios to be considered and the operational guidelines to be agreed.

Finance and  
Economics  
Committee-  
Future  
Budgetary  
Arrangements.  
465/2(5)  
1240/22(31)

A10. The Committee, with reference to its Act No. A7 of 11th July 2003, received a letter, dated 5th August 2003, from the President of the Finance and Economics Committee confirming the transfer of budgets relating to the States Assembly.

The Committee, having noted the responses given to the questions raised in the President's letter of 18th July 2003, agreed to formally accept the budget transfers and to advise the Finance and Economics Committee accordingly.

A.G.O.S.  
Ex.Off.  
T.O.S.  
C.I.Aud.  
F.E.C.C.

Law Draftsman's  
Office - transfer  
to Chief  
Minister's  
Department.  
422/23(103)

A11. The Committee, with Ms P. Staley, Law Draftsman in attendance, considered the question of the support non-Executive members of the States might expect when the Law Draftsman's Office was transferred to the Chief Minister's Department under the agreed Machinery of Government reforms.

The Committee recalled that P.70/2003 on the proposed Departmental Structure and Transitional Arrangements had not been explicit on this matter. Currently, private members were able to seek assistance from the Law Draftsman in drawing up amendments to proposed legislation. It was the Committee's view that this arrangement should persist under the new system.

Ex.Off.  
C.E., P&R  
P.R.E.O.  
P.R.C.C.

The Committee agreed to request the Policy and Resources Committee to consider this to give reassurance to future non-Executive members that they would still be able to approach the Law Draftsman for assistance.

The Greffier of the States was directed to send a copy of this Act to the Policy and Resources Committee.

Liberation 2005  
Sub-Committee

A12. The Committee noted Act No.A5, dated 31st July 2003, of the Policy and Resources Committee regarding the establishment of the Liberation 2005 Sub-Committee.

The Committee formally agreed to appoint Senator C.G.P. Lakeman as its representative on the Liberation 2005 Sub-Committee.

Matters for  
information.

A13. The Committee noted the following matters for information -

- (a) paper, dated 11th September 2003, from the Committee Clerk in connexion with the Standards Board for England;
- (b) letter, dated 2nd September 2003, from Mr. R.R. Jeune, CBE, thanking the Committee for the gift to mark his retirement as Chairman of the Administrative Appeals Panel;
- (c) e-mail, dated 12th September 2003, from Deputy F.G. Voisin regarding the re-organisation of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department;
- (d) that the proposed newsletter to States members on the refurbishment of the States Building and the new facilities for members had been overtaken by events. An updated newsletter would be published in due course after consultation with the President and the Vice President;
- (e) that the Committee planned to hold an 'Away-Day' meeting to discuss its terms of reference and its strategic plan. It was envisaged that this might be combined with an opportunity to consider the way forward for the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly;
- (f) that some 800 people had taken the opportunity to tour the States Chamber led by Senator C.G.P. Lakeman on Heritage Day 13th September 2003;
- (g) that Mr. B. Querée, Political Editor of the Jersey Evening Post, had been present for Items A4 and A5 of the meeting

Date of next  
meeting

A14. The Committee confirmed the date of its next meeting to take place on 3rd October 2003, commencing at 9.30 a.m. in the Halkett Room, Morier House.