

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SCRUTINY LIAISON COMMITTEE
BY DEPUTY M.R. HIGGINS OF ST. HELIER
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 13th JULY 2020**

Question

Will the President advise –

- (a) how often the Committee meets, whether all meetings are minuted and whether formal votes are ever taken to decide matters before the Committee; and
- (b) in relation to the Committee's recent amendment to 'A safer travel period: States Assembly approval' (P.84/2020), who took part in the meeting to approve the amendment, whether there was a vote on lodging the amendment and, if so, what the results of the vote were?

Answer

- (a) The Committee holds regular scheduled meetings on a largely monthly basis, with un-scheduled meetings held (primarily digitally) to deal with matters arising in-between. All such formal meetings are fully minuted.

In 2019 meetings were held on the following dates:

Scheduled

23rd January
28th February
28th March
8th May
20th June
18th July
26th September
6th November
12th December

Un-scheduled

7th January
15th February
6th March
8th March
4th June
14th June
17th June
5th July
10th October
19th November
12th December
20th December

In 2020 meetings have been held on the following dates:

Scheduled

23rd January
27th February
18th June

Un-scheduled

16th January
12th March
28th May
4th June
15th June
29th June
2nd July

The following dates have been agreed for scheduled meetings for the remainder of 2020 (10am to 11.45am unless otherwise stated):

- 16th July 2020 (11.15am to 1pm, subject to the States meeting)
- 24th September
- 22nd October
- 19th November
- 3rd December
- (Opening meeting 2021 21st January):

In response to the ‘Stay at Home’ instructions issued during the Covid-19 pandemic, the Committee established a daily meeting slot from 19th March for those of its Members who wished to informally catch up on Scrutiny or other matters and to help communication in respect of any necessary co-ordination of Panel and Committee work on emergency legislation and community challenges. A weekly Scrutiny Activity Bulletin was established to convey the Committee’s activity in this period along with that of all other Scrutiny Panels.

All approved minutes and the weekly Scrutiny Activity Bulletins are published on the [States Assembly website](#).

In respect of formal votes, the *Scrutiny and Public Accounts Committee Proceedings: Code of Practice* states:

12. In practice Panels/PAC make most of their decisions by consensus without the need to vote. Where a vote is necessary, each member of the Panel has one vote. The Panel Chairman does not have a deciding vote in the event of a tied vote. It is not possible to proceed with a decision on a tied vote.

All decisions of the Chairmen’s Committee/Scrutiny Liaison Committee during this Assembly have been made on a consensus basis.

- b) As above, all decisions of the Chairmen’s Committee/Scrutiny Liaison Committee during this Assembly have been made on a consensus basis. The minute from the meeting held on 29th June reads:

Scrutiny Liaison Committee

Record of Meeting

Meeting held digitally

Date: 29th June 2020

Present	Senator Kristina Moore (President) Deputy Kirsten Morel(Vice-President) Senator Sarah Ferguson Connétable Mike Jackson Deputy Mary Le Hegarat Deputy Rob Ward
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Tim Oldham (Assistant Greffier: Committees and Panels)

Agenda matter	Action
<p>1. A Safer Travel Period (P.84/2020)</p> <p>Further to the lodging of <i>A Safer Travel Period (P.84/2020)</i> on 26th June by the Council of Ministers, a briefing held with the Ministers for External Relations and Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture, and observing associated scrutiny related and more general activity and commentary on the matter, the Committee agreed to lodge an amendment to P.84/2020. The Committee was mindful of its remit as a co-ordinating and oversight body, but agreed that due to the extremely compromised timeframe and far reaching cross-cutting nature of the Proposition, lodging such an amendment in its own name would be an exceptional but expedient and appropriate approach in the circumstances.</p> <p>Upon finalising the wording of the amendment it was noted that Deputy Mary Le Hegarat, whilst continuing to approve the lodging of the amendment, did not anticipate being fully supportive of the substance of it when debated.</p>	TO