

3.10 Deputy J.M. Maçon of the Chairman of the Privileges and Procedures Committee regarding the review into the efficiency of States business:

Will the chairman undertake to review the original list of considerations for the review into the efficiency of States business to include other matters offered to her by States Members before the January hearings and will she inform the Assembly of the membership of the review group and the criteria for their appointment?

Connétable J. Gallichan of St. Mary (Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

The States Business Organisation sub-group is a sub-committee of the Privileges and Procedures Committee and therefore consists of members of the committee. Membership of the group was discussed at the committee's meeting of 20th November and the following members volunteered: the Constable of St. Mary, the Deputy of St. Peter and Deputy Fox. Other members of the Privileges and Procedures Committee also expressed an interest in taking part in discussions when available. At the conclusion of the review, the sub-group will report its findings and any recommendations to the full committee. The nature of the review being undertaken by the group encourages suggestions from other members. As stated in the letter to all States Members dated 25th November, a number of possible areas for review have been identified so far. However, this is not an exhaustive list and the group welcomes the ideas and opinions put forward by all other Members. Members are therefore invited to attend the hearings with the sub-group between 11th and 15th January 2010 to express those views.

3.10.1 Deputy J.M. Maçon:

I thank the chairman for her response. However, I believe the issue is that when presented with the list, it is much easier to talk about the subjects on that list than perhaps introduce new ones. This is why that certain Members felt that perhaps it would be important to introduce new points to this list before the January hearings and I was wondering if the chairman would offer to take any further points before the January hearings?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

As I have indicated, all suggestions for areas for review are welcome. The list is not the terms of reference for the review, just simply an outline to enthuse Members when the letter went out and hopefully engage them to respond and take part in the review.

3.10.2 Deputy D.J. De Sousa of St. Helier:

Could the chairman inform Members what the terms of reference are for this review and if she considered putting out a call to all Scrutiny Panels to see if Members would like to be involved in this review?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

The matter of organisation of efficiency falls squarely in the remit of the terms of reference of the Privileges and Procedures Committee - Standing Order 128 - to keep under review the composition, the practices and the procedures of the States as Jersey's legislature. Therefore, it is firmly in the domain of the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

3.10.3 Deputy M.R. Higgins:

In fact, I am surprised at the list of names that were put forward because I thought I put my name forward for that as a member of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee). I certainly did volunteer for it and I would expect to be on that body. Would the chairman confirm that I will be a member of that sub-panel?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Deputy, that seems to me to be a matter internal to P.P.C. Deputy Southern?

3.10.4 Deputy G.P. Southern:

I do not believe the chairman answered the previous question about what the terms of reference are. Will she do so and will she further state how she intends to report back to the House and will she be reporting back in the form of a report which is a higher quality than her review of Ministerial government which contained every suggestion that was put to P.P.C. without any evaluation whatsoever. Will she bring some evaluated judgment and recommendations back to this House?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Firstly, the previous review that the Deputy refers to was undertaken by the previous Privileges and Procedures Committee, of which I was not the chairman. This review is, as was set out in the letter that was circulated to all Members, simply a way to look at ways of improving how the States carry out their work in order to enhance efficiency and it was pointed out in that letter that it would need to embrace all areas of States business. Therefore, we are at this time asking Members to put forward all views they have on ways in which the efficiency of the States can be investigated. The list of suggestions indicated came from initial comments that different Members from various areas of the Assembly had made. These were put down but they are not exhaustive and the remit of the sub-committee is to investigate simply how the efficiency of the States meetings can be improved.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

May I?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Some very wide terms of reference so far, Deputy, yes.

3.10.5 Deputy G.P. Southern:

Indeed, no terms of reference really suggested and no commitment on whether she will come back to the House with recommendations and evaluated ways forward rather than just a list of this person said this and this person said the opposite.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

I apologise. I did mean to include that in my answer. Certainly the Privileges and Procedures Committee has already initiated work - research - on the workings of other parliaments which will be used as a basis of evaluation of an indication of other options available. Once the sub-committee has undertaken the review, any recommendations will be put to the Privileges and Procedures Committee and then, in the normal course of events, either a report will be given to States Members or depending on the conclusions drawn - and I have no intention at this stage or at any stage of pre-empting the findings of that committee - a proposition for perhaps enhancements to procedure will be brought to this Assembly. This Assembly is paramount in that.

3.10.6 Deputy A.E. Jeune:

While the chairman has given a very good broad answer I wonder if she could just clarify whether this review group will be addressing the length of time Members speak for? Thank you.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

As indicated, this committee will be asking Members for their views on many issues, on any issues they think will be able to enhance the workings of the States Assembly. If Members choose to talk to us and bring their views on length of speeches, for example, or on any item they think has a valid chance of enhancing the States workings, then they will be considered by the review group.

3.10.7 Deputy S. Pitman:

Could the chairman inform Members what prompted P.P.C. to do such a review? Thank you.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Basically, over recent months I have been having more and more informal comments from Members - and I stress Members from all areas and all sides of the Assembly - who felt that the other legitimate work which they are as elected Members required to undertake, not least of all I would emphasise the Scrutiny function, were being concertinaed into a smaller and smaller time each week and certainly one area that was of grave concern was the inability to plan ahead for inviting expert witnesses, *et cetera*, to Scrutiny Panels when it was uncertain whether the States would be sitting on what would normally be termed to be non-States days.

3.10.8 Deputy S. Pitman:

Supplementary. It is my understanding that most of the concerns have come from the Council of Ministers and indeed this is what has prompted the P.P.C. to do this review. As I recently had a look at some minutes from the Chairmen's Committee in which Scrutiny had made several suggestions to the P.P.C. to deal with certain issues and just about all of those issues were turned down. I am afraid to say that I feel this review is going to be very one-sided.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

I am not sure what the question was.

The Bailiff:

The question I think was is the review going to be very one-sided and is the Privileges and Procedures Committee the lapdog of the Council of Ministers? **[Laughter]**

The Connétable of St. Mary:

I am very easily able to answer that particular question. No, it is not going to be one-sided, no P.P.C. is not the lapdog and if the Deputy will look at the Members that I have already said are from the P.P.C. - which as Members know straddles both the Executive and the Non-Executive - there are no Executive members on the review group.

3.10.9 The Deputy of St. Mary:

Really following on from the previous question I suppose, does the chairman agree that the media coverage of this efficiency review completely ignored the deficiencies

on the Ministers' side, for instance propositions being brought with completely inadequate information [**Approbation**], reports and comments coming in on the day of the debate and reports with misleading information? The question is, why was the media coverage the way it was and does the chairman find that in ignoring the deficiencies on the Ministers' side that coverage and also the original letter did a disservice to the review?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

No, I do not. A balanced impartial media press statement is prepared for all releases that P.P.C. does. How the media pick it up will depend on the mood of the moment. Certainly I was interviewed at length. Unfortunately, at one stage, I was cut off by time, as often happens to us, just as I was getting to what I call the really interesting bit. However, I would say that our review is not in any way ignoring the failings of the Executive. For example, in the letter which was circulated I did say that the committee was working on a standard format for reports and we have had already, in recent weeks, a number of examples of where reports have been deficient and the work which P.P.C. is undertaking, unfortunately it seems to be of cart before horse now, but it was certainly aimed to avoid such failings in reporting and was certainly aimed, I think, not specifically at the Non-Executive, so the Deputy can draw his own conclusions.

3.10.10 The Deputy of St. Mary:

The chairman said that research is under way and I am very pleased about that because of what is happening in other jurisdictions. Will that research also apply to all the issues that will come the chairman's way shortly about a balanced review covering all sides of the House? Will that research then cover all those aspects equally?

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Yes, of course. The research that P.P.C. undertakes simply looks at what happens in other jurisdictions. It does not look at it from any particular angle and if any new suggestions come to light during the course of the review they will be looked at on their own merits.