

**4.10 The Connétable of St. Helier of the Chief Minister regarding the delay in his publication of the Napier Report into the suspension of the former Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police:**

Will the Chief Minister explain the reasons for the delay in his publication of the *Napier Report* into the suspension of the former Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur (The Chief Minister):**

The reason there was a delay in the original publication of the report is due to the difficulty of some of the individuals who were involved in the original suspension process not being available to meet Mr. Napier when he was first in Jersey. This also coincided with the Icelandic volcanic ash cloud that delayed travel arrangements. As soon as this had passed arrangements were made to complete the interview process. By that time Mr. Napier had other work commitments that further delayed him in completing his final report. When I received the final report on 13th September, I had to carefully consider the conclusions and, given that there was some criticism, I decided that I had to take advice. Upon receipt of the relevant advice I decided to release the report forthwith, which was done on Friday, 8th October.

**4.10.1 The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Could the Chief Minister advise us of the cost of the report, what he plans to do with it and what he plans to do about its findings?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

The cost of the report has not been finally determined but it will be between £40,000 and £50,000. What I am doing with it is digesting carefully the findings in it and seeing what action, if any, needs to be taken as a result.

**4.10.2 Deputy T.M. Pitman:**

Given that a number of we Back-Benchers have been proven 100 per cent correct in the reality of huge flaws (whether through gross incompetence or otherwise) in how the suspension process was initiated, does the Chief Minister agree, upon reflection, that justice is not meant to operate by suspending an individual and then hoping you can come up with the evidence to warrant those actions afterwards?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

No, I am quite satisfied that the suspension was the correct thing to do, then and now, and that has been fully justified by the facts. **[Approbation]**

**4.10.3 The Deputy of St. Martin:**

Possibly I would remind those foot-stampers maybe they would read the *Napier Report* before stamping. Headlines are not reports. I would ask the Chief Minister- it is customary, indeed good practice - that when a report has been commissioned that report is then made known to States Members and the media so Members are able to ask questions. Can the Chief Minister inform Members when there will be a press conference to enable Members not only to question the Chief Minister but also the author on the findings of that report?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

I see no reason to hold a press conference for this or to involve Mr. Napier. We have already incurred enough money on this report. The matter, as far as I am concerned, should now be put to bed.

**4.10.4      The Deputy of St. Martin:**

Sir, could I just ask again of the Chief Minister, maybe he could give us a reason as to why he feels it is unnecessary to have the author present his report to enable Members to question him on it?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

The report is sufficiently detailed. It is a matter for the author if he chooses to or wants to elaborate on it. He may wish to. He has indicated no wish to elaborate on it. He believes the report speaks for itself.

**4.10.5      The Deputy of St. Mary:**

Does the Chief Minister not see that by answering in that way he has given a very good impression of a man with something to hide?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

No, I do not.

**4.10.6      Deputy R.G. Le Hérisser:**

Without provoking a facetious answer from the Chief Minister, could I ask the Chief Minister what lessons he has learned - or the human resource function in the States has learned - from the findings of the report?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

At this stage I am still digesting it to see what lessons, if any, need to be learned but it is really that you have people you believe are doing the right thing and the course of action that was followed was, in the end, shown to be entirely justified.

**4.10.7      Deputy M.R. Higgins:**

I would just like clarification from the Chief Minister. When he said that he would not hold a press conference to enable the report author to give his findings, has he asked Mr. Napier whether he would like to have a press conference or is he just speaking for him?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

Yes, I have asked Mr. Napier because I had originally intended, as in discussions with the Deputy of St. Martin, that Mr. Napier would be present at a conference. He chose not to attend.

**4.10.8      The Deputy of St. Martin:**

I find that answer quite astonishing really. It is the States who are paying the author and I think the States deserve to have the author present to be questioned. I really am disappointed with that answer. The Minister knows full well that I have been asking for some weeks why the terms of reference were altered and a very important part was taken out. Can the Minister inform Members who was responsible for removing that part of the terms of reference and why was that part taken out?

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

The terms of reference were clearly given to Mr. Napier. The report contains all the information relevant to the report, whether in the form set out in the terms of reference or in the form set out in the previous proposition. As to the cost of the report, the money paid was to produce a report not to attend a press conference.

**4.10.9      The Connétable of St. Helier:**

The Minister has said on a couple of occasions this morning that he believes that the subsequent disciplinary investigation was fully justified and correct. Could he explain how this can be, given that the initial suspension has been shown by Mr. Napier to be fundamentally ill-conceived? **[Approbation]**

**Senator T.A. Le Sueur:**

No, Mr. Napier suggests that there could have been procedural errors in the suspension process. He says there was no conspiracy or anything there. The courts have subsequently looked at this; the new Minister for Home Affairs has looked at it as well and found the suspension process is fully justified. The evidence that we see from the *Wiltshire Report* and elsewhere further amplifies, if any further proof were needed, that that suspension was totally valid and justified.

**The Deputy Bailiff:**

We now come on to question 11, which Deputy Lewis will ask of the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture.