

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

TUESDAY, 3rd FEBRUARY 2026

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER.....	8
1.1 Tribute to Former Deputy David De La Haye.....	8
1.2 Welcome to Portuguese delegation	9
QUESTIONS.....	9
2. Written Questions.....	9
2.1 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding school debt in Jersey (WQ.1/2026):.....	9
2.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding growth bids approved in the Government Budget 2026-29 (WQ.2/2026):.....	10
2.3 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding revised access criteria for Government-funding In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF) (WQ.2/2026):.....	10
2.4 Deputy J. Renouf of St Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the High Value Residency (HVR) Scheme in 2025 (WQ.4/2026):	12
2.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of H.M. Attorney General regarding the Crime (Public Order) (Jersey) Law 2024 and the UK’s Public Order Act 2023 (WQ. 5/2026):	13
2.6 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the consultation ‘Interest deductions for residential Jersey property’ (WQ. 6/2026):.....	15
2.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Zero-Ten tax regime (WQ.7/2026):.....	16
2.8 Deputy M.B. of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding debt owed by Andium Homes (WQ.8./2026):	16
2.9 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding Home Carer’s Allowance (HCA) (WQ.9/2026):	18
2.10 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the School Street Scheme pilot at Trinity School (WQ.10/2026): 18	
2.11 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding medicinal cannabis prescriptions (WQ.11/2026):	19
2.12 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding hospital treatment options for skin conditions (WQ.12/2026):	21
2.13 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the New Health Care Facilities Programme and the future use of the Kensington Place/Gloucester Street site (WQ.13/2026):	21

2.14	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding employees leaving the public sector (WQ.14/2026):.....	23
2.15	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding Affordable Housing and First Time Buyer (FTB) restricted properties (WQ.15/2026):	23
2.16	Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding the findings and recommendations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General in her review of Andium Homes, ‘Housing Repairs and Maintenance Report – 5 February 2015’ and ‘Housing Repairs and Maintenance: follow-up report – 25 April 2019’ (WQ.16/2026): 25	
3.	Oral Questions	27
3.1	Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the Island’s economic outlook (OQ.20/2026):.....	27
	Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	27
3.1.1	Deputy I. Gardiner:	27
3.1.2	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	28
3.1.3	Deputy J. Renouf:	28
3.1.4	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	28
3.1.5	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	29
3.1.6	Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:	29
3.1.7	Deputy I. Gardiner:	29
3.2	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding his reasoning for omitting Psychotherapists from Schedule 1 of the Draft Health and Social Care Professionals Register (Jersey) Law 202- (P.15/2026) (OQ.22/2026):.....	30
	Deputy T.J.A. Binet of St. Saviour (The Minister for Health and Social Services):	30
3.2.1	Deputy T.A. Coles:	30
3.3	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the High Value Residency Scheme policy aspiration of 15 housing consents per year (OQ.15/2026):	30
	Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):.....	31
3.3.1	Deputy J. Renouf:	31
3.3.2	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	31
3.3.3	Deputy T.A. Coles:	32
3.3.4	Deputy J. Renouf:	32
3.4	Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding the cost of the information technology Transform Programme in the Employment, Social Security and Housing Department (OQ.15/2026):	32
	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):.....	32
3.4.1	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	33
3.4.2	Deputy A.F. Curtis:.....	33
3.4.3	Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:	33
3.5	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Slaughter of Animals (Jersey) Law 1962 (OQ.26/2026):.....	33
	Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):	33
3.5.1	Deputy A.F. Curtis:.....	34

3.6 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Housing regarding the impact of the Right-Sizing Policy (OQ.23/2026):	34
Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South (The Minister for Housing):	34
3.6.1 Deputy D.J. Warr:	34
3.6.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	35
3.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the rationale for reducing the bird-registration threshold from 30 to one under the Article 4(1)(a) of the Animal Health (Bird Diseases) (Jersey) Order 2017 (OQ.18/2026):	35
Deputy S.G. Luce (The Minister for the Environment):	35
3.7.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	35
3.7.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	35
3.7.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:	36
3.7.4 Deputy A.F. Curtis:	36
3.7.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	36
3.8 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding strengthening Jersey's preparedness for unforeseen events (OQ.21/2026):	36
Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):	37
3.8.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:	37
3.8.2 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:	37
3.8.3 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:	37
3.8.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	37
3.8.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	38
3.8.6 Deputy I. Gardiner:	38
3.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding the Animal Welfare and Control Scrutiny Review (OQ.19/2026):	38
Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade (Chair, Comité des Connétables):	38
3.9.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	39
3.9.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	39
3.9.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:	40
3.9.4 Deputy T.C. Coles of St. Helier South:	40
3.9.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:	40
3.9.6 Deputy H.L. Jeune:	40
3.10 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Islands network of Marine Protected Areas (OQ.25/2026):	41
Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):	41
3.10.1 Deputy J. Renouf:	41
3.10.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	42
3.10.3 Deputy J. Renouf:	42
3.11 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the provision of neurology services in Jersey (OQ.24/2026):	43
4. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Infrastructure	43
4.1 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:	43
Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John (The Minister for Infrastructure):	43
4.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	44

4.3	Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:	44
4.3.1	Deputy I. Gardiner:	44
4.4	Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	44
4.5	Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:	45
4.6	Deputy A.F Curtis of St. Clement:.....	45
4.7	Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	45
4.8	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	45
4.8.1	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	46
4.9	Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	46
4.9.1	Deputy H.L. Jeune:	46
4.10	Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	46
4.10.1	Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson:	47
4.11	Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:.....	47
4.12	The Connétable of Trinity:.....	47
5.	Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for International Development	47
5.1	Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	47
	Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for International Development):	48
5.1.1	Deputy H.L. Jeune:	48
5.2	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	48
5.2.1	Deputy C.D. Curtis:	49
5.3	Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:.....	49
5.3.1	The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	49
5.4	Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:.....	49
5.5	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	49
5.5.1	Deputy J. Renouf:	50
5.6	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	50
5.6.1	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	51
6.	Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister	51
6.1	Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	51
	Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):	51
6.1.1	Deputy D.J. Warr:	51
6.2	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	52
6.3	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:	52
6.3.1	Deputy J. Renouf:	52
6.4	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	53
6.4.1	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	53
	PUBLIC BUSINESS.....	53
7.	Reduction of Lodging Period.....	53
7.1	Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	54
7.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):	54
8.	Draft Marriage and Civil Partnership (Dissolution and Separation) (Jersey) Law 202- (P.85/2025) - deferral of debate to 24th February 2026	54
8.1	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):.....	54
8.1.1	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:.....	55

8.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis:	55
9. Draft Public Records (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.95/2025) - as amended (P.95/2025 Amd.).....	55
9.1 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	55
9.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North:.....	57
9.1.2 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	58
9.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	58
9.1.4 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	59
9.2 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	61
9.3 Deputy K.F. Morel:.....	61
10. Amendments to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025)	63
10.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:.....	63
10.2 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): second amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.(2)).....	64
10.2.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	64
10.2.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	65
10.2.3 Deputy M.R. Scott:.....	65
10.3 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.).....	66
10.3.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	66
10.3.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	67
10.3.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:	69
10.3.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:.....	70
10.3.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	70
10.3.6 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	71
10.3.7 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	72
10.3.8 Deputy M.R. Scott:.....	72
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED	74
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.....	74
10.4 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): third amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.(3)).....	74
10.4.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:	75
10.4.2 Deputy M.R. Ferey:.....	77
10.4.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	77
10.4.4 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:	78
10.4.5 Deputy S.M. Ahier:	78
10.5 Amendments to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025) - as amended.....	79
10.5.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:.....	79
10.5.2 Deputy S.M. Ahier:	79
11. Consultation on Fireworks and other Pyrotechnics (P.111/2025).....	81
11.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North:	82
11.1.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:	82
11.1.2 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	83

11.1.3	Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:.....	84
11.1.4	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:	84
11.1.5	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:	84
11.1.6	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	85
11.1.7	Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	85
11.1.8	Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:.....	86
11.1.9	Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	86
11.1.10	Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:.....	87
11.1.11	Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:	87
11.1.12	Deputy M.B. Andrews:.....	88
12.	Extension to Jersey of the PCT, Hague Agreement, Madrid Protocol and Nice Agreement (P.117/2025)	90
12.1	Deputy M.R. Scott (Assistant Minister for External Relations - rapporteur):.....	90
12.1.1	Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:.....	91
12.1.2	Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	91
12.1.3	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	92
12.1.4	Deputy M.R. Scott:.....	92
13.	Draft Elections (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.119/2025)	94
13.1	Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	94
13.2	Deputy S.M. Ahier:.....	95
13.3	Deputy S.M. Ahier:.....	96
14.	Draft Fire Safety (Tall Residential Buildings) (Jersey) Regulations 202- (P.120/2025)	98
14.1	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):.....	98
14.1.1	Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):	100
14.1.2	Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:.....	100
14.1.3	Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	100
14.1.4	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	101
14.2	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	103
14.3	Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:.....	103
15.	Draft Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.1/2026).....	105
15.1	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):	105
15.1.1	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	105
15.1.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	106
15.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	107
15.2.1	Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	107
15.2.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	108
15.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	110
16.	Draft Social Security (Health and Christmas Bonus) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.2/2026).....	111
16.1	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):	111
16.1.1	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	112
16.1.2	Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	112

16.1.3	Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:	113
16.1.4	Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:	113
16.1.5	Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	113
16.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	116
16.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	116
17.	Draft Employment and Discrimination (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.4/2026).	117
17.1	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):	117
17.1.1	Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	118
17.1.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:.....	118
17.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	120
17.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	120
ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....		122
18.	Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	122
ADJOURNMENT.....		122

[9:30]

The Roll was called and the Greffier of the States led the Assembly in Prayer.

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

May I raise the défaut on Deputy Porée?

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to raise the défaut on Deputy Porée? The défaut is raised.

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:

I have a medical appointment at 10.40, if that is in order, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much.

COMMUNICATIONS BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The Bailiff:

1.1 Tribute to Former Deputy David De La Haye

Members will have seen that former Deputy David De La Haye recently passed away. Mr. De La Haye was born 1936 and attended Westwood College in St. Ouen before completing his studies at De La Salle College. He was married to Anne and spent his working life as a farmer up until the mid 1980s. Then from 1985 he was a hotelier with his wife running the Idle Rocks Hotel in St. John for several years. He served in the Honorary Police, starting out as a Constable's officer and ending as a Centenier. He first entered politics when he was elected Deputy of St. Ouen in 1972. A position he held for some 15 years until he moved constituencies and was elected a Deputy of St. Helier No. 3 District in 1987. During his time in the States, Mr. De La Haye served on a wide range of committees and held several significant roles including vice-president and then president of the Resources Recovery Board, a member of the Executive Committee of the Association Internationale des Parlementaires de Langue Française, reflecting his commitment to international parliamentary co-operation, vice-president of the Housing Committee, president of the Ann Alice Rayner Fund, and member of the Committee of Inquiry into the Rue Fondon Trading Estate development. He was committed to openness and transparency, and in 1987 he persuaded the then Island Development Committee to ensure that applicants or their agents could have access to written objections received by the committee in respect of their applications. He retired from the States in 1990. Our thoughts are with his family and friends at this difficult time, and I ask Members to stand to reflect upon his life. **[Silence]** May he rest in peace.

Connétable R. Honeycombe of St. Ouen:

Can I just advise you that I have to take a close family relative to hospital this afternoon, and I will be absent for an hour or so?

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much.

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

I would like to raise the défaut on Deputy Doublet, please.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to raise the défaut? The défaut is raised.

1.2 Welcome to Portuguese delegation

I would also like to announce that there is a distinguished delegation joining us in the gallery this morning; all from Portugal: the Secretary of State for Portuguese Communities, Mr. Emidio Sousa; the, Antonio Moniz; Consul General, Ana Brito Maneira; and Consular Officer, Vitor Oliveira. They are all visiting Jersey for the next 2 days as part of a Portuguese governmental, cultural, and community engagement visit. I invite Members to welcome them in the usual way. **[Approval]**
[9:45]

QUESTIONS

2. Written Questions

2.1 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning regarding school debt in Jersey (WQ.1/2026):

Question

Further to a [December 2025 article](#) in the media which stated that “Schools across Jersey were almost £4.5 million in debt within the first 10 months of this year”, will the Minister explain –

- (a) what constitutes “being in debt” in the context of the school estate;
- (b) the main drivers behind any overspends and the actions, if any, that are being taken or considered to ensure budgets are not exceeded this year; and
- (c) whether any such actions include cuts in service provision and, if so, will the Minister provide details of any services considered for reduction or removal?

Answer

- (a) The article quoted refers to a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request where the requestor asked for school deficits and surpluses as at 31/10/2025. The response to the FOI listed the surpluses and deficits as requested. It is unclear as to why the word “debt” was chosen for the article as “debt” is defined as a sum of money that is owed or due. No schools are in debt but some ended 2025 with a budget deficit, while others were in surplus.
- (b) Staff budgets are overspent predominantly in Special schools and on inclusion support in mainstream schools. More frontline staff have been appointed than were originally budgeted to address safety issues for both children and staff to meet individual needs. There is a rise in secondary school pupil numbers combined with a sharp increase in the numbers and complexity of special educational needs across primary and secondary schools.
- (c) The overspend on non-staff budgets in schools is due largely to increases in the costs of essential supplies and services. There has also been some one-off expenditure on buildings to create serveries for school meals in primary schools.
- (d) Headteachers are delegated the responsibility for the management of school budgets within the allocated fiscal envelope. Where schools are experiencing pressures on budgets a school finance board has been established to support the Headteacher to enable the school to return to a balanced budget. It is recognised there are pressures in relation to the provision of inclusion support in schools and this requires careful consideration over time.

2.2 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding growth bids approved in the Government Budget 2026-29 (WQ.2/2026):

Question

Will the Minister confirm the total number of growth bids approved in the Government Budget 2026-30 (as amended); and will she advise whether it is her assessment that this total is justifiable, in light of the Government's stated intention to curb public sector growth?

Answer

The 22 growth bids included in the proposed Budget 2026-29 were set out clearly in Appendix 3 (Pages 110-111) with a total value of £52.7 million in new growth for 2026. These include, among other items, additional funding for nursery fees for 2–3-year-olds (£3 million), the Children's Services improvement programme (£7.6 million) and digital health (£8 million).

During the Budget debate, the Assembly also approved amendments providing additional amounts for the States of Jersey Police and the Environment Department, and these will be treated as additional growth lines. These additional amounts were both offset by additional savings across departments, through Amendment 36, and therefore do not constitute an increase in net growth.

The growth included in the Budget was assessed by the Council of Ministers as necessary to achieve the relative balance struck between the need for immediate investment and the need to balance public finances and I believe the growth to be justified. These considerations were also discussed both in the Budget debate and during several of the debates on the associated amendments. Ultimately the Assembly approved the Budget.

However, it is clear that the recent levels of growth in revenue are not sustainable, and that is why Government has taken steps to curb the growth and reprioritise spending. These measures include an extended recruitment freeze in non-frontline areas and reductions in the use of consultants and temporary staff. The Budget reflects the Council of Ministers' assessment that recent levels of revenue growth are not sustainable and that public expenditure must be reprioritised accordingly.

2.3 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding revised access criteria for Government-funding In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF) (WQ.2/2026):

Question

Further to the introduction on 1st October 2025 of revised access criteria for Government funded In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF), will the Minister provide an update on the number of –

- (a) Islanders who have been provided IVF treatment under the new criteria, including the number of IVF cycles administered to each person and details of the clinics used;
- (b) positive pregnancy tests resulting from those IVF treatment cycles;
- (c) Islanders seen by the Assisted Reproduction Unit for IVF treatment since 1st October 2025 who did not qualify for funded treatment, with a breakdown of the reasons for their non-qualification;

and will the Minister also provide the total expenditure on Government funded IVF cycles for 2025, broken down by month, together with any underspend or overspend for the year and, where relevant, plans for any underspent funds?

Answer

Due to the small number of patients involved and the requirement to protect against potential identification of patients and associated treatment outcomes, the Minister is unable to answer (a) or (b) other than confirm that the answer to (a) is less than 5 couples.

With regard to (c) 12 patients were seen by the Assisted Reproduction Unit (1 October to 31 December 2025) who did not qualify for funded treatment. Reasons for non-eligibility under current IVF criteria include:

- 9 patients already had a child with their current partner (as opposed to a child from a previous relationship)
- less than 5 patients had previously self-funded at least 3 IVF cycles OR did not meet the health criteria (as above a more detailed breakdown is not provided in protect personal data).

Total expenditure broken down by month:

January 2025	£56,689
February 2025	£26,995
March 2025	£41,621
April 2025	£14,305
May 2025	£14,262
June 2025	£4,894
July 2025	£24,578
August 2025	£20,078
September 2025	£28,610
**October 2025	£75,701
November 2025	£23,114
December 2025	£21,933
2025 Total Spend	£352,773
2025 Budget	£620,000
2025 underspend	£276,227

**Lister Clinic does not bill monthly. The Lister October bill included IVF provided in previous months.

*** Due to clinics in the UK being closed over the Christmas period, no patients are referred through the ARU from mid-December (ie. December is 2 weeks data only)

In accordance with standard Treasury processes, underspends are not carried over into the following year (subject to occasional exceptions for major projects). The IVF 2025 underspend was

reabsorbed by the Treasury to compensate for Health and Care Jersey overspend in other areas. This is standard process.

In 2026 HCJ has received the full £620,000 IVF funding allocation. Work is underway to review the criteria with a view to implementing further amendments before end Q1 2026.

2.4 Deputy J. Renouf of St Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the High Value Residency (HVR) Scheme in 2025 (WQ.4/2026):

Question

“Further to the number of approvals under the High Value Residency (HVR) Scheme in 2025, which exceeded the previously-stated aspiration of 15 approvals per year, will the Chief Minister –

- (a) explain what policy framework, if any, currently exists regarding HVR approvals;
- (b) state the number of approvals, if any, the Minister is targeting;
- (c) provide clarification on the methodology used to track approvals, including the Government's preferred measures and a table detailing the total number of approvals according to this methodology; and
- (d) advise whether the previously-stated aspiration has been superseded and, if it has, explain when this was changed and for what reasons?”

Answer

- (a) The policy framework is provided for in paragraphs 117 – 217 of the [P Residential and Employment Status Guidance 20161205 RB.pdf](#). See extract in Appendix below.

In relation to paragraph 121(g), the current minimum expectation of charitable giving is £100,000 per annum. This is in addition to the minimum tax liability of £250,000 per annum and any wider economic or other benefits.

- (b) When the scheme was established in 1974, the aim was it would result in 15 housing consents per year for people arriving and settling in Jersey. This objective was reaffirmed in 2005 and remains in place. However, a number of individuals also leave the scheme each year.

The overall benefit and impact is more clearly illustrated in the net number of new arrivals. Over the past 10 years this has averaged at an additional 8 people per year.

- (c) Application approvals, actual arrivals in Jersey, and departures from the scheme are all tracked between the Department of Economy and Revenue Jersey and reported periodically to the Housing and Work Advisory Group. They can be viewed monthly at [High Value Residency](#).

Table: 10-year statistics - applications, arrivals, departures from the scheme, and change in number 2(1)(e) residents:

	Approved applications	Arrivals	Departures from the scheme	Change in no. of 2(1)(e) residents (arrivals less departures)
2016	17	13	6	7
2017	34	20	3	17
2018	14	29	10	19
2019	21	12	6	6
2020	20	15	14	1
2021	23	28	16	12
2022	9	11	14	-3
2023	29	16	13	3
2024	18	11	10	1
2025	37	29	11	18
10 Year Total	225	184	104	81

Note: 233 2(1)(e) residents currently live in Jersey.

(d) See part b above.

2.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of H.M. Attorney General regarding the Crime (Public Order) (Jersey) Law 2024 and the UK’s Public Order Act 2023 (WQ. 5/2026):

Question

“Will H.M. Attorney General undertake to consider the UK’s [Public Order Act 2023](#) in order to advise Members –

(a) to what extent the [Crime \(Public Order\) \(Jersey\) Law 2024](#) is similar to the Act;

- (b) in particular, how the substantive offences and police powers outlined in the Law 2024 compare to those set out in the Act;
- (a) whether the Law could be applied in a similar way to the Act in the UK, particularly in light of the case, [National Council for Civil Liberties v Secretary of State for the Home Department](#); and
- (b) with reference to the response to paragraph (c), what impact, if any, there would be on the application of the Law were the Assembly to legislate in order to define thresholds for police intervention?”

Answer

- (a) to what extent the [Crime \(Public Order\) \(Jersey\) Law 2024](#) is similar to the Act?

The [Crime \(Public Order\) \(Jersey\) Law 2024](#) (the “**2024 Jersey Law**”) is not in any way similar to [the Public Order Act 2023](#) (the “**UK Act**”). The UK Act contains bespoke protest offences whereas the 2024 Jersey Law deals with traditional public order offences of riot and affray as well as threats of violence, including killing someone, threatening, abusive or disorderly conduct, and harassment, (it is similar in fact to Part 1 of [the Public Order Act 1986](#) which is still in force). It does not create protest-specific offences. By contrast the UK Act specifically addresses public protests which cause serious disruption, (which does not have to include any violence or threat of violence), including disruption to infrastructure.

- (b) in particular, how the substantive offences and police powers outlined in the Law 2024 compare to those set out in the Act?

Substantive offences

There is no comparison between the offences in the UK Act and those in the 2024 Law. The UK Act provides for protest-specific offences which focus on tactics used in disruptive protests. It includes the offences of:

- i. Locking-on (physically attaching to objects, people/land when aiming to cause serious disruption);
- ii. Causing serious disruption by tunnelling;
- iii. Obstructing major transport works; and
- iv. Interfering with key national infrastructure.

The 2024 Jersey Law by contrast is a codification of customary law public order offences, or a re-enactment of already existing statutory offences, namely:

- i. Riot;
- ii. Affray;
- iii. Threats to kill, rape or cause serious physical injury;
- iv. Threatening, abusive or disorderly conduct;
- v. Harassment
- vi. Prohibition on having an offensive weapon in a public place or on school premises without lawful authority or reasonable excuse

Police powers

The UK Act provides enhanced police enforcement powers, with additional powers for stop and search in protest settings.

The 2024 Jersey Law does not contain any police powers, only offence provisions and court order making powers in the event of conviction. The general powers for the States of Jersey Police, (search, stop and search, entering premises etc.) are found in the [Police Procedures and Criminal Evidence \(Jersey\) Law 2003](#) (“PPCE 2003”), and at customary law and are of general application to all types of crime.

- (c) whether the Law could be applied in a similar way to the Act in the UK, particularly in light of the case, [National Council for Civil Liberties v Secretary of State for the Home Department](#)?

The UK Act specifically covers bespoke protest offences and the case of the National Council for Civil Liberties v Secretary of State for the Home Department (the “**Liberty case**”) concerned a challenge to the lawfulness of Regulations which lowered the threshold for when the police could impose conditions on protests. The issue in the case was whether the Regulations, which purported to make these changes to primary legislation, were lawful. The Court found they were not.

The 2024 Jersey Law does not contain equivalent protest offences to those contained in the UK Act. Furthermore, the 2024 Jersey Law contains no power for the States to amend the Law by Regulations, or a power for the Minister to do so by Order. Consequently, there is no scope for the 2024 Jersey Law to be applied in a similar way to the UK Act, and the Liberty case is of no relevance to the 2024 Jersey Law.

- (d) with reference to the response to paragraph (c), what impact, if any, there would be on the application of the Law were the Assembly to legislate in order to define thresholds for police intervention?”

As noted above, the 2024 Jersey Law does not contain any police powers, only offence provisions and court order making powers in the event of conviction. Police intervention powers, such as stop and search, are given to the States of Jersey Police under Part 2 of PPCE 2003 and the principles governing stop and search are provided for in [The Police Procedures and Criminal Evidence \(Codes of Practice\) \(Jersey\) Order 2004](#).

2.6 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the consultation ‘Interest deductions for residential Jersey property’ (WQ. 6/2026):

Question

Will the Minister detail what work is ongoing with regards the consultation ‘[Interest deductions for residential Jersey property](#)’, the [results](#) of the which were published in September 2025, and advise when such work is likely to conclude and whether a report of the further work will be published?

Answer

As stated during the debate on the Deputy's amendment to amendment 14 to the 2026-2029 Budget, officers are currently preparing a full report, including an economic impact assessment, as required by the agreed proposition. This will be discussed by the Council of Ministers during Quarter One 2026, at which point a decision will be made and the outcome will be notified to members thereafter.

2.7 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding the Zero-Ten tax regime (WQ.7/2026):

Question

Will the Minister advise whether –

- (a) any consideration has been given to adopting a standard rate of corporate tax rather than maintaining the Zero-Ten tax regime;
- (b) she has any concerns about the reliance of the Zero-ten tax regime on personal income tax; and
- (c) further to the response to [Oral Question 205/2024](#), she has undertaken any discussions with counterparts in the other Crown Dependencies in relation to potential reforms to the Zero-Ten tax regime and, if not, why not?

Answer

- (a) Jersey's standard corporate tax regime is zero/ten and no consideration is being given to changing the rates – other than in relation to Pillar 2 taxes for in-scope multinational groups of entities. All the Government's work to date on the Financial and Related Professional Services (FRPS) Competitiveness Programme confirms that Jersey's tax neutrality and its favourable and simple tax regime is a key driver of the jurisdiction's prominence as a globally leading International Finance Centre. We must continue to uphold this core strength.
- (b) Jersey has a broad-based tax regime including GST and (even excluding Pillar 2 revenues) we are forecast to raise £185m from corporate income tax in 2026. Furthermore, financial services companies are estimated to pay over half of overall tax revenues (including personal income tax from employees in finance). In order to maintain and grow our tax base (including personal income taxes) for the benefit of all Islanders, it is essential that we preserve our Zero/Ten regime and our international tax competitiveness.
- (c) Jersey has an ongoing dialogue with other Crown Dependencies, including on tax matters. The Minister has previously confirmed to the Assembly that no discussions or communications with her counterparts in the Isle of Man or Guernsey about changing Jersey's Zero/Ten regime have taken place, for the reasons set out in (a) and (b) above.

2.8 Deputy M.B. of St. Helier North of the Minister for Treasury and Resources regarding debt owed by Andium Homes (WQ.8./2026):

Question

Further to the response to [Written Question 174/2025](#), regarding debt owed by Andium Homes, will the Minister –

- (a) advise the outstanding debt owed by Andium Homes as at the end of 2025;
- (b) provide details of any proposed borrowing for future years; and
- (c) advise whether she remains satisfied that the necessary assessments are being regularly undertaken by the Andium Board to monitor financial viability?

Answer

a) The outstanding debt, all of which is unsecured, as at the end of 2025 was as follows: -

- £227.4m from the States of Jersey Housing Development Fund
- £100m from the Private Placement arranged in November 2024
- £159.5m from the Revolving Credit Facility (RCF) arranged in 2020 and amended and extended in December 2025. Andium has the capacity on the RCF to drawdown to a maximum of £300m with an optional agreement in place to extend that by a further £75m.

As at the end of 2025, Andium Homes had property assets valued at £1,457m. The total of £486.9m of drawn debt as at the end of 2025 represents gearing of 33%.

b) Andium maintains a 40-year business model to ensure that their strategic business plan can be delivered in a financially sustainable way, including funding the supply of new social rented and affordable homeownership opportunities through borrowing. Importantly, the level of borrowing is reduced through the income received from the sale of some of their existing homes through the Andium Homebuy scheme. The scheme offers Islanders an opportunity to purchase their own home where they would likely otherwise be unable to do so.

Andium’s projected borrowing profile is determined by their anticipated development programme. This programme continuously evolves to meet the housing needs of the Island and policy objectives of the Minister for Housing.

Below is an indicative projection of borrowing, based on the programme of investment in Andium’s latest Strategic Business Plan:

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Total borrowing at year end	£487m	£565m	£573m	£546m	£521m	£536m
Annual movement per year		£78m	£8m	(£26m)	(£25m)	£15m

c) As outlined in my previous response, Andium regularly assesses its financial position to ensure it remains financially stable, by projecting its cash flows over a 40-year period. These projections are then stress tested for the impact of, for example, changes in the rental and sales market, inflation and interest rates. It is the responsibility of the Andium Board to

monitor financial viability and debt levels in accordance with their own risk appetite, and I remain satisfied that the necessary assessments are being regularly undertaken.

2.9 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding Home Carer's Allowance (HCA) (WQ.9/2026):

Question

In relation to Home Carer's Allowance (HCA), and further to the answer to [Written Question 260/2022](#), will the Minister advise what consideration, if any, is being given to allowing old age pensioners to receive the HCA in addition to their States of Jersey pension, and will she further advise whether a person in receipt of HCA is eligible for respite care and, if so, explain to what extent?

Answer

I have given consideration to allowing old age pensioners to receive the Home Carers Allowance (HCA) in addition to their States of Jersey Pension and I have just published a significant review into carers and the support available - [Update on carers review](#).

HCA is a contributory benefit that primarily supports working age carers with a standard weekly benefit payment. It is not designed to provide additional financial support for carer respite breaks. However, rules allow a carer to carry on receiving HCA for up to 6 weeks a year while they are on a respite break. This applies to all HCA claimants.

Financial support for respite breaks is available via the Long-Term care scheme and in a situation where someone is receiving care at home from an informal/unpaid carer, it would form part of the package of care that someone receives when they are assessed and join the scheme.

2.10 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for Infrastructure regarding the School Street Scheme pilot at Trinity School (WQ.10/2026):

Question

Further to [Written Question 375/2025](#) regarding the [School Street Scheme](#) pilot at Trinity School will the Minister advise –

- (a) when the design brief for a permanent layout is expected to be ready for Ministerial or States' approval;
- (b) whether the finalised design brief will be published for parishioners and the public to view, and if so, when, and if not, why not;
- (c) how the project and associated works have been incorporated into the Department's forward work programme;
- (d) whether funding has been allocated for the permanent scheme, and if so, in which budget year the allocation has been proposed;
- (e) whether the Minister intends to engage with local schools, parents, and parishioners on the final scheme and proposed timelines, and if so, when will that engagement take place, and what form will it take, and if not, why not; and

while the permanent design is developed and funding arranged, will the current temporary layout remain in place or be modified, and what might trigger any changes before final design and funding are in place?

Answer

- (a) The traffic calming and pedestrian improvements carried out on La Grande Route de la Trinite outside Trinity School are located on the diversion route for the Northern sewer network upgrades. The sewer upgrade works will carry on throughout 2026. Any significant work to make the Trinity School scheme permanent cannot be carried out while the diversion route is in place, therefore, no physical works can be carried out in 2026. The next available safe working window for carrying out the anticipated works, that have to be done during school holidays, is likely to be school summer holidays 2027. As work can't start until then, 2026 budgets and resources have been allocated to other priorities. The Minister is the competent authority for determining works on Government owned main roads.
- (b) The design brief for the permanent layout will be available for the public and parishioners to view and is currently expected to be produced early 2027. The brief will be developed from the feedback received during the initial trial summarised in the consultation report published in 2025 and published on the GoJ roadworks webpage.
<https://www.gov.je/Environment/ClimateEmergency/TacklingTransport/CyclingWalking/Pages/SaferSchoolZones.aspx>
- (c) The physical on site works are provisionally programmed for school summer holidays 2027 for the reasons stated above, and detailed design works provisionally programmed to start in early 2027 so that detailed designs are ready for the summer holiday period.
- (d) Funding is proposed for this project in 2027, and it is anticipated that this will be provided from the Car Park Trading Fund return allocation for road safety and sustainable transport, although this will need to be confirmed prior to the work commencing.
- (e) During the first year of the current traffic calming and pedestrian improvements, feedback was received from members of the public as well as specific stakeholders such as the school and the Parish. The permanent scheme will be developed taking account of this feedback received. Once a design has been prepared and approved, graphics of the proposed permanent scheme will be made available to the community.

There are currently no plans to carry out significant changes to the current design though Infrastructure and Environment will continue to monitor and respond if any urgent issues come to light.

2.11 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding medicinal cannabis prescriptions (WQ.11/2026):

Question

Will the Minister state the total number of medicinal cannabis prescriptions issued in each of the last 5 years, and the number of hospital admissions for mental health conditions over the same period, and will he further advise what work, if any, is planned to investigate a potential correlation between prescriptions and admissions?

Answer

The department holds validated data on the number of medicinal cannabis prescription items *dispensed* on-Island, rather than the total number of prescriptions issued.

Validated dispensing data is available for:

- 2022 (full year)
- 2023 (partial year, January – June)
- 2024 (full year)
- 2025 (partial year, January – June)

This data records the number of individual prescription items supplied in Jersey.

A complete figure for the total number of medicinal cannabis prescriptions issued in each of the last five years cannot be provided. Prescriptions for Jersey residents may be issued and dispensed off-Island, including by off-Island prescribers, and are not fully captured within Jersey’s medicines data systems. In addition, not all prescriptions that are issued are subsequently dispensed.

Identifying, collating and validating all prescribing data would require manual data collection across multiple external providers, access to non-Jersey clinical systems, and detailed validation to ensure accuracy and avoid duplication. This would be resource-intensive and is not currently achievable within existing capacity and resource constraints.

Any attempt to estimate total prescriptions issued without this level of validation would therefore be incomplete and potentially misleading. For this reason, the department reports dispensed prescription item data which reflects actual medicine supply.

Year	Total number of medicinal cannabis prescription items dispensed on-Island
2021	Unavailable
2022	23,639
2023*	16,714 (Jan – June)
2024	53,477
2025**	33,296 (Jan – June)

* There is a gap in centrally reported data for July to December 2023. This reflects the scope and timing of the audit carried out on data for 2022 and the first half of 2023. At that point, the Chief Pharmacist controlled drug returns were not digitised, and the audit relied on detailed manual review of monthly submissions. This involved collating returns from multiple pharmacies, reconciling prescriber details and estimating patient numbers without a unique identifier, followed by additional work to assure data quality before publication.

** There is a short lag before full-year 2025 data can be confirmed. This reflects the operation of the current digital returns process, which requires the Chief Pharmacist submissions to be completed, validated and reconciled before annual figures can be finalised. Final 2025 prescribing data are expected to be available in the coming weeks.

Year	Total number of hospital admissions for mental health conditions
2021	276
2022	239
2023	218
2024	214
2025	233

Work is underway within adult mental health services to actively monitor all admissions to the service where the use of cannabis – both prescribed and unprescribed – may be a contributory factor to the admission. In 2025, this was identified in 22% of admissions to the acute adult mental health admission ward. This is also an issue that is discussed and considered at the Mental Health Strategic Partnership Board.

2.12 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding hospital treatment options for skin conditions (WQ.12/2026):

Question

Further to the response to [Written Question 74/2025](#), regarding hospital treatment options for skin conditions, will the Minister provide an update on Jersey’s phototherapy service, including when new equipment will arrive and when the service will be started again?

Answer

In my response to [WQ.74/2025](#), I confirmed that two capital replacement bids had been submitted for a new phototherapy machine. Neither was successful, as other, more critical equipment had to be prioritised. I subsequently asked officers to explore the use of charitable funds to support the purchase, and in September 2025 I approved a [grant](#) from the E. J. Bailhache Fund to enable the purchase of the machine.

The machine is scheduled to arrive at the end of March 2026, and a workforce plan is being developed to ensure the service can begin as soon as possible once the machine is installed.

2.13 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the New Health Care Facilities Programme and the future use of the Kensington Place/Gloucester Street site (WQ.13/2026):

Question

In relation to the [New Health Care Facilities Programme](#) and the future use of the Kensington Place/Gloucester Street site, will the Minister –

- (a) provide details of what health services will be provided within the ‘ambulatory facility’ on the site;

- (b) advise what other, if any, non-health related services are being considered for the site;
- (c) explain why no ‘meanwhile uses’ have been developed; and
- (d) advise whether any disposals of parts of the site are under consideration?

Answer

Please see the below in answer to the above questions:

(a) provide details of what health services will be provided within the ‘ambulatory facility’ on the site

The specific health services to be delivered from the Kensington Place Ambulatory Facility are yet to be fully confirmed. A draft Functional Brief describing the services at the Ambulatory Facility was developed when the NHFP configuration of healthcare facilities was confirmed in 2022: Acute, Ambulatory, Health Village and Enid Quenault Health and Wellbeing Centre. However, given the time elapsed since then, and recognising the continual evolution of healthcare, especially digital healthcare, it has been essential to review and agree any changes in clinical requirements or service configuration needed to best support the health needs of the people of Jersey. This review process will update the Functional Brief (FB) and will also determine any adjustments required for an updated Development Control Plan (DCP), both of which will define the scope of services to be provided within the Ambulatory Facility.

This work is well underway, and over the last six months, over 100 meetings have taken place between the New Healthcare Facilities Programme team and more than 380 Health and Care Jersey colleagues, as well as wider stakeholders. This is to ensure that that all services have been reviewed and that the demand and capacity modelling is appropriately updated.

(b) advise what other, if any, non-health related services are being considered for the site;

As with the clinical services, consideration of any potential non-health related uses remains under development as part of the ongoing DCP and Functional Brief work. As part of the review outlined in the answer to (a), we have undertaken workshops with key strategic leaders within HCJ and the wider healthcare system, to understand any changes which have taken place since 2022 that might impact the planned requirements. No final decisions have been taken at this stage.

(c) explain why no ‘meanwhile uses’ have been developed;

Meanwhile uses have been developed for Kensington Place that have assisted with the operation of the existing Jersey General Hospital:

- storage of clinical supplies;
- storage of materials and equipment for refurbishment projects;
- service and operational vehicle parking

There remain other projects that will be developed as “meanwhile uses” to ensure that best use is made of the site before its permanent redevelopment. The specific meanwhile uses are still being determined as an outcome of the DCP and FB review work already underway. These are important to avoid abortive costs and also so that the permanent uses are not jeopardised by temporary uses. The New Healthcare Facilities Programme team has also been focused primarily on the Common Strategic Priority of starting construction of the Acute Hospital at Overdale.

(d) advise whether any disposals of parts of the site are under consideration?

This remains yet to be determined, and no formal decisions have been made at this stage.

2.14 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Chair of the States Employment Board regarding employees leaving the public sector (WQ.14/2026):

Question

Further to the [June 2025 Labour Market Report](#), will the Chair detail how many employees left the public sector compared to how many joined annually from 2020 to date; and will he further provide the total annual pay roll cost for the public sector from 2020 to 2025?

Answer

The size of the public service headcount increased by a third between 2018 and 2024. That rate of growth is unsustainable. That is why this Council of Ministers has taken actions to curb the growth of the public service.

In August 2024, we took the decision to introduce an external recruitment freeze. If we had not taken that action, and the growth trajectory of early 2024 had been allowed to continue, then there would have been an estimated 515 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) additional employees by 31 December 2025. That is approximately £31m in staffing costs per year that has been avoided.

The table below shows the total headcount of permanent and fixed-term employees who commenced Government of Jersey employment for each of the years 2020-2025, as well as the number of employees who left Government employment in each period. It is notable that in 2025 almost all the increases were within the frontline departments of health and education. In that year, the number of net additional staff were: +157 in Health and Care Jersey and +50 in CYPES.

Year	New Starters	Leavers	Net effect
2020	737	471	+266
2021	867	590	+277
2022	962	615	+347
2023	1,172	579	+593
2024	1,015	540	+475
2025	879	655	+224

Total annual payroll costs are set out in the Annual Report and Accounts each year.

2020: Page 210 – 211	R Government of Jersey Annual Report and Accounts 2020.pdf
2021: Page 276 – 278	R States of Jersey 2021 Annual Report and Accounts.pdf
2022: Page 188 – 190	States of Jersey Group 2022 Annual Report and Accounts
2023: Page 169 – 172	States of Jersey Group 2023 Annual Report and Accounts.pdf
2024: Page 138 – 139	States of Jersey Group 2024 Annual Report and Accounts.pdf

Payroll costs for 2025 are currently undergoing an annual audit and the figures will be published in the 2025 Annual Report and Accounts, which is due to be published in April 2026.

2.15 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding Affordable Housing and First Time Buyer (FTB) restricted properties (WQ.15/2026):

Question

In relation to Affordable Housing and First Time Buyer (FTB) restricted properties, will the Minister –

- (a) advise whether his department holds a comprehensive list of developed sites which have such restrictions, and if not, explain what efforts are being undertaken to capture this data;
- (b) provide the information that is held, including, but not restricted to:
 - (i) the total number of properties with restrictions on sale or occupation developed under prior Island Plans;
 - (ii) a breakdown of the sites in which these restrictions exist, including under which Plan they were rezoned; and
- (c) detail what policy work is currently being undertaken to assess –
 - (i) whether the stock of housing with restrictions for First Time Buyers is sufficient, too low or too high;
 - (ii) whether the conditions of occupation should be reviewed and extended; and
 - (iii) to what extent the delivery of new home purchase products such as Home Buy, First Step, and ‘shared equity’ ownership sites impact on the need for properties with Affordable Housing and FTB restrictions?

Answer

- (a) There is currently no comprehensive list of sites with Affordable Housing or First-Time Buyer (FTB) restrictions. Work is underway to bring this information together and make it publicly accessible.

These restrictions have been applied over many decades through various Planning decisions and legal agreements, meaning that records are held across multiple systems and the conditions vary between sites. This is also a cross-cutting policy area involving the Minister for the Environment’s Planning functions and, therefore, requires close consultation with the Department.

Bringing this information into a single list will improve transparency, make the transaction process smoother for the parties involved in buying and selling restricted properties, and provide a stronger evidence-base for policy decisions.

- (b) As noted above, the (i) total number of properties with such restrictions and (ii) a breakdown of the sites where they apply is not currently held in a consolidated form. Work is underway to verify and bring this information together. Once this exercise is complete, I can confirm that a comprehensive list, including accurate totals and site-specific details, will be published.
- (c) The First-Time Buyer policy is monitored on an ongoing basis as part of my ongoing policy responsibilities. In relation to the work being undertaken on points (i) to (iii):
 - (i) A range of evidence is used to assess whether the stock of FTB restricted housing is sufficient. The *Housing Needs Survey 2023-2025* provides the most up to date picture of Islanders’ housing needs, aspiration and financial ability to buy a home. It shows strong but constrained demand for home ownership, with around 4,030 existing or concealed households aiming to move within, or enter into, owner occupation over the period, 74% via a mortgage, a typical FTB route. However, once affordability criteria are applied, estimated

owner occupier demand falls from about 4,280 to 3,140 households, reflecting reduced affordability.

This suggests there is large number of potential households for whom FTB-restricted properties or other affordable purchase products may be appropriate. Demand on the Assisted Purchase Pathway reinforces this, with over 3,000 households registered on the waiting list. However, many applicants fall below the income and savings levels required to purchase a home sustainably. This highlights the importance of a broad mix of affordable purchase products that match the financial circumstances of these households.

- (ii) I keep the conditions of occupation for First-Time Buyer properties under regular review in line with my policy responsibilities for determining FTB eligibility, whilst ensuring continued alignment with the Planning restrictions set by the Minister for the Environment.

The expansion of FTB supply, including forthcoming Andium Homes developments and the delivery of *Bridging Island Plan* sites, provides an opportunity to consider whether policy arrangements for FTB-restricted properties and affordable purchase products remain appropriate, or whether I may need to make adjustments in response to housing market conditions, affordability considerations, changes in supply and demand, and wider government priorities.

This supports both the *Investing in Jersey* programme, particularly our ambition to support young families moving from flats into houses, and my own commitment to promote right-sizing in accordance with the *Right Sizing Policy*.

- (iii) Affordable purchase products are routinely assessed to understand how they support the ongoing need for both Affordable Housing and First-Time Buyer-restricted properties, and to ensure they remain responsive to market conditions and interact effectively with one another.

For example, the First Step scheme was adjusted to reflect evidence of demand for larger family-sized homes prior to Andium Homes' planned delivery of larger FTB-restricted properties on *Bridging Island Plan* sites from 2026-2027.

These products are designed to complement, rather than replace, Affordable Housing and FTB-restricted provision. Whilst FTB status is an important eligibility requirement, each product has its own criteria, such as income and savings thresholds, which means they reach different parts of the market. Their exact impact on demand for Affordable Housing and FTB-restricted homes cannot, therefore, always be clearly established.

The use of Affordable Housing and FTB restrictions remains an important mechanism for ensuring that homes designated for affordable ownership stay within that tenure and continue to be appropriately targeted at, and financially accessible to, the households they are intended to assist upon first and subsequent sales.

2.16 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Housing regarding the findings and recommendations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General in her review of Andium Homes, 'Housing Repairs and Maintenance Report – 5 February 2015' and 'Housing Repairs and Maintenance: follow-up report – 25 April 2019' (WQ.16/2026):

Question

Further to the findings and recommendations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General in her review of Andium Homes “[Housing Repairs and Maintenance Report – 5 February 2015](#)” and “[Housing Repairs and Maintenance: follow-up report – 25 April 2019](#)”, will the Minister advise what oversight he has had of the actions taken in response to these recommendations and will he state –

- (a) how many properties in the Andium Homes rental portfolio are currently subject to outstanding safety or compliance actions;
- (b) what is the anticipated or planned cost of this work and when will the work be completed; and
- (c) what, if any, additional capital has the Minister approved to support this work in this electoral term?

Answer

In answering this question, it is important to understand the positive journey that Andium has been on since its incorporation in 2014. At that time, the housing stock it inherited was in a very poor condition with significant backlog maintenance. Andium was able to bring the stock up to 100% Decent Homes Standard (DHS) within 5 years of incorporation, something which has been maintained annually since.

- (a) As of Monday 2 February, a total of 6 properties are subject to an outstanding inspection related to compliance checks, and are being actively progressed. This number changes and is carefully monitored and forecasted throughout the year. It should be noted that maintaining the quality of thousands of homes is an ongoing, dynamic process. Inevitably, a planned proportion of properties will always require attention each year whether to uphold the DHS or to meet statutory compliance. Andium’s continual monitoring and responsive action demonstrates a proactive and robust approach to long-term sustainable asset management.
- (b) The costs of the works specifically noted in part (a) above is estimated at no more than £1,680. The works are due to be completed this week. However, keeping the housing stock compliant is a continuous activity with some £19m invested per annum by Andium in maintaining their portfolio across planned maintenance, cyclical & statutory inspections, repairs, empty properties and fire safety. The programme is forecast in advance, and the budget is already in place to ensure continued sustainable compliance. In addition, Andium has a funded Capital programme, which predominantly deals with new supply, but also significant refurbishment projects where required.
- (c) This would be a matter for the Minister for Treasury and Resources, as shareholder. However, Andium receives no funding from the Government and is a net contributor to the Government with annual returns of circa £30M, in addition to repayments and interest payments on loans from the Housing Development Fund.

It is worth noting that all but one of the Controller and Auditor General’s recommendations for Andium Homes in 2015 were reported as fully implemented in the 2019 follow-up report. The final recommendation, which was partly implemented at the time, has since been completed by Andium Homes.

The recommendations from the C&AG are still followed and referred to as a benchmark for Andium's procurements processes, tendering policies, KPIs and culture, as well as having tenant participation as part of the procurement process including tenant representation at Board level.

3. Oral Questions

3.1 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the Island's economic outlook (OQ.20/2026):

Further to the reported findings of the Jersey Institute of Directors' third Economic Confidence Survey for 2025, which indicated that 63 per cent of businesses in Jersey felt "pessimistic" about the Island's economic outlook, will the Minister advise the Assembly what specific actions, if any, the Government is taking to address these concerns, and if no actions are being taken, explain why not?

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

I thank the Deputy for her question. The Institute of Directors survey is a very useful survey but it must be taken in context. Interestingly, the report finds that the majority of respondents are pessimistic about Jersey's economy while that same majority is optimistic about their own businesses. To answer the question specifically, we have an entire programme in Government, the Future Economy Programme, which is focused on tackling the Island's future economic outlook and of course the ageing population. Last year as well, we invested £10 million in various parts of the economy through the Better Business Support Package. This year we are matching that, and that is entirely designed to support businesses and help them prepare for a higher productivity environment, thereby helping create confidence in the economy. At a wider level, the Investing in Jersey programme is designed to provide confidence and certainty in investment in Jersey's infrastructure. I have been working with the Minister for the Environment for some time to simplify the planning process, particularly from an economic perspective. The Minister for Financial Services is working on the competitiveness work in finance in order to build long-term confidence there. I have obviously, with the Council of Ministers, appointed a new ferry service provider, and that is aimed at providing certainty in Jersey's ferry services for the long term. Of course this Government is moving forward with its commitment to the hospital and developing the hospital construction site, which again, alongside Investing in Jersey, is ensuring that our infrastructure is fit for purpose into the future. We will continue to work with businesses to drive economic growth in Jersey and help address the economic challenges that we have, both from the current global uncertainty and also our own demographic issues, both of which we have been aware of for some time and working to address. I am pleased to say as well we are also seeing signs of growth in tourism, with the year ahead showing forward bookings and hotels being higher in all but one month of the year to come.

3.1.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

The Minister mentioned geopolitical uncertainty. Would the Minister accept that while global geopolitical uncertainty plays a role, domestic policy choices, such as public spending levels, regulatory burden and clarity over investment plans also materially affect business confidence in Jersey?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I fully agree with the Deputy, and that is exactly why we have developed the Investing in Jersey programme, to provide that certainty particularly in the construction sector. It is why also we are pushing forward with the hospital project again to provide that certainty. There is no question that the Government needs to continue to invest in capital programmes that drives confidence in the economy and also provides infrastructure, which Islanders and visitors to the Island can use. I am

pleased to say that after years of neglect through various Governments, that investment in infrastructure is coming forward and will continue to do so in the coming years.

3.1.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Most of the items that the Minister mentioned are well known about and have been for some time, and the I.o.D. (Institute of Directors) survey could be said to have them already priced in. What is he going to do that is new that would suggest that the dial could be shifted in terms of confidence?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is interesting the Deputy says that it is work that has been known about for some time. That is exactly right, because it was some time ago that we understood on the back of COVID, on the back of Brexit, these were tumultuous events which will knock economic confidence. I think it is also really important that, as I said in the beginning of my answer, the same number, the same majority of business leaders, were happy and confident in their own businesses, just not so in the economy. I do not think that the work we are doing, although previously announced, is in any way old work. It is new work that continues and will continue to provide confidence in our economy. I think new work that we do need to do is we need to work more clearly around planning and to ensure that the planning process is smooth for all businesses. I think it is really important as well that we continue the work in the agricultural sector, which has completely re-found confidence in that area, but there are challenges ahead which will need to be dealt with. From the tourism perspective, that has been a focus for some time and we will continue to work with the tourism sector to ensure that they can feel the confidence that they need as well by ensuring that Jersey remains a fascinating visitor destination and a popular visitor destination. It is a case of continuing with the work that we have begun, because I think the work that we have begun is long-term work, and while politics can too often be a short-term game, it is by maintaining that strategic direction and continuing to invest in our economy, particularly the capital side of it, which I think is very new for governments of Jersey over recent decades, that we will provide that confidence that the Island needs.

3.1.3 Deputy J. Renouf:

Can the Minister therefore confirm that his aim in terms of reducing that 60 per cent figure to something which he would presumably find more acceptable is to keep on going on and hope that people notice that eventually it bears fruit?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I think one of the difficulties around economic policy is that it is always and should always be long term. I think we can do new things. I think we can further reduce stamp duty on investment properties in order to stimulate confidence in the construction sector. I think there are other things that we can continue to do, or we can do, and we will continue to look for greater opportunities. I am also looking at ways we can develop our ports so that they are more widely used, and also I am very pleased to see that investment in the airport is taking place, which I think will also help deliver greater confidence for people using the airport and the Island's economy. I think it is very difficult, when you are focused on long-term issues, to satisfy the short-term appetite of the political arena, but I will continue to focus on the long term, because it is the long term through which we will bear fruit, as the Deputy says.

3.1.4 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Deputy Gardiner's question focuses on the I.o.D. survey, but has the Minister conducted his own survey from a departmental level? If not, why not? If he has, could he let us know what the results were and whether they tally with this information?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is not for me to undertake a survey because, particularly, Statistics Jersey undertake the Business Tendency Survey. I think that is a far better organ to use for surveys of economic confidence in this Island rather than the department itself. I do expect the Business Tendency Survey to have more than 41 respondents, which the I.o.D. survey had. I think it is important to understand that the I.o.D. survey was just 5 per cent of its membership; so it was not a huge sample. It is also a self-selecting sample, so it is, in my view, likely that you are going to get people who feel motivated to respond, and often that comes from a negative perspective as well.

3.1.5 Deputy M. Tadier:

Has the Minister been able to give consideration as to why there seems to be an apparent disconnect between a pessimistic outlook for the wider economy versus an optimistic outlook for individual businesses? Does that suggest to the Minister that there is no connection between what happens in the outside economy in terms of whether or not businesses have confidence in their own future success?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is something I consider a lot and it is something of a philosophical question. It is difficult to provide a precise answer to. But my take on it is that any business leader knows their own business, they know the numbers in their own business and they know how it is performing. When it comes to the economy, it is very much a sense of feeling rather than a sense of knowing because we issue, for instance, the G.V.A. (gross value added) statistics in October every year, just once a year. That just gives us that one annual snapshot. We have the Business Tendency Survey. We do not have a lot of other economic indicators that we look at. Obviously last year, from a tourism perspective, had many negatives around it, which will not have helped from a confidence perspective. But where do people get most of their sense of the economy? A lot of people will get it from the media, and it is an unfortunate reality around the media that they tend to prefer to report bad news rather than good news. Certainly from the international media's perspective and the national media's perspective, the tumultuous events, everything from allies turning against allies and so on, creates for a great sense of uncertainty in the world that we live in. I think that speaks to people's feelings about the economy, which is something they cannot measure themselves as opposed to their own businesses, which they do measure themselves.

3.1.6 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

Would the Minister agree with me that the planning process can be smooth when applicants and their agents engage at an early stage with the officers of the department to ensure that the applications coming forward are compliant with the Bridging Island Plan? It is really only when they try to stretch the envelope that applications run into difficulty.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I will agree with the first part of the Connétable's statement; not so much for the second part of the Connétable's statement. I think it is always worth applicants going as early as possible to engage the Planning officers. But I do not think it is always about stretching the envelope that leads to a lack of a smooth process. There are many other reasons that a process can be disrupted and not to do with that. But I do agree, and I would always suggest that applicants or anyone thinking of creating a planning application go as early as possible to the department and engage in that pre-application process.

3.1.7 Deputy I. Gardiner:

The Minister mentioned that a low number of businesses engaged with the Institute of Directors. Does the Minister accept that by dismissing concern as a rhetoric risk for a smaller number of businesses further undermining confidence among businesses who are directly experiencing rising

costs, labour shortages and regulatory pressure? Has the Minister engaged with the Institute of Directors or planning to engage with the Institute of Directors to understand the feeling?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I reject the idea that I am dismissing anything to do with this survey. I take all surveys seriously, and as I said in my answer to Deputy Tadier, there is a lack of statistical information for Islanders and Island business leaders to help them understand where the economy actually is. So any survey is helpful. I thank the Institute of Directors for doing their survey, because I do think it is helpful. From that perspective, I very much welcome the survey. I certainly do not dismiss it. All I am trying to say is that we, in Jersey, will continue to focus on trying to build confidence in Jersey's economy, and we do that, and we are doing that over the long term. As I said, it is not focused on always the short term. It is long-term matters. I do engage with the Institute of Directors regularly. We have had a rough drumbeat of monthly or bimonthly meetings. over the past few years.

[10:00]

I will continue to do so, though I must say that I have not spoken to the Institute of Directors since the survey was issued, but I will do so in the very near future.

3.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding his reasoning for omitting Psychotherapists from Schedule 1 of the Draft Health and Social Care Professionals Register (Jersey) Law 202- (P.15/2026) (OQ.22/2026):

Will the Minister outline his reasoning for omitting psychotherapist from Schedule 1 of the Draft Health and Social Care Professionals Register (Jersey) Law 202- (P.15/2026)?

Deputy T.J.A. Binet of St. Saviour (The Minister for Health and Social Services):

The introduction of the new law was only ever intended to include those professions that are subject to statutory regulation in the U.K. (United Kingdom). Psychotherapists are not regulated by the Health and Care Professions Council and there are no statutory national standards, qualifications or fitness to practice requirements to which they could be aligned or against which they could be held to account. Local registration would not enhance public protection and to insist on it would simply create unnecessary red tape with no meaningful benefit to anyone. That said, should the U.K. introduce statutory regulation for psychotherapists in the future, the new law has been designed to allow them to be added very quickly and very easily.

3.2.1 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Firstly, does the Minister believe that being tied so closely to the U.K. gives Jersey the ability to be flexible and agile in addressing concerns that come forward? Also, is the Minister not aware that psychotherapists actually exist in line one of schedule 1, but have to be considered an arts psychotherapist? Is this actually balanced and just?

Deputy T.J.A. Binet:

Under all of the circumstances, I think it is balanced and just, and I have given my reasons in the first part of the answer to the question, and I have not really got a great deal more to say about that.

3.3 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Chief Minister regarding the High Value Residency Scheme policy aspiration of 15 housing consents per year (OQ.15/2026):

Further to Written Question 4/2026, in relation to the High Value Residency Scheme, will the Chief Minister explain why the policy aspiration of 15 housing consents per year remains in place given that consents have averaged 22 per year over the last decade, and advise whether that number of consents remains his preferred policy objective?

Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):

When the scheme was established in the 1970s, the policy aspiration around 15 housing consents was intended to ensure stability and control growth. While arrivals have averaged a slightly higher figure in recent years, at around 18 per year, the scheme remains modest in scale and carefully managed. Net growth is considerably lower than arrivals as some residents leave each year, with numbers increasing on average by only around 8 people per annum since the year 2016. There are currently 233 net-high-value residents paying approximately £33 million in income tax each year, representing about 5 per cent of our total income tax take. They also contribute through stamp duty on high-value property purchases, which exceeded £15 million in 2025, and through philanthropy and with new applicants expected to give a minimum of £100,000 annually to local charities. While many donations are made anonymously, it is estimated that tens of millions of pounds have been given to local charities and good causes over the years served by the high-net-worth community. Many also invest in local businesses, support start-ups and business growth and contribute to skills mentoring and voluntary work across the community. The objective is therefore not to meet a rigid numerical cap but to maintain a balanced and sustainable level of arrivals for the reasons aforementioned that delivers clear economic and social benefit without placing undue pressure on housing or public services. The aspiration of around 15 housing consents a year therefore I believe remains an appropriate planning guide, with applications considered on their individual merits, and always in the Island's overall best interests.

3.3.1 Deputy J. Renouf:

It seems from the Chief Minister's answer that in terms of the numbers that he is relying on H.V.R.s (high-value residents) leaving the Island to compensate for arrivals in order to keep the overall size in check. Will he be encouraging high-value residents to leave in order to continue achieving this balance that he talks about or would this expose the slight absurdity of the Government's position in relying on a policy failure to justify consistently ignoring the 15 a year?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I think the Deputy is completely misrepresenting the position to suit his own view on the matter. I am not sure what he is exactly trying to achieve through this course of questioning or by his forthcoming proposition given the benefits we see. If we refer to the Written Question that I provided last week, we will see that on average over the last 10 years, 22 approvals per annum were given, of which 18 arrived, and the average of 10 high-net-worth leaving the scheme annually, which left a net increase of 8. We know roughly over the last 10 years for every approval we give we have about a third actually arrive and settle and stay. Because as well as many new arrivals, some residents leave the Island, sadly some residents pass away. Only a very small number, fewer than 5 I think in the last 5 years, have moved to entitled status through long residence, and anyone who does so has to give up their high-value residency tax status. It seems to be eminently sensible that we use the statistics we have over the last 10 years and we know that for every 9, shall we say, approvals we give, the high-net-worth community over here is only growing by about 3 annually, and those are the figures I think we need to be mindful of.

3.3.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Can the Chief Minister outline what mechanisms exist to collect economic data away from just tax and duty that high-value residents bring to the Island?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

That is something I think we will be due to go into again. The last report I think was done by a major firm of accountants some 10 years ago, in approximately 2014 or 2015. It is difficult to collate exact data, because the high-net-worth community is such a small part of our overall community; 133 out of 105,000. We can collect the tax details, the stamp duty on properties, we can make guesstimates

of what they spend in the economy, although it is difficult to pinpoint that exactly. It is also, as I mentioned before, charitable and philanthropic contributions are often made anonymously. So it is quite difficult to give an exact position. I think it is something we could look at again in the future, but I will say with certainty that the small number of high-net-worth make a significant contribution to our community.

3.3.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

Given that high-value residents do not have to spend an entire day in Jersey once they have got their status, does that make it even harder to correlate how much they would actually spend, even in our supermarkets, restaurants, and bars?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I am not sure I know of any high-net-worth residents that spend less than a day in Jersey. We make it clear as part of the application process, we are looking for people to call Jersey their home, and I believe the vast majority of them do just that. Of course, I cannot speak for all of them, but some of the decisions and their residency and where they are domiciled will be a matter for themselves. But I believe the vast majority of our high-net-worth community, some of whom have been here for decades, are calling Jersey their home and treating it as such.

3.3.4 Deputy J. Renouf:

In the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, the average number of high-value residents arriving was in the 30s or slightly below. Since 2010, it has been over 150 per decade. There has clearly been a big step jump. Does the Chief Minister have a view about whether there would ever be too many high-value residents on the Island?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

The answer to that is possibly there could be, but right at the moment there is not. We have 233 out of 105,000 whose fiscal contribution is disproportionate to the number of them here. Yes, of course, we do not want to see thousands of that. We do not want to be in a position where we are impacting adversely upon the economy, but that will never happen. Since the 1970s I think the scheme has been very successful. It has helped to contribute towards Jersey's prosperity. As long as we continue to manage it carefully and manage the growth of the community ... and that is how we should measure it, by the growth in the community, not by the number of applications we accept, because as we know that is not really relevant to the ... what I am trying to say is every approval we give does not result in a settlement. I think the answer to that is, we have a good position at the moment and we need to maintain it as such.

The Bailiff:

Question 4, Deputy Wilson is not here.

3.4 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North of the Minister for Social Security regarding the cost of the information technology Transform Programme in the Employment, Social Security and Housing Department (OQ.15/2026):

Further to the response to Oral Question 265/2025, will the Minister advise the cost of the information technology Transform Programme in the Employment, Social Security and Housing Department and provide details on the implementation of the programme and whether any additional costs are anticipated?

Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

I have to admit I am a little bit perplexed by this question because the details of the overall costs are, of course, out there in the open in the Budget documents. For clarity, the overall Budget for this programme is £30.6 million. It is a large I.T. (information technology) programme and, as such, I

do not think it would be ... I could not go through the Gantt chart I have got in front of me with regards to the implementation. But I am happy to provide that in writing to the Assembly. With regard to any additional costs, no, there are no additional costs anticipated.

3.4.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

Just with the implementation, no doubt the Minister has been briefed on progress. Can she advise whether her team or the project team have shared whether they use A.I. (artificial intelligence) and code assisting to speed up delivery, and whether they have seen any improvement in the process, given the wide proliferation of professional code assist technology that many professional organisations are deploying for their benefit and hopefully their customers.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I think that is rather an operational question rather than a political question, but I can say that I have asked the team to be very aware of learnings from other jurisdictions. I am very aware of issues with regard to automated decision-making and the issues that that led to in Australia. I have asked the team that are working on this to make sure that they are delivering this programme in the most efficient, effective and modern manner, but also cognisant of any risks that may be taken with regard to using new technology as well.

3.4.2 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

The Minister says it is operational. Could she confirm then that no briefing has explained that they have made any time saving or any efficiency saving in the delivery of the project because they have been able to use newer techniques to improve productivity within the project?

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

That is not a briefing that I have had so far. We have a political oversight group planned in the coming week, I believe. We are always pressing the team to ensure that they are delivering this programme in the most efficient and effective way possible. We do provide political oversight but we are not running this programme on an operational level. We are making the political decisions. It would be incorrect for me to take decisions around the right technology or the wrong technology on the basis that I simply do not have the technical expertise or experience, and I need to rely and trust in the officers that are working on this programme.

3.4.3 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

Would the Minister advise if the timeline is as expected and it would be delivered on time or there are delays?

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

There is a phased delivery, we could not possibly implement all of the delivery at once. The timeline is as expected. As I said in my answer to the initial question, I am quite happy to give the Assembly a written response because I think it is so detailed and it does cut across a number of phases over the next few years. I think that that would be a more appropriate way of answering such questions.

3.5 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Slaughter of Animals (Jersey) Law 1962 (OQ.26/2026):

In relation to the Slaughter of Animals (Jersey) Law 1962, will the Minister advise the number of licenses issued under Article 4 (Prohibition of slaughter and stunning except by a licensed slaughterer) of the law; and will he further advise whether his department allow licenses for slaughter and consumption under Article 5 (Exceptions), and if not, why not?

[10:15]

Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):

The law dates back to 1962, and in the short period of time I have not been able to get the number for the number of licences issued since that time. But what I can say to the Deputy is that no licences have been issued other than to licence slaughtermen in the abattoir in the last 2 years. I can further say to him that the department allows licences for slaughter and consumption under Article 5, but that we have not had any applications under exemptions either.

3.5.1 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

Article 5 allows for slaughter outside of the abattoir as long as it is only for personal consumption. Does the Minister agree that the preferred approach for most should be to take their animals to the abattoir for slaughter, even if it is for home consumption, but that retaining the right to slaughter at home ensures pressure on the abattoir to remain value for money and provide a quality service, as I am sure we all agree it currently does?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Our abattoir does provide a good value for money, especially in a small jurisdiction like we have. It is of high quality and I absolutely agree with the Deputy that regardless of where it is being consumed, it is far preferable to have animals slaughtered at the abattoir under proper welfare conditions, under proper conditions to remove dangerous material that might be in the animal, and under the Food Hygiene Law.

3.6 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South of the Minister for Housing regarding the impact of the Right-Sizing Policy (OQ.23/2026):

Will the Minister advise what evidence, if any, his department has collected to demonstrate the impact of the Right-Sizing Policy, published in May 2024, including how many Islanders have benefited from this policy since it was introduced, and if no such evidence has been collected, will he explain why?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South (The Minister for Housing):

The Right-Sizing Policy has multiple different angles to it, and the policy document itself has performance indicators towards the end that show how the different aspects of it may be measured, but what I can tell the Deputy, we are aware of when it comes to providing new right-sizing homes there have been 36 right-sizing appropriate homes approved through the planning process and a further 14 pending, so that is 50 in total. I have no doubt that some of that has come about as a result of the heightened focus there has been on the subject because of that policy. I can confirm that Andium, Jersey Homes Trust and Le Vaux Housing Trust have developed their right-sizing policies, which I have supported with them and, since the policy was introduced, 81 households who were under-occupying social housing properties have now downsized.

3.6.1 Deputy D.J. Warr:

I thank the Minister for his answer. Does the Minister therefore consider it to be a success. I understand there are a number of issues around when an application is means-tested, giving up full home ownership. There are a number of criteria which limit the ability for people to right size. Does the Minister consider that the policy is correct? Are there any adjustments he can see going forward to improve on the policy?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I am not sure what the Deputy was referring to when he referred to criteria there because, as I said, the policy focuses on this from multiple different angles. One thing that I think is probably going to help with the delivery of the right-sizing policy has been, as a result of the decision that the Assembly made in the recent Budget debate, thanks to an amendment from Deputy Coles, to introduce a right-sizing stamp duty incentive. I think that is going to help with the whole picture of this and hopefully lead to that benefiting more people.

3.6.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

The Minister just mentioned the stamp duty incentive. Obviously, the 2024 right-sizing policy was quite restricted by this. Does he now expect to see this policy be expanded to include a lower stamp duty rate for right-sizing?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I wonder if the Deputy is referring to some kind of version 2 or addendum to the policy that takes into account that. I think that would clearly make sense. The Budget amendment that the Deputy lodged was approved, but the outcome from it has not been achieved yet because the amendment did give a timeline in order to do that, so it would make sense if we were to produce some addendum or version 2 of that right-sizing policy, that we align it with the introduction of that incentive when it comes about. But that does sound like a sensible idea.

3.7 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Minister for the Environment regarding the rationale for reducing the bird-registration threshold from 30 to one under the Article 4(1)(a) of the Animal Health (Bird Diseases) (Jersey) Order 2017 (OQ.18/2026):

Will the Minister explain the rationale for reducing the bird-registration threshold from 30 to one under Article 4(1)(a) of the Animal Health (Bird Diseases) (Jersey) Order 2017, thereby imposing an immediate legal obligation on all poultry keepers, including small-scale and domestic keepers?

Deputy S.G. Luce (The Minister for the Environment):

The number of confirmed outbreaks of avian influenza in the U.K. (United Kingdom) and France in poultry and captive birds is of concern to me. There have been 112 outbreaks in France since October last year, with more than 1.8 million animals dead or culled, and 90 confirmed outbreaks in the U.K. The Island needs to be prepared for any outbreaks and it is important that the States Vet has at this time a database of all poultry and captive bird keepers. Registration ensures authorities know where birds are kept, regardless of flock size, so they can act quickly when disease is detected. Being able to speak to all owners in very quick order is a benefit not only to the States Vet, but to the owners of that poultry.

3.7.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

What assessment does the Minister make of how the amendment was communicated? Will the Minister ensure that future urgent changes are clearly and promptly conveyed to avoid unintentional non-compliance?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I am very happy to do that. I would like to apologise to people. Previous to 2017, it was mandatory that all chickens should be registered. The rules were relaxed at that date, and it occurred to me that it would not be very contentious to go back to where we were for the animal health reasons I have mentioned. Consequently, I signed an order in December. The timing was not great. The 14 days after that included Christmas, and before we knew where we were the order had been enacted. So I would like to apologise to those people who were a bit surprised by that. It is my fault entirely but, as the Deputy says, I will take much more notice in the future with this type of order.

3.7.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

Does the Minister believe that the order and details within this are clear enough for people so they do not - and I am really sorry for the pun - fall foul of this legislation?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

My brain does not allow me to respond with a quip, but I would say I think it is important. I think everybody needs to be involved in this. If you have got one chicken, 5 chickens, 10, 15, 20, we all need to know where these animals are, and I think it is a good idea.

3.7.3 Deputy T.A. Coles:

This next question comes more because if you ever go to the Parish of Grouville, the last time I was there I counted about 15 feral peacocks that seem to take residence in people's gardens. The question is: where does the responsibility rely around these birds because obviously they choose their area that they live in, and that might be in somebody's garden. Would they then be considered as keeper because that peacock spends a considerable amount of its time in that garden, and if so, is there a way to amend this register?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Feral chickens, poultry and other birds are a challenge on the Island. We are certainly aware of a number of groups of feral chickens. We can take action where necessary, but wild birds obviously are a real challenge and do not fall under this legislation. However, the peacocks that the Deputy mentioned, it may well be that under certain conditions the States' Vet would decide to act, but it is not usual.

3.7.4 Deputy A.F. Curtis:

This obviously is a new reporting requirement for the last 10 years, for Islanders who could have as few as one chicken. Did the Minister consider whether the processes for those who have to declare are easy enough and whether he should have made any digital process changes to make it easier for people to file this so it is not a more bureaucratic process for those with a very small impact or perhaps a very controllable number of paltry or similar?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I have to hold my hand up and say that I did not delve deeply into the subject when I was requested by the States Vet to consider making this order. I will go back and see how easy it is for people to register and certainly, in this day and age, I would fully expect people to be able to do that online.

3.7.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Could the Minister outline what are the consequences for those who have to register if they do not register? Could the Minister outline how this will be enforced in practice, particularly domestic keepers who are unaware of the change or, for example, what Deputy Coles was talking about, chickens and poultry going into gardens and become residents without having an ownership?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

This is not about trying to criminalise somebody with 2 chickens in their back garden who may have missed this announcement and have not had them registered. It is more about trying to encourage people to comply with the law. We are not running around the Island making sure that every last chicken has been registered in the last few weeks, but this is about trying to get owners of chickens to help each other to act responsibly so that, as I said, if we do have a situation with avian flu in Jersey the vet can contact all the owners, and it is for their benefit as much as the States Vet's benefit.

3.8 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North of the Chief Minister regarding strengthening Jersey's preparedness for unforeseen events (OQ.21/2026):

In light of current geopolitical uncertainties and the importance of food security, energy resilience and the Island's transport links, will the Chief Minister advise what steps, if any, the Government has taken to strengthen Jersey's preparedness for unforeseen events, including disruption to supply chains, and if no steps have been taken, will he explain why?"

Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):

The Government has taken a number of practical steps to strengthen Jersey's resilience to potential disruption affecting food security, energy supply and transport links. Emergency preparedness is co-ordinated through the Emergency Planning Team and the Jersey Resilience Forum, which brings together 27 partner organisations to plan for, respond to and recover from major incidents. We maintain close working relationships with U.K. Government departments, regional resilience forums and military liaison officers to ensure we are sighted on emerging risks and can escalate issues quickly where needed. Our planning is underpinned by the Jersey Emergency Risk Register that is aligned to the U.K. National Security and Risk Assessment, which identifies the Island's most significant risks and drives contingency planning. We have also established an energy resilience working group, are responding to recommendations on critical national infrastructure and progressing proposals for a new resilience law to strengthen governance and accountability. In addition, steps have been taken to protect supply chains and connectivity, including strengthened ferry service arrangements and ongoing work on energy security as part of the Island's developing energy strategy. Together, these measures reflect an active and ongoing programme to ensure Jersey is better prepared for both anticipated and unforeseen events.

3.8.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Will the Chief Minister advise whether the Government has assessed how long essential food, fuel, and medical supplies could be maintained in the event of prolonged disruption to sea or air links, and what are the contingencies?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

Those considerations are looked at periodically. I cannot give the exact details of the latest estimates on that figure but I can assure Members they are constantly reviewed

3.8.2 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:

The Chief Minister said that the most significant risks are assessed. What specific risks have been identified as the most significant to the Island?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I do not think I have time to identify all of them, but we are constantly working with quite a large risk register, which is categorised into risk depending on the prevailing circumstances and the political situations at the time. I cannot be specific, but I am happy to share risk registers with Members.

3.8.3 Deputy R.S. Kovacs:

I will appreciate if that could be shared. How often are emergency preparedness plans reviewed and tested in that sense?

[10:30]

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I would just say regularly. I do not think there is a set timetable. The forums and the groups meet regularly, consistently, and that culminates in Emergencies Council meetings when emergencies are declared or further action is required. But I can assure Members that all known risks are constantly monitored, and careful consideration is given in the hopefully unlikely times we might need to step in. Of course, we learnt a lot from recent incidents, we learnt a lot during COVID, and we learnt a lot from the very sad events we had following COVID in relation to L'Ecume, and the Haut do Mont situation.

3.8.4 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

The Chief Minister mentioned a number of groups and responsibilities and areas that is being looked at under this, but could the Chief Minister clarify where clear Ministerial responsibility now sits for overall Island resilience and how progress is being monitored as a whole of government level?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

The overall responsibility sits with the Council of Ministers. I chair, in my role as Chief Minister, the Emergencies Council and a number of the groups. The Emergencies Councils, off the top of my head, consists of Economy, Infrastructure, Health, Chief Minister, Home Affairs, as I believe it.

3.8.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Specifically we have heard from the Chief Minister before about this particular resilience law that he mentioned as well. Will the Chief Minister, as the head of this Ministerial responsibility, be bringing this law any time soon and could he give a timeline please?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I cannot at the moment, but I am due for an update this month. I am happy to keep Members posted.

3.8.6 Deputy I. Gardiner:

Since the Chief Minister cited that we responded to COVID and the other incidents that we had, can the Chief Minister identify what specific changes, one or 2 changes, have been implemented since those incidents to strengthen our preparedness?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I would allude the Deputy to some of the details I gave in my original answer, including, I think, more regular meetings of the political groups that I mentioned and, of course, the considerable unseen work ... I am sorry, I will give way if the Deputy is confused.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

No, the question was: can the Chief Minister present specific change what happened in our preparedness based on the lessons learned during the COVID and managing other incidents?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I am sorry, I do not understand the question.

The Bailiff:

She wants to know what specific changes have been introduced post-COVID?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I cannot list all of those off the top of my head. But I would be happy to invite the Deputy to come into the office and I will happily run through all the work that is going on.

3.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity of the Chair of the Comité des Connétables regarding the Animal Welfare and Control Scrutiny Review (OQ.19/2026):

In relation to the Animal Welfare and Control Scrutiny Review and the presentation to the Comité des Connétables of options regarding seasonal restrictions on dogs on beaches by the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development in 2024, will the Chair advise what consideration was given to the options presented whether any public or Parish consultation took place and detail what evidence or views informed the Comité's position?

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade (Chair, Comité des Connétables):

The Deputy asks an oft-repeated question in this Chamber. But I am pleased to answer the specific question she asks at this stage. The Comité initiated the exchange of correspondence with the

Minister for Sustainable Economic Development about the Policing of Beaches Regulations 1959 following its meeting in May 2024. We had noted the petition on the States Assembly website to create dedicated dog-friendly beaches throughout the summer months and invited the Minister to a meeting in June or July 2024 to discuss the issues. The Minister was unable to attend at that point but following the petition, having reached 1,000 signatures, he wrote to us on 3rd September setting out some options for taking proposed legislative changes forward. He also responded to the petition on 10th September saying he had written to seek the Comité's views. We considered the proposals at our meeting on 16th September and replied that it was unable to support any of the options as proposed. We did not receive a Children's Rights Impact Assessment from the Minister and so we did not undertake any public or Parish consultation at that time. But I would be happy to expand if required.

3.9.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

How does the Comité evaluate whether the current restrictions continue to reflect the needs and expectations of Island residents?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

There were 3 elements of the proposals, as put by the Minister, and one was to designate a specific beach to allow for dogs to be walked off the lead at any time. This is one element, I think, where the public have views. The Constables have a pretty good feel of what goes on in their Parishes. Some Parishes have more beaches than others and I am probably one of those. Some Parishes have very limited beaches and I refer to the Constable of St. Saviour. But we know what goes on on the beaches, we get all the feedback from the public; whether it is a requirement to extend the hours or open all the beaches, whether it is to do with hours or whether it is to do with the policing of the beaches. In terms of our situation, as the Deputy mentions, we were consultees to the Minister's inquiry and our response to the first question, to designate a specific beach to allow for dogs to be walked off the lead, was not supported. That was dictated by a number of factors, which we are well aware of. It is not only about other users of the beach, it is about the tourism season, it is about the weather, it is about signage and it is about policing; there are lots of factors. In terms of the change of start time for dog-walking restrictions from 10.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m., there was among the 12 Constables who were present at that meeting limited support for altering the start times, though if this was considered the view was that it should be to 11.00 a.m. and not 11.30 a.m. However, such a change would incur considerable cost to change all signage, and so that must not be underestimated. I am sure the Constable of St. Ouen will confirm that the change in speed-limit signage can end up costing £30,000 quite easily. This has to come from somewhere. The third point the Minister made was to remove the current restrictions on weekdays during May, leaving restrictions for weekdays and public holidays. This was considered to be too confusing, as there are several public holidays in May and the school ½ term, so it was not supported. I say for my part, as a regular dog-walker at La Pulente, I think the risk more is to public barbeques and sausages on barbeques, which certainly would not be safe with a lot of dogs that are walking on the beach, and that is something some dogs who have limited recall will struggle to contend with.

3.9.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

The chair of the Comité mentioned an issue of cost. I note that there are 10,050 dogs at the last count on the Island, each paying £10 for a licence, which raises £100,500. Is that not a source of money that could be put towards something specifically for dog owners?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I think that that could well be the case. One of the concerns about signage, and I think the Minister for Transport will say that there is such a thing as sign-blindness. However many signs we put up, will they be adhered to? I suspect not, and even that is the case now from a policing point of view.

While there is signage out there, it is really difficult to police, that the public do not tend to look at these things. I think it is an issue of education to dog owners; 10,420 was the latest calculation, to be accurate. But of course there are far more numbers than that with people who use the beaches without a dog. It is a question of getting a balance. I would say from the Comité point of view, we continue to receive any views from anyone and whether there should be any changes, which I say personally I would support some but not all.

3.9.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I thank the chair of the Comité for the answer. Are we not pointing, therefore, towards perhaps that money, that the time has come to employ dog wardens who have an educational role, who have an enforcement role and have a role to ensure that good owners are supported? Those who are not perhaps complying could be directed in the right way so that they can. Is that considered by the Comité, to use that money to employ dog wardens across the Island?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I know that the Deputy has brought up this point before and it has been considered. The result is not easy to achieve in practical terms. In each Parish is our Honorary Police service and the police are very good at picking up miscreants. To police, miscreants involves very often some sort of identification. If we get an identification, say a black Labrador, we can go on our Parish systems and investigate that and a fair chance who can identify a series of owners who may own that dog. The easiest identification comes from the identification of a J number on a car and that can be tracked back, and I have to say this does happen. The biggest issue, I think probably which aligns almost to the Deputy's question, is dog attacks, dog on dog; sometimes a difficult thing to apply. Going back to the point of dog wardens, how do we do that? A dog warden is going to cost, I do not know, £30,000 or £40,000 a year; that could be provided for within the dog licence fees. I would not argue that. It is something that we can take to the Comité and consider and report back how to do that.

3.9.4 Deputy T.C. Coles of St. Helier South:

The chairman of the Comité mentions obviously that people use the beaches and other things but there is also the factor of migratory birds and nesting birds. These are also things that need to be considered when making any policy about dogs being off lead. As the chair has also mentioned, that not all dogs have excellent recall. Would he commit that the Comité will keep this in mind when making any decisions?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, in fact we have taken advice from the States Vet in terms of the point the Deputy makes. Many Jersey beaches support shore birds and migratory waders that use the intertidal zones for feeding and resting. Off-lead dogs can disturb these species causing them to flee repeatedly, expending extra energy or abandoning young. This risk increases if dogs are allowed off lead year-round or with further relaxed off-lead walking during spring and summer months and nesting season.

3.9.5 Deputy T.A. Coles:

The recently published Marine Spatial Plan has an Article in there that does require a review of dogs on beaches as part of that. Will the Comité be committing to a full contribution to this before it gets published?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, I believe we should, to hear from all parties who use the beaches. I suspect the view will come back fairly well balanced.

3.9.6 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

From the chair's answer earlier, I believe that no consultation was done specifically to support the response to the Minister in 2024. Could the chair clarify how the Comité was able to reach its position without seeking the public's input, and will the Comité in the future do a consultation especially related to the Marine Spatial Plan and the request to look at the beaches law more in depth in the future?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I think it is fair to say that the Comité were consultees to the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development's questions. As I repeat what I said before, the Constables are well-versed in what goes on in their Parishes.

[10:45]

Notwithstanding that, I think a way forward is to initiate feedback from the public in whatever form works best. I am sure the Comité would be happy to do that..

3.10 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade of the Minister for the Environment regarding the Islands network of Marine Protected Areas (OQ.25/2026):

Further to the extension of the Island's network of Marine Protected Areas, as set out in the Marine Spatial Plan, and following the lodging of P.18/2026, will the Minister explain the reasons for the phasing of the implementation of the M.P.A. (Marine Protected Areas) network and any changes to the boundaries?

Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for the Environment):

Over the course of December and January recently, the Government of Jersey Marine Resources Team held meetings with fishermen and fishing committees, both in Jersey, Normandy and Brittany. Those organisations were asked to share verbally or submit in writing their concerns and recommendations relating to the latest Marine Protected Area proposals. Recommendations to modify the M.P.A.s were received in writing from the French and on paper, from the Jersey Mobile Gear Working Group. I gave consideration to these proposals and, based on these submissions and economic information that was reported to me in December, I proposed the various changes to the M.P.A.s. That is a small change; the north-west of the Minquiers permanently removed from protection, 0.27 per cent of the total territorial water; a very small change north of Grosnez, 0.06 per cent of our territorial water to be removed from protection; and the phasing of an area to the south-east corner, equivalent to 0.86 per cent of our territorial water, which will come back into protection in 2030.

3.10.1 Deputy J. Renouf:

My understanding was that there were 3 areas that were phased. I wonder whether the Minister could publish a map which make these clear, because it is not in the proposition. But these areas that have been put down for phased protection, the department's own surveys have confirmed that these are sensitive habitat-rich areas that need protection. Therefore, how is the Minister going to ensure that now he has delayed protection until 2030 in those areas they do not just get dredged to destruction over the next 4 years, thereby negating the whole point of protection?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

Can I first clear up the issue over the 3 phased areas? The Deputy is quite correct, there are 3 phased areas. The first 2 were proposed for phasing some time ago when I first came to office and this last phased area to the south-east of the Island is one I proposed recently. But those 3 areas all come into full protection in 2030. The final lines for protection for Marine Protected Areas has been a very difficult project to come to fruition. I have had to balance environmental protection. I have had to balance the future of the fishing fleets, both here and locally and in France. While we started by looking at the amount of time various boats spent in those areas, recently we have also commissioned

some economic work to show the value to some boats of being able to fish in these particular areas of our waters. I have had to take that into account as well. The case for immediate cessation of fishing in all these areas was made quite strongly by the French and by the local fleets. I had to perform a balancing act where they asked me for areas to be removed from protection, some of which I had granted, some of which I have not. I accept that I will be criticised by the environmentalists who think I should have done more. But I also will be criticised by the fishermen who think I should have done more as well. I hope that I have reached a good balance here, one that will be accepted by both sides, while not being particularly happy. But I think it is important, vital, as we move towards having a fishery in our territorial waters which is sustainable. But we have to make sure that we have fishing boats that are still profitable and still in business when we get to that point.

3.10.2 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

Could the Minister explain the criteria he used to determine which areas of seabed would be protected, given that research commissioned at his request identified high density of maerl in certain areas, specifically in the south-east corner, that he is proposing to be left open to dredging until 2030?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

I looked at lots of data when coming to this conclusion. One of the pieces of data we looked at was not only the amount of financial contribution to a French fishing business but, more importantly, the percentage of time that fishing boats spent in particular areas. I felt right at the outset we had decided to phase some areas where the case was made for certain boats that spend over 20 per cent of their time in a particular area. We then had to be consistent and apply that to other vessels. I then had to balance that against the research work that I commissioned when I became Minister, the results of which showed that certainly some areas around our coast were very high in maerl. What I have done, I hope, but I certainly am confident that in certain areas, there is an area outside the 3-mile limit close to our territorial limit where the maerl is very good and I have said that is going to remain protected. There is a certain area closer to Jersey shore where there was less maerl found, less than 5 per cent viable, and I have allowed those areas to be continued to fish until 2030 when they will come into full protection. It is a balancing act where boats fish a lot, where they make a lot of money and their business would be threatened if they were removed immediately. I have allowed some phasing but only in areas where the levels of maerl have been reduced, to other areas where I have allowed continuation of full protection.

3.10.3 Deputy J. Renouf:

I understand that there is a balancing act needed but I do not think the Minister answered my supplementary question earlier, which is that the effect of this, if it will be to ensure that dredging is intensified to make maximum use of that 4-year window, thereby potentially rendering the areas almost worthless in terms of protection, does he consider that the risk of this happening is worth what it seems to be, a political negotiation with France to keep the French happy?

Deputy S.G. Luce:

It has always been my intention to try to work with the local fishermen and work with the French fishermen in Normandy and Brittany, to work together to come to an agreement. That was never going to be an easy thing to do and I accept the criticism that by closing some areas and not others. Those areas which will remain to be dredged for the next 4 years may well get exploited more greatly than they are currently. It is a balancing act. I would say to the Deputy, I cannot keep everybody happy. I cannot keep anybody happy in this particular regard. But what I can do is say to the Deputy that we have in Jersey Marine Protected Areas which are properly protected by law, even though they are unlike other jurisdictions. We are moving from 6 per cent to 21.7 per cent on 1st September and then adding a few more per cent in 2030. We have done great things protecting our territorial waters.

We are doing great things protecting our territorial waters. We will do better things in the future to protect both the fishing fleet and the marine environment.

In accordance with Standing Order 63 (9), a written response would be provided to the following oral questions that had not been asked during the time allowed at the meeting:

3.11 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement of the Minister for Health and Social Services regarding the provision of neurology services in Jersey (OQ.24/2026):

Question

“In relation to Islanders with a neurological illness or condition, will the Minister explain the current provision of neurology services in Jersey, advise the number of appointments available each week during 2025, state the number of people waiting for a routine or emergency neurology appointment, and advise current waiting times?”

Answer

Written answer provided in accordance with Standing Order 63(9)

Services for Islanders with neurological conditions are delivered by an established and experienced team, which includes a Consultant Neurologist who has been in post on a fixed-term basis since September 2025. Interviews for a substantive Consultant Neurologist appointment are scheduled to take place later this month.

In relation to the remaining matters raised, the average number of neurology appointments available each week during 2025 was 17. The number of individuals currently waiting for a “soon” or “routine” neurology appointment is 980, while a further 24 individuals are waiting for an “urgent” or “emergency” appointment. The current median waiting time for neurology services is 23 weeks, although more urgent cases are typically seen within approximately 2 weeks.

4. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for Infrastructure

The Bailiff:

I will move on to questions without notice and the first Minister to receive questions is the Minister for Infrastructure. The first question, is that you, the Connétable of Trinity?

4.1 Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

The Minister’s department currently have some major drainage schemes underway and, as a consequence, large volumes of heavy goods vehicles are being moved on to Parish roads. These roads were not designed to take this sort of volume and weight of traffic that are now being imposed on us. The consequence of that is that they are starting to suffer, and this is going to go on for several months. I wondered if the Minister has any provision within his budget to instigate some repairs to reduce the burden on my ratepayers, some of whom do not even have the benefit of a mains drainage connection.

Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John (The Minister for Infrastructure):

Perhaps I should answer the last part of that question first. The works are designed to ensure that more people can enjoy mains drains, and we have hundreds of properties in the north of the Island that currently are not connected to mains drains that should be. They are alongside main roads in some cases. The work is going to take longer than the Constable suggests; it is more than months. There is another full year to go of disruption for people who live in or adjacent to those roadworks. The Constable, I am sure, will be aware that the department have already helped with some minor repairs on some roads. We will continue to keep dialogue with the Parishes that are affected. I would just like to thank the community for their tolerance so far and I would ask for their tolerance for the next 12 months.

4.2 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

A few weeks ago I asked about Les Creux and the process for Les Creux and the preferred bidder for Les Creux. I wonder if he could update us and, in particular, say how long he is prepared to give the existing - I do not know if he uses the word "bidder" - preferred bidder to meet the requirements that he outlined a few weeks ago before perhaps moving on.

The Connétable of St. John:

I had hoped to meet with the representatives of St. Brelade before the next sitting, not realising that the sitting was this week and not next week. I apologise to my colleagues for that. I have had some updates and I have to say I am disappointed with the update I have received. I would expect to be making some form of decision by the end of this week and I will update both parties involved.

4.3 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

Would the Minister update about progress that was made on the development of First Tower playing field?

The Connétable of St. John:

You can be sure of tax, death and a question from Deputy Gardiner about First Tower. The progress is slow; unfortunately the landowner is currently not able to engage with us. The department has continued though to look at the feasibility, the accessibility, environmental aspect and we look forward to engaging both with the landowner, and once we have done that successfully, engaging with the school and the community to ensure that we have a facility that is fit for both educational and community needs.

4.3.1 Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am grateful for the response. Would the Minister indicate would it happen in this term or do you expect that it will continue into the next term?

The Connétable of St. John:

I would certainly hope that the landowner is well enough during this term. But I would not like to give an assurance that that is going to be the case. We are in informal dialogue, I believe, but we need to wait for the landowner to be able to engage with us.

4.4 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

In the headlines in the paper today, "Talk about hospital delays spark review plans for Kensington Place." A favourite question of mine to the Minister, I think back in 2024 and then in September 2025 and that is" why is it not possible to, therefore, develop the site as a meanwhile use car park to help businesses in that area?

The Connétable of St. John:

I also read the *Jersey Evening Post* today and that is where I pick up some information, not all of it reliable. But I will be talking to my colleague from Health after this sitting is finished to see if

something can be done. We tried to do something before Christmas but we were unable to do so and we will try again.

Deputy D.J. Warr:

I feel reassured by that, thank you.

4.5 Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:

Regarding the answer that the Minister gave about Les Creux, he said he was disappointed. Given that this process has been going on for nearly 2 years with absolutely no community consultation and no positive outcome, does the Minister have confidence that Jersey Property Holdings have the knowledge, skill and experience to lead expressions of interest processes for community projects?

The Connétable of St. John:

I thank the Deputy for her question. I think we have learned lessons, as I have said in this Chamber before, about the Havre des Pas experience, and we are certainly learning lessons here. People are doing their very best, they are working incredibly hard. They are not able to dedicate time to all the projects in front of them. We have got a challenge on our hands and we have got to be thorough. I am going to review what has happened here. I said in the last sitting I believe that I think we should go for a whole process with some external support, and that is my firm belief now.

[11:00]

4.6 Deputy A.F Curtis of St. Clement:

In recent weeks a business has started promoting a local soil improver that they are selling, and their post confirms it is produced by the green waste site. The branding in such images shows the Government of Jersey brand. For the benefit of the public, can the Minister confirm if this business has any affiliation with his department and whether it has any right to use the Government brand?

The Connétable of St. John:

I thank the Deputy for bringing this to my attention. I will confirm that the company that is promoting these goods have got no endorsement from the Government of Jersey. They have no right to use the Government of Jersey's name. They have no right to use the Government of Jersey address. They have received no discount for their purchase, they would pay the same as you and I. I have got officers on the case this morning.

4.7 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

The Minister will be aware of the long, sad, sorry tale of the Nude Food Dunes restaurant construction. Would he agree that as a result of perhaps poor advice going back from his predecessors and Property Holdings going back some time and unenforceable conditions put on the site, would he agree to get round a table and discuss how the drainage issues can be overcome, how the property ownership details can be dealt with so that the place can be opened as a functioning restaurant as soon as possible?

The Connétable of St. John:

In short, yes. I received some correspondence last week requesting a meeting and I have asked officers to arrange for that meeting to take place.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I thank the Minister.

4.8 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

On the question of Nude Dunes, would the Minister be wary of being subject to undue lobbying? We are dealing with a site here which is in private ownership, which does have obligations which the

Government of Jersey has failed to enforce. While the owner is going round trying to contact as many States Members as possible, including Ministers, it is important to note that there has also been a change of use, which prohibits it from being used as a café, which the owner has sought. Any suggestion that the site wants to be used as a café should be taken with a pinch of salt. Is that the Minister's understanding as well?

The Connétable of St. John:

I have to say I am aware of some of that lobbying. But my focus is on providing toilet facilities for the public. I am not involved in the planning part of any application. My responsibility is to ensure that we can get public access to toilets.

4.8.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Could the Minister inform us whether the encroachment that currently has been subject to enforcement on the Nude Dunes site is still in place or has it been removed? Does the Minister think it is appropriate for Ministers to engage, if it is the case, that there are still planning obligations which have not been complied with?

The Connétable of St. John:

Unfortunately, I am not aware of the position of the encroachment, so I will have to come back to the Deputy.

4.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

Following on from the Connétable of Trinity's question regarding the long-term drainage works and the long-term diversion routes into Parish lanes, it was a bit confusing in the answer the Minister gave. Who is responsible for maintaining and repairing those lanes, especially when lanes are being used that are not designed or suitable for the volume of and weight of traffic it is currently at and sustained at?

The Connétable of St. John:

I believe it is quite clear that the Parishes are responsible for the byroads and the Government are responsible for the main roads. What we have done so far is taken a pragmatic approach and offered assistance where we felt we could. But that is not a commitment to continue doing that. It is a commitment to continue to ensure that traffic can pass through those roads.

4.9.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I am just wondering, because this will be a year-long diversion and the Minister has talked about that, and I have seen with my own eyes some of the small potholes starting to be filled in but they have also started to erode again within a week. I do not think the quality of the repairing is particularly well done. I was just wondering how long this commitment to fix small holes will continue until the diversion is finished?

The Connétable of St. John:

There are different types of repairs that can be done to roads. You can plug a hole, you can fully repair a hole, you can reinstate a part of the road. The team are working with the Parishes to try and do our best with them. The byroads remain the responsibility of the Parishes and we are trying to take a reasonable approach. This work will accommodate around about a fifth of the Island pumping stations as far west as St. Mary and as far east as the Zoo. It is a considerable amount of volume that goes down St. John's Main Road to Bellozanne. We are going to double the capacity and be able to join up homes that have not enjoyed mains drains for decades and new homes as well.

4.10 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Will the Minister provide an update on the project to redesign and redevelop F.B. Fields?

The Connétable of St. John:

I thank the Deputy for her question. The focus of the F.B. Fields, we are working with the Table Tennis Association to get them back into their home. It is over 2 years since they were forced out due to Storm Ciarán. There has been no further formal works done on that area at the moment.

4.10.1 Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson:

F.B. Fields would be one of the key sites for hosting a future Island Games. What assurances can the Minister give that the Island will have the right facilities to host in future, and indeed is it still the plan for the Island to bid to host?

The Connétable of St. John:

I am delighted to confirm that certainly is still the plan to host and that the F.B. would form a major part of that with athletics. What we need to do is find a resolution for cricket first of all, and that is where our focus of attention has been, to give cricket an international-sized pitch. We are in the top 30 in the world, we need to give the cricket players the relevant opportunities to play. Then once the cricket is resolved then we will be able to do some detailed work on the F.B.

4.11 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:

Can the Minister give an update on the project development on the Safer Roads to School for St. Saviour?

The Connétable of St. John:

I understand we were due to meet with representatives of St. Saviour recently to talk about the detailed project. There has been significant work undertaken and there is still significant work to do. I look forward to that detailed briefing with officers and Members.

4.12 The Connétable of Trinity:

Could I just ask the Minister to expand on the answer he gave just now about the extent that the drainage system will be improved in the north of the Island with the works currently undergoing? Because my inquiries of the department for those residents in Trinity who do not enjoy mains drains connection is that there is still another 500 metres of drainage in St. John's Main Road or the Grande Route de St. Jean that will be required before we can bring on the pumping station at Ville-a-L'Eveque and the pumping station at the Zoo.

The Connétable of St. John:

There is probably more than a kilometre that we need to do because we need to not stop at Sion but go up as far as Hautes Croix. I am not sure of the details of each pumping station and how they connect but properties in Trinity I am sure will be able to connect to some of the works that have been done. But further work will be needed in local areas to extend the mains drains in the local area. This work we are doing is an enabler so that more homes can join.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. That brings that period of questions to an end.

5. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Minister for International Development

The Bailiff:

We now have the second period of questions to the Minister for International Development

5.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

As the Jersey Overseas Aid 5-year Strategic Plan concludes in 2026, could the Minister outline what arrangements will be put in place to provide an objective assessment of J.O.A.'s (Jersey Overseas

Aid) impact and value for money, and will this include an independent review to inform the development of the next strategy?

Deputy C.F. Labey of Grouville and St. Martin (The Minister for International Development):

The short answer to that is yes. We have already explored an independent external evaluation. We will be conducting that now to set in train the preparation for our Strategic Plan, which will need to be rewritten, as the Deputy says, from 2027 to 2031.

5.1.1 Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Does the Minister believe that the themes that Jersey Overseas Aid has developed over the last 5 years - and in some cases extremely well - will be continued and looked at as an important part of the future Strategic Plan moving forward?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

Personally, I would like to see them continue. I think the chosen themes add value to our projects. As I have said many times, it is not only about giving the finance, we also can add to that by giving our expertise that we have here on-Island with Conservation Livelihoods, dairy and Financial Inclusion. Personally, I would possibly extend those themes to include climate and climate considerations but that would need to be explored with the new commission.

5.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

Considering that 2025 has been a challenging year internationally, what would the Minister say have been her best achievements?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

If I could highlight a few. I had a meeting with U.N. (United Nations) World Food Programme when we were very concerned about getting aid into Gaza. Participating in a bilateral meeting like that was an achievement. We co-chaired the U.N. O.C.H.A. (Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs) Pooled Fund Working Group here, which attracted a host of international delegates to the Island. We also hosted the Start Network again, attracting a lot of international delegates to the Island. I met on Teams, it has got to be said, Deputy Strachan from Guernsey after their elections to try and forge a working relationship with them and to share insights and our approach to international development. We have engaged over 1,000 Islanders, young people in schools with our partners, and deployed 38 volunteers in our community work projects.

The Bailiff:

Minister, we are not quorum, so forgive me for a moment. We will get some more Members into the Assembly.

Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Just as a matter of interest, could I ask how many Members have joined online today?

The Greffier of the States:

Just one.

The Bailiff:

Just one only. Yes, Minister, you can continue.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

The only thing I was going to add to that, and it does not count specifically for 2025 for last year, is most recently in January we hosted a Conservation Livelihoods Conference in Cambridge that attracted 19 different countries and over 100 delegates.

5.2.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis:

I thank the Minister for that answer. What will her priorities be in her work programme for the remainder of the year?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

As I have just alluded to, we will be conducting an international external evaluation of J.O.A.'s programmes in preparation for the Strategic Plan. I intend to launch a new programme for our J.P.O.s (Junior Programme Officers). Historically we have used U.N.H.C.R. (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees), which focuses on refugees. We are in negotiations now with U.N.I.C.E.F. (United Nations Children's Fund) to set up a similar programme with them. I think that would be a really positive move for the Island and Islanders who want to participate in those schemes. I do not know what else. We will just continue to uphold our humanitarian work with local charities and our volunteers.

[11:15]

5.3 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

Jersey Overseas Aid joined the United Nations Junior Professional Officer scheme in 2021. Participation in that enables Islanders to embark on a career within the United Nations. Will the Minister advise the Assembly what benefits she sees from our participation in that scheme?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

As I said in the answer to the last question, I am currently negotiating with U.N.I.C.E.F. But the current scheme I think offers Islanders a fantastic opportunity in international development. Because, believe it or not, it is an incredibly hard sector to get into because they will want experience. This gives Islanders experience in that field. It also means that Jersey raises its profile, and the participants in that scheme are countries like Australia, Canada, the Scandinavian countries. Jersey is up there with larger countries. It puts us in the humanitarian space in a very positive light. Yes, I think it is a wonderful opportunity for Islanders and for Jersey.

5.3.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Will the Minister advise whether we have a contract with the U.N. to continue participation and, if so, for how long will we be supporting this J.P.O. scheme?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

Commissioners make decisions on that year by year but we do have a contract with U.N.H.C.R. and we plan to continue that and extend it to U.N.I.C.E.F. as well. But it is really for Commissioners to decide; it is not just my decision.

5.4 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

I make no political comment, only by way of relieving suffering. It is my understanding that Médecins Sans Frontières has been banned from operating in Gaza. Is there another group or maybe a medical facility outside of the affected war zone that could be supported by the Minister to ease suffering?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

We do not support Médecins Sans Frontières; it is not one of our partner agencies. At the minute we are supporting M.A.P. (Medical Aid for Palestinians), as it is referred to. We have got current programmes with them.

5.5 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Just following up with Deputy Catherine Curtis's question, could the Minister perhaps address the achievements on the ground that she feels have been most impactful over the last few years?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

I am not entirely sure what that means. It could be supplying funding for emergency aid. It could be sending our volunteers to community work projects. Each of our sustainable grants actively help people on the ground, like with Dairy for Development, Conservation Livelihoods and Financial Inclusion. I think we do an awful lot of work on the ground.

5.5.1 Deputy J. Renouf:

I was hoping that the Minister might be able to say where she felt that Jersey's money had made the greatest difference to lives, to people in need.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

That is quite a difficult one. Possibly our Dairy for Development programmes that started in Rwanda and is now extended to Zambia, Malawi and Ethiopia and Nepal. This provides nutrition for children which then enables them to go to school - sorry, my voice is going - and build up skills. We started very small with single heads of households and then passed a calf on to the next head of household. Now it is extended within the region of places, rather than just villages. I think probably that, but included in that is the Financial Inclusion programme which allows any savings that people make to be banked. Yes, I think they are all very, very positive.

5.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

My question relates to the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, which the Minister has regard for. Could I ask in particular in relation to goals 5 and 16, one is about gender equality and promoting peaceful and strong institutions? What levers does the Minister have when engaging either through Overseas Aid or through her wider international development role to ensure that countries that we are dealing with that Jersey could have some influence on ensuring that these 2 goals in particular are promoted?

Deputy C.F. Labey:

I believe 3 themes that promote those 2 areas. I am sorry, could somebody get me a glass of water?

The Bailiff:

Yes, of course.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

My voice is going.

The Bailiff:

Could we have some water please for the Minister? Yes, it is in hand.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

Thank you.

The Bailiff:

There is some here.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

Thank you, I will keep going. As the Deputy may be aware, there are 17 goals but there are 5 pillars, which represent people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership. I believe each of our 3 themes recognise and overlap most of that, certainly those 5 pillars. But we represent a lot of the themes

anyway. The one that he alluded to was gender equality. The programme I have just described about giving the head of households a calf, I think that head of households is always a woman and then they pass it on. I think the Financial Inclusion, helping people and, again, mainly women be banked with their savings. I think we touch on many of the themes.

5.6.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

If I had have known I would have probably asked about development goal 6, which is access to clean water. My question has a context. I was contacted by a member of the public who was concerned about the situation in Syria since the change of regime, where he thinks that there has been a rollback on human rights and especially when it comes to women's rights in the country and the way women are treated. I was wondering if the Minister could talk specifically about whether she has any interaction with Syria and whether this is something which is on her radar and how involvement of Jersey over there. If it is not being done, how that might help and if Jersey is in that area, what it can do specifically to exert soft influence in those areas.

The Bailiff:

Minister, you have got 9 seconds to tell us about Syria.

Deputy C.F. Labey:

OK. I would say it is a bit early to tell what is going to happen after the Bashar regime. I did in fact visit Syria in October and I was pleasantly surprised with how the society is, and there is a lot of positivity post-Bashar. It is a case of wait and see, I think.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much for that, Minister.

6. Questions to Ministers without notice - The Chief Minister

The Bailiff:

The third period of questions is for the Chief Minister and the first question is from Deputy Warr, then Deputy Catherine Curtis.

6.1 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

Sorry, just I did not think I was going to be called quite as quickly as this, so let us just pull this up on screen. How often has Jersey's Government been consulted by the Home Office when it comes to cannabis policy?

Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St Ouen and St. Peter (The Chief Minister):

I would have to check, I am not sure what communications and the number of communications that have taken place between Jersey and the U.K. on this matter. I know there have been some but I could not give the exact figure.

6.1.1 Deputy D.J. Warr:

Would he be able to come back to me on that? My next question then, the follow-up question, and I am hoping I will get a written regular response to this, is have representatives from the Home Office visited Jersey cannabis production sites in the last 12 months to discuss Jersey's cannabis production?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

First of all, I just want to make clear Jersey would ask to consult with the Home Office, not the other way round. It would be unusual for that. Through our licensing regime, I understand through the international cannabis rules, our licences are vetted by a team from the U.K. Home Office, but other than that I can provide no further details.

The Bailiff:

The second question has not been answered, has it, your supplementary?

Deputy D.J. Warr:

No, Sir. Have representatives from the Home Office visited Jersey cannabis production sites in the last 12 months?

The Bailiff:

Chief Minister, can you answer that question?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I presume if they were visiting with a view to commenting on giving a licence, I would think the answer to that would be yes. But I do not know, I would have to check with the relevant Ministerial team.

6.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

There were soldiers from Jersey who fought in Afghanistan, would the Chief Minister be willing to say something in recognition of the bravery and service of those soldiers, bearing in mind the dismissive comments made by President Trump since of our last day's Assembly sitting?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

The men and women who served did so with courage, professionalism and a deep sense of duty. They operated in extraordinary difficult circumstances, dangerous circumstances, far from home. I want to place on record, might if I may, our respect as an Assembly for all those from Jersey who served alongside our allies and for their families who shared the burden of service. I would disassociate myself and the Government from any comments made by others contrary to this.
[Approbation]

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

I just thank the Chief Minister for his comments. I had spoken to an ex-soldier and I know how much that hurts, those remarks from the United States.

6.3 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

The Chief Minister recently put out a social media post regarding the phase out of internal combustion engine cars in which he characterised the U.K. position as: "The United Kingdom has proposed 2030 but with flexibility and ongoing debate." How does the Chief Minister justify characterising the U.K.'s position as flexibility with ongoing debate, given that the U.K.'s consultation finished some time ago? The U.K. position is that all new cars will be either zero emissions or hybrids from 2030.

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I believe that Ministers from the U.K. have expressed there would be flexibility. I cannot remember the exact details, the Prime Minister made a statement along the lines that they were sticking with that target for now. I personally think that while I support the principle of that, we need to ensure that Jersey moves at a pace that is suitable, appropriate and practicable for Jersey. There is no point us moving ahead of markets, moving ahead of how products are manufactured. The point of my social media post was to direct Islanders to the consultation that was taking place. But for the avoidance of doubt I do believe we need to be flexible and pragmatic on our approach. I think it is well worth in the early part of the new Assembly reconsidering our targets to make sure they are still achievable.

6.3.1 Deputy J. Renouf:

Does the Chief Minister recognise that the longer we keep importing internal combustion engine vehicles the harder we make it to get to our 2050 deadline?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

No, I do not. I believe we can still reach our target of 2050 with some sensible and practical flexibility.

[11:30]

6.4 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will stick on the theme that was raised by my St. Brelade colleague. Does the Chief Minister think that there is another angle to consider with the reduction in combustion engine cars, which is that Jersey could promote itself and do so perhaps more quickly as a clean-air Island, and that what is considered now a fringe benefit could be one of the central benefits to reduce pollution on our roads for our children but also for those visiting the Island?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

I think we could do that. I think that would be a good idea. But, as I said before, we want to make sure it is practicable. There is no point in doing that if it is going to cause more challenges, more disadvantages for Islanders and create challenges for businesses. We are lucky we have clean air generally speaking. I do accept we have a lot of cars on our roads. But I think it is about finding the right balance and the right pathway to get to where we want to be and not doing it at any cost. If we were to jump ahead of the rest of Europe and the U.K., then we would find ourselves, I think, in great difficulty because the availability of cars would not match our needs. I also think we should wait to see how other low fossil emission forms of energy are being developed, rather than putting all of our eggs into the electric car market basket.

6.4.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

I do wonder what the reticence is on behalf of Government. Is it one that he is worried that people simply will not be able to afford to buy electric vehicles? If that is the case, is it not that there needs to be schemes to assist with the transition from fossil fuels to electric, given that the whole back story, I can only see positives about going electric? It is a case of how we get there and how we take people along. Is the main consideration, to reiterate, one of cost for families in Jersey?

Deputy L.J. Farnham:

It is one of practicality and reality. If I just refer to my post that was mentioned before: "Jersey is committed to tackling climate change but the requirement to begin phasing out importation of petrol and diesel engines could be not practical by 2030. While electric and other low-emission vehicles are improving the uptake and uptake is growing, a 2030 deadline would move faster than the market infrastructure and affordability may allow, particularly on-Island, with limited vehicle supply, higher cost and constraints on charging provisions. International comparisons show that Jersey would be moving ahead of most comparable jurisdictions." That is what I was basing my comments on and urging people to participate in the consultation. I agree we must push forward with this but at a realistic timeline, which might be different to the 2030 we are currently targeting.

The Bailiff:

Any more questions for the Chief Minister? If there are no further questions for the Chief Minister, that brings the period of questions to an end. Moving to the Order Paper, there is nothing under J or K.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

7. Reduction of Lodging Period

The Bailiff:

Before we begin Public Business, a decision needs to be taken about whether to reduce the minimum lodging period in respect of certain items on the Order Paper. Firstly, Chair of the Privileges and Procedures Committee, do you make the proposition under Standing Order 26(7) that the lodging period be reduced to allow the third amendment to the amendment to Standing Orders Code of Conduct be debated at this meeting?

7.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

Indeed, I do.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition? Those in favour kindly show. Thank you very much. The proposition is adopted and the lodging period is reduced. Minister for Social Security, there are 3 matters which I think you have kindly effectively brought forward to this meeting to ensure that there is a slightly lesser burden at the next meeting, end of February. Is it your proposition that the lodging period should be reduced in respect of 3 matters lodged by you, namely the Draft Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Jersey) Amendment Regulations, the Draft Social Security (Health and Christmas Bonus) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations and the Draft Employment and Discrimination (Jersey) Amendment Law so that they can be debated at this meeting?

7.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

Yes, and you are correct. The only reason I am doing this is to help spread the work across the next few sittings.

The Bailiff:

Yes, thank you very much. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition? Those in favour of adopting the proposition, can you please kindly show? Thank you very much. The proposition is adopted and the 3 lodging periods are reduced.

8. Draft Marriage and Civil Partnership (Dissolution and Separation) (Jersey) Law 202-(P.85/2025) - deferral of debate to 24th February 2026

The Bailiff:

The first item of Public Business is the Draft Marriage and Civil Partnership (Dissolution and Separation) (Jersey) Law lodged by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. The debate is listed to resume following adoption of the principles on 25th November last. Deputy Catherine Curtis, is it right that your panel wishes to seek a deferral of this matter until the end of February?

8.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

This date was agreed and this is 3 meetings after the adoption of the principles and you wish to postpone the matter until the 4th meeting, is that correct?

Deputy C.D. Curtis

Yes.

The Bailiff:

I think that is really a matter for Members. That is your proposition. Is that seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition that this matter be put back to the end of February?

8.1.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:

Yes, I am fully supportive of the request from this panel. As Members will appreciate, there has been significant work in relation to this remit under the Justice and Home Affairs. They have been having to review a lot of legislation and this is one piece that they would like to be able to further ... they have been consulting with stakeholders and they have got one or 2 items that they wish to complete. I have agreed that and I would ask Members to do likewise.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Does any other Member wish to speak on this proposition? Deputy Curtis, do you wish to respond?

8.1.2 Deputy C.D. Curtis:

Yes. Thank you. Just to say that the panel asked for this deferral because there are still outstanding issues on legal points which we are trying to resolve. Members may have seen the letters from the Jersey Family Law Association which have been published on the States Assembly website, but there has been progress since this was called in: an amendment lodged by the Minister, a meeting with the Minister to discuss the way forward and a meeting arranged with a family division judge. Following this, the panel will be in a position to complete our review. I thank the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs for her support in this matter, and I ask Members to support the deferral.

The Bailiff:

Thank you. Those in favour of adopting the proposition kindly show. Thank you very much. The proposition is adopted and the matter will be debated on 24th February.

9. Draft Public Records (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.95/2025) - as amended (P.95/2025 Amd.)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Public Records (Jersey) Amendment Law lodged by the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development. The main respondent is the chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel. May I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Greffier of the States:

Draft Public Records (Jersey) Amendment Law 202-. A law to amend the Public Records (Jersey) Law 2002. The States, subject to the sanction of His Most Excellent Majesty in Council, have adopted the following law.

9.1 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

I just wanted to check whether it could be read as amended because we have an amendment too.

The Bailiff:

I think we come to that after the principles have been proposed when we come to the Articles.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

OK, I wanted to check. I get confused there. Thank you, Sir. This draft amendment to the law would, if passed by the Assembly, amend the Public Records (Jersey) Law 2002. Before we discuss the proposed amendment to the law, I would first like to thank Members and officers of the Economic International Affairs Scrutiny Panel for the work they have done, particularly around our amendment

to the amendment and for providing supportive comments on these proposed changes. The proposed changes were originally made by the Records Advisory Panel as part of their statutory duties within the existing law. This is the first time that the law has been reviewed since its introduction more than 20 years ago and did not warrant a major overhaul. However, it was considered that there were significant areas where changes were needed to ensure that the law remains fit for purpose. At this point, I would like to pay tribute to the Records Advisory Panel, a voluntary body, for bringing this proposal to my attention. Their work over the last 20 years has been vital to the good conduct and running of Jersey's public records functions. It is worth noting, before we go much further, what the purpose of the law itself is. Namely, the Public Records Law is a law relating to records concerning States functions and other public functions in Jersey relating to access to those records when they become archives and conferring various functions on the Jersey Heritage Trust, the Archivist and the Records Advisory Panel. To be clear, the proposed amendments do not put any further onus on existing administrations and their recordkeeping. The proposed changes are to amend the definition of administration of the States to mirror the Freedom of Information (Jersey) Law 2011 in order to be consistent, to broaden the definition of a public record, which currently states the creation and receivership: "... by a public institution in the performance of its functions" to now include whether it was created or received in Jersey or elsewhere, while every effort was considered to try and define an entity that is an administration of the States or corporation owned by the same on which the States have a controlling interest so as to not require a schedule of public institutions. This proved rather complicated owing to the nature of how different all of these public institutions have been created. As such, and in line with other jurisdictions such as the U.K. and the Isle of Man, the amendments propose the introduction of a schedule of institutions to clarify which bodies are captured by the draft law and avoid areas where there has previously been uncertainty. This proposed schedule will be introduced by regulations made under the amendment law. Subject to approval, this proposed schedule may be amended by order of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development on the recommendation of the Records Advisory Panel. Further, the Amendment Law provides if there is a dispute by a body being categorised as a public institution under an administration of the States or corporation owned by the States or in which the States have a controlling interest, they have the right to refer the matter to the Minister for consideration and a decision. The most significant changes relate to the role and responsibility of the Archivist, and both their principal duties and other functions have been refined and amalgamated to make it clearer. Conscious of the positive relationships that have been developed between the Archivist, her team, and the various bodies who have provided records to Jersey Archive, it was felt that there was not a need to introduce fines or other penalties for those organisations in breach of the law. As such, the initial amendment proposed in Article 7 of the draft Amendment Law that inserts subparagraph 2A into Article 38 of the primary law that states: "If the Records Advisory Panel are made aware that a public institution is in breach of its duty of records management under the law, it will advise the Minister who may, on the advice of the panel, take the necessary steps to remedy the breach." At this point, I would like to highlight my proposed amendment to the draft law amendment relating to Article 38. I acknowledge that it was an amendment made late in the day and my decision in doing so has been informed by further concerns raised by the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the States Greffe. The particular context of the original Article 38 amendment, as previously highlighted, is that it is the Records Advisory Panel which becomes aware that a public institution is in breach of its records duty and it accordingly may notify the Minister, who may then take the steps that he or she considers necessary. That is under Article 2A. This includes but is not limited to: "... directing the public institution to remedy the breach with the assistance of the Archivist." That latter part is Article 2B. The word "direct" is used in multiple contexts already in the Public Records Law, for example in relation to both directions for the Records Advisory Panel and the Archivist. However, while "direct" is an undefined term and does not carry any sanction for non-adherence, the context is still the Minister directing, which appears at odds with the spirit and intention of the States of Jersey Law 2005 and the Departments of the Judiciary and the Legislature (Jersey) Law 1965. To confirm, this amendment is clarificatory

and does not affect the operation of subparagraph 2B before it. The overall effect would still be the availability of essentially political solutions but, and I think it is really important and I am grateful to the Scrutiny Panel for looking at this, by removing Article 2B through the amendment to the amendment what we are doing is we are avoiding the constitutional clash between that States of Jersey Law, which quite appropriately provides for the separation of the Executive from the Judiciary and the Legislature, and so avoids the Minister being able to direct the Judiciary or the Legislature in that area.

[11:45]

By keeping Article 2A, we still create the ability for remedies to be put in place but not in any way directed. While penalties are not being proposed, the Archivist may name a public body who has been in breach of its duty in its statutory annual report or other reports detailing the steps taken to the remedy of records management. Finally, and certainly not least, the proposed amendments require the Minister to publish a Code of Practice, which is detailed in the law, to assist public institutions with the performance of their duty of records management. A copy of the draft Code of Practice has been included in the proposition. This draft code was circulated to those institutions covered by the proposed draft amendments to the legislation in spring 2025 and was welcomed. Subject to the Assembly's support, this draft law will come into force by Ministerial Order and the schedule of institutions included in the draft regulations will be lodged simultaneously. I commend these amendments to the law and ask the motion be put forward.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the principles? Deputy Ahier and then Connétable of St. Brelade.

9.1.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North:

I would just like to comment on Article 7 of the draft Amendment Law, which would alter the provisions of Article 8 of the principal law. I am grateful to the Minister for the amendment he has lodged as it addresses a point of concern identified by P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) when it considered the law. P.P.C. is not a Scrutiny Panel but we do consider upcoming business at each meeting in case there are matters of relevance to P.P.C.'s remit. Article 7, as originally drafted, would have given the Minister a power to direct public institutions to remedy any breach of their duty of records management. Within the law, the States Greffe and other non-Ministerial departments are counted as public institutions and the Minister would therefore have had a power to direct the States Greffe, the Greffe being responsible for the administration of the Assembly's records. P.P.C. had 2 concerns about the Article as originally drafted. One was on a matter of principle. Was it appropriate for a Government Minister to have such authority over the Assembly's records in light of the separation of powers and the Assembly's constitutional independence? An important part of States Assembly privilege is that the Assembly manages its own affairs. The second question was a practical one. How could the Minister direct the States Greffe when the States of Jersey Law states the Greffe is not subject to Ministerial direction? Similar provisions exist for other non-Ministerial departments in other legislation. We are therefore grateful for the amendment. Article 7, as it now stands, would still allow for the Minister to bring breaches to the attention of the States Greffe. It is just that explicit power of direction has been removed. P.P.C. otherwise had no concerns regarding the operation of the Amendment Law. In administering the Assembly's records, the States Greffe already works to the provision to principal law, and it will work to these new provisions as well. This may seem like a small matter, but it is important that the Assembly's operation and privileges are considered when legislation is developed that may impact on there. I give notice to the Chief Minister that I will write to him to ask that there is direct consultation with P.P.C. in future when it is considering a draft law or regulations that could impact on the Assembly in that way.

9.1.2 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

The Comité, if I can speak for the Comité, has not discussed this at all, other than it being on forthcoming States business, but we note it is a draft law so requires Privy Council approval in due course and a commencement date to be agreed. I raise this because on page 12 there is also annex A setting out the role of the designated manager for public institution, and that this will vary according to the institution's size. Given that Parishes will be inevitably involved, we feel there may be a cost implication, although the Minister in the outset indicated there would not be a cost. I would appreciate clarity on that. We feel that when the report says that no financial staffing implications will occur, this only refers to government departments, as per Standing Orders, but there is no indication of when the commencement date envisaged might be. That will certainly have an implication of Parishes and their staffing, and we would need a lead-in time to consider that. We do have the retention schedule agreed with the Jersey Archive under the Public Records Law and that, of course, is due to be reviewed at present. I would appreciate the Minister's comments regarding the cost implications.

The Bailiff:

There was another light on over here, but I did not write down the name. Sorry.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

This side, I think, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Was it you, was it?

Deputy M. Tadier:

I did have my light on. I do not know if ...

The Bailiff:

In that case, it may have been you. Sorry. Deputy Tadier.

9.1.3 Deputy M. Tadier:

I will try not to have a conversation sitting down. I respond as the Economic International Affairs Scrutiny Panel chair. First of all, we did issue initial comments originally in the middle of January. We are happy with the body of the proposition. We recognise that the Public Records Law does need to be updated, and we also recognise the good work that goes on from the Archivist and the associated bodies. We also note that there was an amendment which came fairly late in the day and therefore it was not really appropriate for us to debate it, I do not think. We wanted some time as a Scrutiny Panel to look at this, as the chair of P.P.C. has explained, and I will speak to the amendment specifically. The amendment does propose removing a specific provision. Formally it was Article 38(2B) which would have allowed the Minister, if notified of a breach of records management duty, to direct the public institution to remedy the breach with the assistance of the Archivist. As a result of this removal, we asked the following questions recently as part of our short scrutiny of this: why this power had been included in the original draft, why the Minister now proposed to remove it, whether its removal would weaken accountability or enforcement and whether alternative means exist to achieve compliance in remedying a breach? Government officers advised us that, as drafted, the Records Advisory Panel identifies breaches and may notify the Minister. The Minister may then take any steps considered necessary to address the breach. The term "direction" already appears elsewhere in the Public Records Law in relation to both the R.A.P. (Records Advisory Panel) and the Archivist of Ministerial direction over independent institutions. Sorry, the direction of independent institutions could be interpreted as inconsistent with the States of Jersey Law 2005 and Departments of the Judiciary and the Legislature under the 1965 law, which requires independence from

Ministerial interference. The panel understands the rationale provided. It appears that the Minister wishes to avoid any implication of direct Ministerial authority over public institutions where constitutional independence must be maintained. The panel considers this explanation reasonable and asks that the Minister explicitly confirm the reasoning for this during the debate, if he has not done already. He may have done that in the opening remarks sufficiently. The reason for this is we want to make sure that Members can be assured that the power is being removed for constitutional consistency rather than in any practical way of limiting oversight. With regard to the impact of removing the power to direct the panel, the second concern was whether removing this Article would materially weaken the enforcement framework for public records management, specifically the panel sought assurance that the Minister would still be able to take suitable action when notified of a breach and that the R.A.P.'s oversight function would not be diminished. Officers confirmed that Article 38 remains unchanged, Article 38(2A) that is. Under 38(2A) when the R.A.P. becomes aware of a breach, it may notify the Minister who may then take any steps considered necessary on the advice of the R.A.P. This provides a broad and flexible power for the Minister to respond to breaches without the specific term "direct". Therefore, the removal of 2B does not prevent the Minister from requiring remedial steps. The panel's view, on the basis of the advice and evidence that we have received, is that we are satisfied that the removal of the Article does not reduce the Minister's functional ability to address breaches. The Minister retains the capacity to act on the advice given by the R.A.P. To conclude, having reviewed the Minister's amendments, the removal of the Minister's power to direct is intended to avoid any constitutional ambiguity but the core enforcement mechanism remains fully operational. There is, therefore, no material weakening of the draft law's intent or effectiveness in remedying such a breach. With that, our panel is happy to recommend both the adoption of the amendment which is being proposed as amended and the underlying change.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on the principles? I call upon the Minister to reply.

9.1.4 Deputy K.F. Morel:

I thank all Members who have spoken. I would like to thank the chair of P.P.C. for bringing his concerns to my attention, and I was very pleased to try and deal with those concerns. I believe, to Deputy Tadier's question, I did try to say in my earlier speech that the reasoning was entirely constitutional, and I do not want any part of this amendment to the law to create a constitutional friction. That is why Article 38(2B), we have the amendment to delete that from the proposition. With regard to the Connétable of St. Brelade, the cost implications, as the Connétable said, Parishes already have retention schedules agreed with the Archive. Really, this is what this law is about. It is about ensuring that the appropriate public institutions engage with the Archive, create retention schedules and then work and operate according to those retention schedules. From that perspective, I do not see any cost implications for the Parishes because, as the Connétable already said, that is the work that they have already done. In that sense, there is no direct impact from this. I think it is really important, while the Public Records Law is, perhaps, a law that people do not look at very often, it is a law which ultimately all of us benefit from and all Islanders benefit from because it creates that archive of our history and our heritage long into the future, long after we are all gone. I know that many families in Jersey, just at the very family level, enjoy using the Archive to help research their family records, and obviously at a political level it is fascinating to read about the past politics of the Island and the past governance of the Island and to learn about those things. The Jersey Archive has records that date back to the 14th century and I believe we are in a wonderfully fortunate position of being able to sit in this small Island and have such a strong record of our history because it is our history that will guide us as we go forward. I may have said this before; I still remember when I was a child at Benest's of Millbrook. They had a big sign and the sign just said ... it was a quote. I am trying to think who the quote was from. It was not Shelly; it was somebody else. It said: "All our past proclaims our future." Mr. Benest had that very big sign right next to the front entrance to

Benest's and it has always stuck in my mind. Really that is what the Public Records Law is about. It is about our past helping to guide us into our future. I would like to thank the Scrutiny Panel for their work. I would particularly like to thank the Archivist and her team and the Records Advisory Panel for their work as well because they do an incredible amount of work helping to guard Jersey's history. They do it on a voluntary basis and for that I really do thank them. With that, I would call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting and if all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 43		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				

Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Deputy Tadier, can you confirm your panel have scrutinised this matter?

[12:00]

Deputy M. Tadier (Chair, Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. Minister, do you wish to propose the Articles as amended by your small amendment in Second Reading?

9.2 Deputy K.F. Morel:

Yes, Sir, I do.

The Bailiff:

Are Members content for the Articles to be taken as amended? Thank you. Minister, how do you wish to propose the Articles?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I would like to propose them *en bloc*, please.

The Bailiff:

Are the Articles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the Articles in Second Reading? Those in favour of adopting the Articles, kindly show. Thank you very much. The Articles are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

9.3 Deputy K.F. Morel:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the Articles as adopted in Third Reading?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I call for the appel, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

If no one wishes to speak, the appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats, and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the chance to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the draft law has been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				

Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

10. Amendments to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct lodged by the Privileges and Procedures Committee. Chair of P.P.C., I think there are 3 amendments all to be considered separately. Is that right?

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion to make the following amendment to the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey, with immediate effect - to replace the Code of Conduct for elected Members contained in Schedule 3 to the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey with the revised Code of Conduct contained in Appendix 1 to the report accompanying the proposition.

10.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

P.P.C. is bringing this revised Code of Conduct for debate today following an extensive consultation period which started in 2024. On 3 occasions, we went out to Members for comments. Firstly, seeking suggested changes and then asking for comments on the revised drafts. We also held briefings and redrafted the code to reflect the feedback given. P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures

Committee) looked at the codes of other Parliaments, both big and small, deciding to move to a rules-based format so that the code would be more accessible and clearer, not just for us as Members but also for the public. The present code is quite wordy, set out in long paragraphs and open to interpretation, whereas short, succinct rules grouped under relative headings make it far easier to find the relevant rule and hopefully also easier to understand. Much of the original code remains. All we have done is rephrase parts to make them shorter and clearer. New elements have been added to reflect the feedback received from Members during the consultation, particularly in relation to behaviours, with clear definitions of bullying, discrimination, harassment, and unwanted behaviour now included. There are also new rules to reflect the way in which Members are expected to engage with the Commissioner for Standards and any investigatory process. We need to have rules with which we can all comply. There is no point making them unrealistic or overly technical. None of this is intended to catch Members out or give rise to increased complaints to the Commissioner, quite the opposite in fact. With trust in the Assembly repeatedly reported as low in Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Surveys and our voter turnout among the lowest in the world, we have to consider how we are perceived by the public. I am sure that none of us feels that lack of trust in us is deserved. Members of this Assembly are dedicated to public service and committed to high ethical standards in public life. This revised code helps us to demonstrate that in all we do. It makes a commitment to the public that we will act on their behalf in an objective, honest and accountable manner. I make the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Chair. Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]**

10.2 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): second amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.(2))

The Bailiff:

We now move to considering the first amendment to be debated, which is the second amendment lodged by Deputy Scott, and I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

Page 2 - after the words “Appendix 1 to the report accompanying the proposition” there should be inserted the words - “, except that within Appendix 1, Part 1, paragraph 1 the words ‘assist elected Members in the discharge of their obligations to the States, their constituents and the public of Jersey’ should be substituted with the words ‘set out the principles and rules governing Members’ conduct to support good governance and public accountability’.”

10.2.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

I think the real question when we think about why we should even be amending the Code of Conduct is parliamentary culture, what it should be. I am most aware that it is very difficult for States Members to be enforcing a Code of Conduct against other States Members. We have to act together in this sort of thing. We do look to the public to some extent to enforce it too. I have done a lot of work recently in the area of complaints and finding that often the public are not even aware how to complain and what they should do to complain. While I really did not wish to make any further comment on this Code of Conduct, I had previously raised this issue with the P.P.C. that the purpose of the code as currently stated did not really mention the public and the value of the code as a tool of accountability at all. Currently, the proposed draft says: “The purpose of the Code of Conduct is to assist elected Members in the discharge of their obligations to the States, their constituents and the public of Jersey.” It is described as a tool to assist States Members. It sounds a bit like it is some sort of perk or an H.R. (human resources) tool, but I would say that our duty is to act in the interests of the public and this is our document to say: “This is how you can make us accountable. This is what you can expect of us.” On that basis, the wording that I have proposed is there to respect the

simplicity of the code while importing this language that basically is saying that the purpose of this code sets out the principles and rules governing Members' conduct to support good governance and public accountability. I did not expect my amendment to be controversial but the P.P.C. did not accept it, and now is the opportunity for the members to explain why because I would be happy to respond.

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the amendment?

10.2.2 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

As the Member who is bringing this amendment has just mentioned, obviously the P.P.C. did not necessarily formally agree with both of the Deputy's amendments. I think this is more why we are having the debate over both, because we could not necessarily agree on both the amendments. When it comes to the Deputy's first amendment, my initial reflection is this is just a choice of wording. It is one way or another. Is the word "assist" - to assist us in our day to day - clear enough in the fact that the code is something we should be living by and working by? Is that too soft? Is it the clarity that she sets out in her amendment that these are the principles and rules because they are things that we should be doing, especially in maintaining public confidence as well as maintaining confidentiality and to remember there should be repercussions if you break the rules by which we are supposed to be working by. I do not necessarily think there is anything wrong with either way the proposed by P.P.C. changes or the amendment changes but personally I like the Member's adjustment because I rather the clarity being that it says principles and rules that we should be delivering for good public accountability. I will be supporting the Deputy's amendment on this one.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on this amendment? If no one wishes to speak, then I call upon Deputy Scott to reply.

10.2.3 Deputy M.R. Scott:

I thank you for the one Member who was prepared to speak, and I thank him for his support. Without further ado, just because at least the votes are transparent, I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had to opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the amendment has been adopted:

POUR: 31		CONTRE: 8		ABSTAINED: 2
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of Trinity		Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy R.S. Kovacs
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy M. Tadier		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy R.J. Ward		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy C.S. Alves		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy H.M. Miles		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
Deputy G.P. Southern				

Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

10.3 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.)

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the next amendment lodged by Deputy Scott, and I ask the Greffier to read that amendment.

The Greffier of the States:

Page 2 – after the words “Appendix 1 to the report accompanying the proposition” there should be inserted the words – “, except that within Appendix 1, Rule 11 should be amended to insert the words ‘whether physical or digital,’ after the words ‘facilities and services’.”

10.3.1 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Again, I suggested an amendment of the Code of Conduct with hesitation but, again, I felt that it was in the public’s interest to bring forward this amendment to remove some ambiguity which I do not believe would be in the public interest if it is not resolved. States Members may remember supporting the Cyber Security Law that I brought in the last sitting, and this has become very prominent in terms of the needs of public interest, protecting the security of systems and that we all need to show leadership here. In the course of this work, I have become too aware of people who work in this area

who do attempt to, and do a lot of work, trying to protect systems but it cannot just be done by technology alone. It has to be done by people following certain rules and really being observant when using those systems. There is an argument that you might say that the wording of this rule, that: “Members must ensure that the use of facilities and services provided to them” could include a system but, in fact, the system is a means of providing a service. It is ambiguous and, in fact, I did research on this because I thought: “Am I being picky? Am I being over anxious here?” I did some research that suggested that generally this sort of language has applied to physical spaces. The neatest way of resolving that ambiguity was to just insert the words “physical or digital” so we all can be clear that we do have a responsibility, some leadership to show and in bringing this States Assembly in a modern age where technology, systems and networks - very much part of the communication facilities of this modern age - are brought into our Code of Conduct. With this, I move that proposition. Thank you.

[12:15]

The Bailiff:

Is the amendment seconded? **[Seconded]**

10.3.2 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

I want to speak on this because I have a number of questions and points to make before I could support this amendment for some particular reasons. The report says that this would assist with the Cyber Security Law, but do we not have to be compliant with the Cyber Security Law because it is the law? Let us not add another level of red tape, if you like, for Members. We talk a lot about red tape, that there needs to be something as part of our Code of Conduct. It is very difficult to define what we mean by digital in these terms. Already we have talked about networks. We have heard about all sorts of quite vague references to what we mean by digital. This puts best practice into the Code of Conduct. This is where I think we all, as Members of this Assembly, need to think very carefully. Best practice is exactly that. It is best practice, but it is not perfection. If you miss perfection because you have missed some sort of best practice - and I will come back to this later - you now are looking at: “That is a breach of the Code of Conduct.” We have to think very, very carefully as to what we mean by that. For example, and there are some genuine questions here, does this mean any use of a device not directly linked is a breach of conduct? For example, if one decides you are going to ... I see people doing this all the time. I see States Members doing this and Ministers and others. You sit by your laptop. You are sat by your desk answering emails and you start eating your sandwich because you have got to eat something. You are trying to have a bit of a break, and you think: “Oh, I am going to check the weather for the weekend because I see the time of the Jersey Bulls game on Saturday.” Am I breaching the Code of Conduct because that is not directly related to my work? It is something I am just generally interested in. It may seem a flippant comment, but we are in the realms there if we are going to say to ourselves: “Our Code of Conduct is all usage of our digital devices that is not directly linked to work.” We have to consider that. There are issues about home working. If I am working at home on my digital device, does my home at that time become a physical environment whereby I have to have the same controls over the physical environment in an office or in the States building, i.e. do I have to say to other people: “Do not come into the room”? We have to consider this. Is that a breach of the Code of Conduct? When we are working online, there is an issue on that. It may be the right thing to do, and Members have to make that decision, but we need to have some clarity as to what that means for us. Rule 9 mentions digital medium, by the way. That is already there. Digital medium is mentioned in Rule 9 of the Code of Conduct that is being brought to the Assembly. Rule 11 includes services, which includes I.T. services. They are already there in the Code of Conduct, so we are referring to them. Does digital refer to emails? If so, how will this be checked? We will have to have monitoring of all emails to confirm that we have not breached a Code of Conduct by sending an email that is not directly linked to work. If I email - I do not know, I cannot think of an example now - a friend just to say: “I will

meet you at 4.00 p.m., as we said”, but it is not directly linked to work, have I breached the Code of Conduct and is that a serious breach? We are going to have to monitor that. This aims to remove ambiguity, but it could create some grey areas. Is this only States devices or is this devices that are our own private devices that we use for States accounts? Is this private email accounts because we are linked to our private email accounts by the fact that we are, I suppose, politically exposed persons and we always have to remember that in the background? Does it refer to social media accounts that are not directly related to our roles? This is the clarity that is needed before we accept that we are going to put these words into our Code of Conduct. There are other rules. There is a Commissioner for Standards, of course, who can make these judgments elsewhere. There also needs to be a definition when we are talking about best practice. This is linked to the Cyber Security Law, which we agreed and I agree with it; it is a good idea. Is a breach of a code for a weak password? I look at all Members in this Assembly and say: “Are you certain that your passwords are strong enough or are you going to break the Code of Conduct, if you can remember your passwords - I look at myself when I say this - because you have a weak password?” I recently got something called a privacy screen which goes across my screen so people cannot see from the sides if I am using my screen in meetings or in things that are on camera. It is a good idea. If I forget to put that privacy screen on and something is seen because I have taken the act of getting a privacy screen from the States Greffe, am I now in breach of the Code of Conduct because I have not appropriately used my privacy screen? We are getting into these real weeds here by accepting it in this way. I think I am talking myself into something here during my own speech. How about the use of wi-fi while we are travelling? If you use wi-fi while you are travelling using a States device because you want to access your email and there is a mistake, are you in breach of Code of Conduct? If you accidentally click on a phishing link - I look at one of the Members here - which are emails or links that are sent purposely for that purpose, people fall foul of them. By making a genuine error in what you are doing, you could fall foul of the Code of Conduct. I think there is a better way to do that, which is to educate and know what we are doing, and the Cyber Security Law should cover that. There is a clear overlap between the Cyber Security Law and this. Are we going to have different enforcement regimes, one for the Cyber Security Law and one for our Code of Conduct? Therefore, does a breach of a Code of Conduct issue become a statutory breach of that Code of Conduct or a breach of the law or both? Will there be a duplication of investigations into that breach? We have to know where we are going with this before we accept what seems like a subtle and not important change of the wording because I do not know what it will be. Therefore, I cannot agree this at the moment. There will have to be sanctions and will they be inconsistent? Will we have one sanction from the Cyber Security Law and one sanction from the Code of Conduct which could be significantly different for the same breach because we have added this into our Code of Conduct in a way that is undefined. Finally, I will finish off by saying the amendment says there are no financial implications. I think there are financial implications. There are training issues involved here. All of us live in a world where it is changing and we are all learning about cyber security. That is good and I absolutely support that. We need to learn but this will have to be taken account of if we are going to enter this into our Code of Conduct because if a breach of Code of Conduct was brought to me, I think it is a very fair defence to say: “I am afraid that my training was never kept up to date in that area and therefore the breach of Code of Conduct was a genuine error and not my fault.” Any Member in this Assembly who can sit there and say: “I am absolutely up to date with every single rule around it”, that is absolutely great if you are, but I think there are many of us who are not. There is also, as I say, a question of monitoring and that will cost. There will be a cost for monitoring the support for what one might call the less digitally literate Members of the Assembly. We all have different levels of digital literacy in this Assembly. That is a fact. I think mine is pretty good. Compared to others, it is pretty bad, but probably better than some others. That is a natural range of abilities that we have. Will you fall foul of the code for those reasons? I think we all need to think in this Assembly while we are sat here individually: “Will that be me?” Also, I think there will be a financial implication because if we are going to look at the devices that we use, it will be necessary that we provide all States Members with States only digital

devices to access online, including telephones and smartphones. That will have a significant cost. We receive a grant to pay at the beginning and good job we did because we would have never got through COVID without us all getting devices that were online, but that was the beginning of that. To summarise, I cannot support this at the moment because I do not think we are ready for this to be in the position that it is, and I think we have already dealt with this in the Cyber Security Law. I think we have to be very careful about what we accept in our Code of Conduct in terms of a word of “digital” that is not clearly defined, maybe undefinable and maybe unreachable, which means that the Code of Conduct becomes to some extent meaningless. I urge Members to reject this.

10.3.3 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I will be slightly more circumspect in my comments. A few weeks ago in this Assembly I was attending a primary school, and one of the questions they asked me was: “Do you ever change your mind in a debate, or have you ever been influenced to?” I said: “It happens now and again.” It has indeed happened just now in this. I am not going to say that I think this is necessarily the best or most pressing amendment that we have ever had in the Assembly, but I do think there is an intellectual consistency which means that we should not be too worried about passing it, although I will caveat that with further comments. My initial thought was that it is unnecessary to specify physical or digital and if we did it for all of the Code of Conduct and specify digital, it could be a little bit like that Monty Python sketch, which is not exactly the same, where they are sitting around in the amphitheatre. I think Reg is in the middle of a diatribe against the Roman Empire and calling his brothers to stand up and saying: “It should be the right of every man”, and I think Stan is saying: “Or women”, and it goes back like this. The question is: “Why are you so obsessed about women, Stan?” The question here could be: “Why are you so obsessed about digital, Deputy Scott?” I am not saying she is obsessed with it but that is one of her political remits. In one sense, fair play to her because she is only doing what this Assembly has asked her to do and what Ministers have asked her to do to champion digital. Then, of course, I did go back to the rest of the Code of Conduct and I see Rule 9 - I think it is Rule 9 or 10 - talks about digital interaction. It is saying when you have interaction with members of the public ... yes, Rule 9: “Members must not subject anyone to a personal attack in any communication whether verbal, written or by some form of digital medium.” Therefore, that could have been worded in a more simplistic way. It could have just said: “Members must not subject anyone to personal attack in any communication” and then left it blank because it could have been by letter, it could have been by telegram - probably do not use that anymore - or it could be in digital form. It does specify there so I think there is a consistency here which means that I am less likely to object to that on those grounds. The concerns I would have more generally is something that I think Deputy Ward has alluded to, is that what I would not want to see happening is this being used as a sword more so than a shield, if that is the correct terminology, insofar as ... or carrot and stick might be more appropriate. I am not sure if there is going to be much more focus on digital usage and security, *et cetera*. I have not necessarily seen the evidence that the support that Members are given routinely, certainly the training that Members are given in even basic things like changing passwords ... I do not think I should necessarily even say this publicly, but I cannot remember ever having been prompted to change a password on the States system in the 17 years that I have been here. Maybe that is something we need to consider because there does seem to be a disconnect. The other thing is that rule 11, as it is worded, probably needs to be kept under scrutiny in the future because it is very much permissive in the sense it is just strange wording anyway, the original wording that we have, whether it is amended or not. It says: “Members must ensure that use of facilities is in support of their parliamentary activities.” What that really means, of course, I think, is do not misuse facilities. Members should not misuse the facilities. Why does it not say that then rather than this very strange wording: “Members must ensure that use of facilities and services provided to them, including meeting rooms and office spaces, is in support of their parliamentary activities and it is in accordance with all relevant policies.”? Again, I think we just need at some point to have a plain English audit of our own procedures and Code of Conduct so that it is understandable. I was going

to say by Year 5 students but also by any States Members in the future. I do not know which one of those might necessarily be the more intelligent group but both of them, no doubt, have great potential. I am not going to make a big deal of this.

[12:30]

What I would say, though, is if we invite and encourage amendments like this, which arguably do not make too much difference, it does to a certain extent undermine the fact that we do have a Privileges and Procedures Committee here. We could see this kind of amendment being put forward into not just P.P.C.'s proposals in the future but any legislation that comes forward and we could find ourselves here all day. I am not especially bothered about it. What I would hope is that the intention of this and the underlying meaning, I think, is correct and that future Members are given all the support they need as well as clear direction about what it means to use facilities appropriate. A lot of it is common sense but, of course, we know that cannot always be taken for granted.

10.3.4 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

I am hopefully the last Jersey Reform Member to speak today on this simple amendment, but I also believe I am the cause of why P.P.C. did not accept the amendments as drafted, so I thought it is my place to stand up and speak. The reason I supported the first one but not this amendment is because I believe where the Deputy in her first amendment made something more direct, she added a vagueness into this which then meant that I felt like I could pull it further apart and put it to those awkward extremes. That is what I did in the email we sent round to P.P.C. and also how it was explained to us at our parliamentary party meeting. What I want to explain to Members now is when you take something to a weird extreme, it does add that inconsistency and ambiguity in the rules that we are supposed to be following. As Members may be aware, there is a ban on dogs being in the parliamentary estate. You are not allowed to have dogs in our offices or in this building due to an event that has happened within this term. When we start seeing the use of: "... facilities and services whether physical or digital" come in, it then makes me ask the question: if I am in a digital meeting with a service that has been provided, which Teams is a service, does that now mean that I am not allowed to have my dog in the room if I am in a meeting that is being provided through Teams? Most of us would say: "Come on. That is ridiculous", but of course this is a Code of Conduct which somebody then might have a disagreement with someone and they decide: "I am going to take that to the extrapolated extreme and make a point out of it and send it off to the Commissioner for Standards." When we read the original draft by P.P.C. as itself, that final sentence: "... and is in accordance with all relative policies", I personally think it means we do not need to specify whether something is physical or digital. It becomes simpler for Members to follow. It makes it easier for people to understand and interpret the rules that are in front of them. These extra 4 words add a level of complexity that just simply does not need to be there because it just states: "... in accordance with all the relevant policies", whether that is a digital policy, whether that is a physical policy. These policies are quite clear and we should be being advised, we should be trained or we should be going out there and making ourselves aware of what policies apply to us. We are not above the policies which have been devised and put out, as the Member has done with her digital and cybersecurity work. Absolutely, that is an incredibly important part of what we do and how we function. I was tempted to quote another Monty Python myself after Deputy Tadier stood up, but I think we have had enough spam for today.

10.3.5 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I was prompted to stand after Deputy Rob Ward talked in the end about States Members' devices, and I wanted to ask the Deputy if, in her research into doing this amendment, whether she has seen that there is a difference between Members, and because there is a difference in access to devices and access to support on devices it means that there will naturally be a difference if this Code of Conduct and her amendment would be agreed, that different Members would be awarded different support

when it comes to digital. What I mean by that, and I have brought it up before with an Oral Question and a Written Question to the Chief Minister, I brought it to P.P.C., is that some Members are provided with government computers. I was, when I entered into politics, because I was an Assistant Minister. So I was granted a government computer, but I had to hand it back when the vote of no confidence happened and I became a Deputy. I did not have another role in the Government, and so I went back to using my own computer. I could have purchased one, of course, with the grant that Deputy Ward has talked about. But also, not only that, I have access to a different device, but what I do not have is access to I.T. support within the Government, and that is a huge issue, because I have had a couple of instances with my computer where I needed to have I.T. support. I also want to have somebody go into my computer and say I am P.E.P. (Politically Exposed Person), and I want to make sure that I am not hacked in any way, that I do not have these phishing emails, that my devices are the top that I can be because of my position, but I do not have access to that. I have to go and source support for myself. I have to pay for myself, yet other Members in this room have access to I.T. within the Government, they can phone anytime. We do not have that luxury. We were provided a phone number, but when I phone that phone number we are told because we do not have a government device they cannot go into my computer, and therefore that is where I am concerned about this amendment, is that unless we have access to the same digital support to be able to ensure that we are protected as P.E.P.s we could fall foul of this Code of Conduct because we do not have that same level playing field to start with. I have raised this for a number of years, I have raised this with P.P.C., and I have yet to have an answer, and I was wondering if the Deputy could talk to that and understand if there is any movement on that going forward.

10.3.6 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

I think Deputy Rob Ward has a very good point to make, and I will give 2 examples I think the Deputy should directly respond to. The calls to the kind of comparison to the Cyber Security Law are ones I think are misguided in judging the main impact of this, and I think what was touched upon by Deputy Tadier is the key one. This is about when facilities and services are used in support of their parliamentary activities. I believe this was brought in in no short reason to prevent, for example, the trading of business or commerce by somebody within the parliamentary estate, or holding completely personal meetings, perhaps a birthday bash in the Ivy Forster room. I think that is why we have got this, and that is the intent behind rule 11. The challenge that comes with digital is there are elements of what we are provided with as a service that are harder to separate with their use. Relevant policy, security I think are fine, but the 2 that have been highlighted, first is that of the connection to the wi-fi and the network in here, especially the one we connect here. We have our own personal devices on that. No doubt if Members step out of this Chamber or are in between meetings in Scrutiny, they will use that for their personal use for their message communications or the internet. That seems entirely a reasonable use of the service. We are not switched on all the time to only performing that, and it is impossible to stop those devices receiving communication of a personal nature. I think that is a reasonable use of a service and it shows where a digital service has many others. The other one that I think would impact how people use their devices is many people use a single device. They will use it for their parliamentary work and their own work. They will have probably purchased that device themselves. In this case it is not a States-managed device, it is one like this. However, by virtue of the fact that you use shared software, and a key one would be the Microsoft Office suite, Word, Publisher. Well, not Publisher, that is getting retired for those who enjoyed the early 2000s publishing suite, but Outlook is a key one. Now, one can use their email platform entirely in line with Government policy ensuring password compliance. The device will be registered against the management policies outlined by Digital Services; however they will have private email accounts on that device. They cannot, by virtue of how digital software is designed, separate the licensing of Microsoft Outlook, a paid-for piece of software, or by subscription, between each device. Therefore, they are using a service provided under Microsoft, the licence we have as Government, for their personal use. One may say commonsense says: "Well, that is a very clear use

of it.” I think that the Deputy has to be clear in summing up how the implication of that is, whether somebody would then be able to turn around on a technicality, say, “Well you should not be using your Microsoft licence for work that is not in the pursuit of parliamentary work.” In particular, as I say, the unavoidable one would be the Microsoft Office suite. So, while I appreciate the intent, I think the thrust of rule 11 is about the use of physical spaces in pursuit of parliamentary business ensuring that those who are on parliamentary property, whether it be Morier House, Hill Street, or here, are on for the correct purpose, and I do not think we need to change rule 11 at this point in time given the ambiguity it causes.

10.3.7 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Deputy Alex Curtis has made the point very eloquently that I think I was planning to do. But I would just emphasise that the amendment would effectively add the word “digital” in front of “facilities and services”, and that, as Deputy Alex Curtis pointed out, means that things like the wi-fi would be encompassed. Whereas the intent I see in rule 11 is that facilities and services provided, including meeting rooms and office spaces, it is intended to make sure we do not misuse, I imagine, the mail system, make personal phone calls on fixed lines, and so on. I think it is a case if we add in “digital” here that we are providing potentially something that can be used against us, and it is unnecessary. I do not think that it feels like it is a useful addition, it adds more confusion and complexity than is needed.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on this amendment? I call upon Deputy Scott to reply.

10.3.8 Deputy M.R. Scott:

I do thank Members for their contributions, which I found quite astonishing at times. So, I think when I try and just get an overview of where these objections are coming from it is because perhaps some people are focusing more on personal fears and freedoms over the public interest. But also, that there has been a bit of a focus on the language that I did not put in this rule 11. Let us read it out again: “Members must ensure that the use of facilities and services provided to them, including meeting rooms and office spaces (1) is in support of their parliamentary activities.” Whatever that might mean. So, maybe if the Deputy or the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning want to have a look at sport or whatever, you might even argue that it is. I do not know. But then we come back to the next point: “... and is in accordance with all relevant policies.” So, basically policies have to exist. A number of Members have been asking me questions about: “Is it right that there should be a different kind of treatment in terms of devices? The use of public wi-fi, what is going on there?” I am not drafting any policies. These are things which either the Greffe are going to produce or maybe the P.P.C. will. This is a different debate. My focus has been on something to do with the public interest, which is ensuring that we, as States Members, protect that public interest by following policies that relate to digital that are designed to protect that public interest. Let us come back to the Cyber Security Law, and we will come back to Deputy Robert Ward who mentioned the Cyber Security Law. It does not impose any duties whatsoever, Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning, on States Members directly. At the moment, it does not impose unsatisfactorily for a number of people, and it does not impose duties on non-Ministerial departments. Ideally it will, and I do believe that most of them are saying: “Yes.” There is an obligation on operators of essential services to take proportionate measures, underline that 3 times in red, to protect cyber security. Now, at some point this is going to happen, and it should happen with non-Ministerial departments.

[12:45]

If anybody wants to take issue with this, I can imagine 1,000 cyber-security experts slapping their heads right now saying: “You what? You do not want to protect the actual security of your systems?” So, I do believe there has been a bit for misunderstanding. At some point, as Deputy Jeune has raised,

there really should be a bit more in the way of policies and protocols that will help us in using systems in what we can say is an agreed responsible and proportionate way. It does not necessarily mean that you will be put before a firing squad if you do look up the weather or something like that, which could indeed be something to do for parliamentary duties. I really do not see that we need to be squabbling about these things when essentially what is being said here is: “Do you agree that we, as States Members, should be complying with protocols that are designed to protect systems?” Now, do they exist at the moment? Well, at some point they will, and at some point there will be opportunity enough to comment on those. We have got one Code of Conduct, and this is our opportunity to show that commitment to stop 1,000 cyber-security experts jumping into the sea in despair right now. Similarly, I think that responds to generally all the points that are raised. I apologise if there is anything else. Deputy Tadier was talking about the use of plain English. We would love him to. The plain English audit. Again, I did not draft this Code of Conduct. I did not put that language in there, but what I have pointed out is an ambiguity basically saying that if protocols come in place, and they will do we can anticipate, that we should be expected to comply with those too. So, on that basis I will not say any more; I think enough has been said. But I really do urge Members to show support for responsible compliance with proportionate measures that will be set out in policies and to support this amendment.

The Bailiff:

Point of clarification?

Deputy A.F. Curtis:

I was confused. I hope it really is a genuine point of clarification. The Deputy put the digital policies and parliamentary together. Could you just clarify that one could be following digital policies compliantly while not performing parliamentary work, for example, using the wi-fi lawfully and not looking for indecent material or anything, but not doing so for a parliamentary reason. If she clarified that that is a possible outcome.

Deputy M.R. Scott:

I did not draft this rule, I just tried to make it less ambiguous. But I do agree that having these 2 things combined is in support of the parliamentary activities and is in accordance with all relevant policies. Well, there is a comma, so as a lawyer I would say it is not saying you have got to do 2 at the same time, but that is how I interpret it. I am sure there will be lots of subjectivity in terms of how the Code of Conduct should be interpreted, and indeed how it is even going to be enforced. But what I can say is if there is a major cyber-security incident so that we cannot use any systems, and if it is as the result of Members not even informing themselves because they did not comply with a policy but perhaps the Greffe said: “You will have training in these things to make you aware of the risks.” That probably would be that you will attend these trainings to be aware of these risks or you will take reasonable measures. Then that could well be a breach of the code, which some people would say it would be without this language. I am just saying let us make that clear. Please do not be worried about these implications because the policies do not even exist.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the chance of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce the amendment has been rejected:

POUR: 14		CONTRE: 29		ABSTAINED: 2
Connétable of St. Martin		Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy R.S. Kovacs
Connétable of St. John		Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy B. Ward

Connétable of St. Saviour		Connétable of Trinity		
Deputy C.F. Labey		Connétable of St. Peter		
Deputy M. Tadier		Connétable of St. Clement		
Deputy S.G. Luce		Connétable of Grouville		
Deputy K.F. Morel		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Connétable of St. Mary		
Deputy I.J. Gorst		Deputy G.P. Southern		
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		
Deputy D.J. Warr		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Deputy M.R. Scott		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy R.E. Binet		Deputy R.J. Ward		
Deputy M.R. Ferey		Deputy I. Gardiner		
		Deputy L.J. Farnham		
		Deputy K.L. Moore		
		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
		Deputy T.A. Coles		
		Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		
		Deputy H.M. Miles		
		Deputy J. Renouf		
		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
		Deputy L.V. Feltham		
		Deputy H.L. Jeune		
		Deputy A. Howell		
		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
		Deputy A.F. Curtis		
		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		
		Deputy M.B. Andrews		

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT PROPOSED

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to adjourn? Adjourn until 2.15.

[12:51]

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[14:19]

10.4 Amendment to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025): third amendment (P.102/2025 Amd.(3))

The Bailiff:

We return on the debate on the amendment to the Code of Conduct. Now dealing with the final amendment to be considered before we return to the proposition, as amended. I ask the Greffier to read the amendment.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Page 2. After the words “Appendix 1 to the report accompanying the proposition” there should be inserted the words – “, except that within Appendix 1, Rule 13, the word “certain” should be substituted with the word “relevant” and the words “such as” and “that have specific terms and agreements, including membership by selection or invitation only” should be deleted.”.

10.4.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

During the latest briefing that P.P.C. gave earlier last week, some Members expressed some disquiet about the wording of rule 13. Others were content with it as drafted. In order to ensure the rules are acceptable to the majority, P.P.C. has brought this amendment so the decision on how Rule 13 is worded can be made by the majority. It is worth noting, Members would only be required to declare a relevant interest, which might reasonably be thought to influence their approach to a matter under consideration. It addresses the principle that a perceived conflict of interest should be treated as seriously as an actual one. If we keep things hidden the public will assume the worst. Members are entitled to private lives, and no one is suggesting that you need to make public every club or organisation to which you belong. This rule, whether amended or not, simply highlights that Members make relevant declarations, and be open and transparent whenever they could be judged by a reasonable person to be any risk of an external influence on their position on an issue. I make the amendment.

Deputy J. Renouf:

Sir, can I ask a point of order? I wonder if you could clarify a matter with the amendment. Having been at the briefing, the question arose around Freemasonry as a potential activity that is caught in the unamended version, and the amendment dilutes the requirement. It is not as explicit. Given that you would have to rule in a future debate potentially about whether or not Freemasonry disclosure was covered should the amendment go through, I wonder if you could indicate whether you think the amended version of this clause would require disclosure of Freemasonry or not?

The Bailiff:

If the amendment is adopted? Well, it is a point about interpretation of the amendment. So, it is a matter upon which if asked I can give a ruling.

Deputy R.J. Ward:

May I ask something? Given that we are discussing whether relevant organisations, private societies and clubs need to be declared, should there be a declaration of Members who may be members of relevant private clubs, societies, which by virtue of the fact of what we are debating may affect the way that they vote?

The Bailiff:

Yes, Deputy Renouf, I think the question you were asking me, and that is a matter for Members as well, is if this amendment, or the rule as currently drafted, catches Freemasonry. Is that the question? I do not want to misrepresent your question.

Deputy J. Renouf:

Yes. The current rule, I think, unambiguously would capture Freemasonry. The question is whether the amendment would also require declaration of Freemasonry were it to be relevant to the matter under consideration?

The Bailiff:

I think that whether it is amended or not, Freemasonry may fall within Rule 13, because if it is not amended it falls within, subject to what I say in a moment: "... certain organisations, such as private societies and clubs that have specific terms and agreements, including membership by selection or invitation." As amended, the rule will say: "... including membership of relevant organisations, private societies and clubs." So, either way, Freemasonry may fall within Rule 13. But I do not think in its current form or in its amended form it is inevitable that someone will need to disclose they are a Freemason as that will depend upon the matter under consideration, because Rule 13: "Members must declare, whether in Assembly proceedings or elsewhere in their capacity as a public office holder, any relevant interest which might reasonably be thought to influence their approach to a matter under consideration." So, it will depend on the context of the matter under consideration. It would not apply to a debate on the Dogs Law. It would just depend on the context. So, it may be in reality the difference between what is currently there and the amendment is quite a small one because the obligation to make a declaration will depend on the matter under consideration, which of course links to the point Deputy Ward just made. Standing Order 106: "A Member of the States must declare an interest at the earliest opportunity, clearly stating the nature of the interest, if the Member has an interest in a matter which is the subject of a proposition or a written or oral question" and so on. There is a strong argument, if this is really about Freemasonry, that a Freemason should declare their interests under Article 106, if that, in reality, is what this is all about.

Connétable P.B. Le Sueur of Trinity:

I would just like to start this off by declaring that I have been and remain a Freemason for the last almost 40 years. Proud to have done so, and it is noted on my declaration of States Members' Interests, which I first completed in 2014.

Deputy T.A. Coles.

I am a member of Unite the Union and GMB Union.

Deputy M.R. Ferey of St. Saviour:

I make the same declaration of Freemasonry. It is on my Declaration of Interests and has been since I became a Member.

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

Likewise, I follow the Constable of Trinity in his declaration.

Connétable R. Vibert of St. Peter:

I follow the Constable of St. Brelade. I am registered as a Freemason, but I have not been for at least 30 years. So, I am not sure. I do not think it has any influence on me whatsoever.

Deputy M. Tadier:

I do find this strange because, as far as I am concerned, we are not debating Freemasonry, we are debating a generic rule here. I can declare I am not a Freemason. I do not know if that surprises any Members.

The Bailiff:

Are you speaking on the debate or doing something else?

Deputy M. Tadier:

No, it is a declaration. But it seems that declaration should not simply be limited to Freemasonry. I am not a member of the Women's Institute either, but I am a trade unionist member of Unite, and I am a member of the St. Helier Yacht Club. I am a member of the Jersey Tourist Guide Association. But they are all listed in my States Members declaration online anyway. I am wondering what the

point is of this exercise. If it is to be comprehensive and for everybody to stand up and list what they are members of it seems to be somewhat of a rabbit hole that we are going down already. So, I do not know if you would like to rule on whether we need to stand up and ... I have got a dog as well by the way.

The Bailiff:

I was specifically asked whether someone ought to declare that they are a Freemason in the context, and I said it was strongly arguable that they were. You have not got to declare that you are a member of the local swimming club.

Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:

In the interest of gender balance, can I declare that I am a member of the Women's Institute.

[14:30]

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

I would like to declare that I am a member and on the committee of the Whiteley Association, which is a women's ... as the same as Deputy Miles, in gender balance.

10.4.2 Deputy M.R. Ferey:

Firstly, I would like to thank the chair of P.P.C. for bringing this amendment, because after discussion at P.P.C., and in the States Members' briefing, and after reading the wording, from my point of view, the revised wording captures more organisations more fairly. Because if you look at the way this wording is constructed, if it is pointed towards Freemasonry, unfortunately it completely misses the mark. Because if we look at: "... any organisations with specific terms and agreements", most clubs or organisations have specific terms and agreements. But it goes on to say: "... or including membership by selection or invitation only." As I declared earlier, I am a Freemason, and I was neither selected or invited to join. In fact, I cannot exactly remember how I did come to join, but I was neither of those things. It came from a casual conversation with another Member, who I had observed on his declaration was a Freemason, and 25 years ago when I was a Centenier, I knew other Freemasons who were Centeniers at the time, and I was interested at that time, went along for a couple of open invitations, and at that time never took it any further. More recently, about 8 years ago, there was an open day, during which I visited the temple in Stockford Road and had a good look around and, again, for one reason or another did not progress it, having a family and whatever, things just got in the way. But I was more interested more recently, because I am at the time in my life where I felt that I had something to give back to the organisation. But if we are looking at Freemasonry in particular, I think there are 2 important points that form part of our rules, and one of them is that we are forbidden from talking about politics or religion. So, how anyone can think that membership of Freemasonry is going to affect what I do in this Chamber is beyond my comprehension. I believe the wording as currently drafted in this third amendment, substituting the words "relevant organisations", is a better outcome, because what it is doing is it stops us from getting too technical, and also if it is pointed at Freemasonry, it is totally incorrect. So, I am going to support this third amendment, and I trust that after hearing what I have had to say about the realities of Freemasonry, I hope other Members will do the same. While I am speaking, if any Member would like to ask me in the coffee room or anywhere else any questions about Freemasonry, I will happily answer those questions.

10.4.3 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I am a very proud trade unionist, and I do not know whether I should declare it. I was trying to work out, 35 years ago I was made an honorary member of the City of London Rock Climbing Club. It was quite a heavy night out. I think that may have lapsed. But quite seriously, I had no problem with the original wording. I have not got a lot of problem with this wording. But I do have a problem

with the justification of private clubs and secret whatevers. As an Assembly, we need to be absolutely open about what we are doing. I am a very proud trade unionist. My entire political development came through trade unionism from a very young age, because it is about democratic representation of working people. I would strive to do that throughout my political career. I make no apology about that at all. They are one of the founding parts of our democracy in the West, and so they are very important organisations. Having said that, I am also a member of Reform Jersey, the political party. Just to add to what Deputy Ferey has been saying, if anyone wants to come and talk to me in the tearoom about membership, I am quite happy to go through some chats with that as well. You are more than welcome. I preferred the original wording, but I think we have got to be very careful here that we do not get ourselves into a rabbit hole. The very fact that it was so difficult for you to find who should determine what is relevant and not at the beginning in terms of disclosure shows the difficulty we are going to get in with these types of rules. So, support it or not, I think it makes very little difference, but we do need to be open about what we are doing.

10.4.4 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

I am not a member of any organisation now. I was a former committee member of the Jersey Blind Society, now retired. But I do agree with Deputy Tadier on this one, if we can move on. As Groucho Marx would say: “I would not want to belong to any organisation that would have somebody like me as a member.”

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on this amendment? If no one else wishes to speak, I call upon the chair of P.P.C. to reply.

10.4.5 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Thank you for the 3 Members who spoke. Obviously, people have already read the report, and they have come to their own conclusions. I will not try to hold up the debate any longer. I am going to remain neutral, so I am not going to try to influence Members one way or the other. So, with that, I will call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the chance to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the amendment has been adopted:

POUR: 30		CONTRE: 10		ABSTAINED: 2
Connétable of St. Brelade		Connétable of St. Lawrence		Deputy R.J. Ward
Connétable of Trinity		Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy R.S. Kovacs
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of St. John		
Connétable of Grouville		Deputy K.L. Moore		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy J. Renouf		
Deputy C.F. Labey		Deputy C.D. Curtis		
Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy H.L. Jeune		
Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson		
Deputy K.F. Morel				

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

10.5 Amendments to Standing Orders - Code of Conduct (P.102/2025) - as amended

The Bailiff:

We now move back to the proposition as amended. Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition as amended?

10.5.1 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I will support this, but I have one issue that we all need to think about, and every management structure needs to think about, and this is about management of us. Not leadership, but management. Whenever we have a rule because of one incident and then add a blanket rule, I think that is an error in management. Deal with the individual issues, do not deal with blanket punishment, if you like, because of one situation. That is about not allowing dogs on to site. Lots of our schools have therapy dogs for helping children. I would suggest more than anything in this Assembly, a therapy dog would be very good for us all. So, I would absolutely push for that. I just think it is wrong to have one blanket rule when one thing goes wrong. To be serious for one moment, I do not think that is good management, and I have to make that point, and I would do so whenever that happens.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the proposition as amended? If no one else wishes to speak I call upon the chair of P.P.C. to reply.

10.5.2 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Thank you, Deputy Ward, for highlighting that point on dogs. I am sure that P.P.C. will revisit that in the near future or after the next election and come back to it and come back to this Assembly. A strong Code of Conduct not only assures the public that we will not abuse the power given to us when

we are making decisions on their behalf, but it also provides us with protection. It gives us a framework within which we can work, underpinned by the principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, leadership and respect. We should all be working to build the public's trust in us as Members and inspire confidence in this Assembly. The easiest way to do that is to comply with all of the rules of the Code of Conduct. They are not overly complicated and are based on sound principles of honesty and transparency. We expect the public of Jersey to follow the laws we make in this Assembly. The very least that they can expect of us is that we can follow our own Code of Conduct. We build trust by demonstrating we can be trusted. These are the rules by which we commit to abide. I maintain the proposition and I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the chance of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce the proposition has been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 42		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy K.L. Moore				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				

Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				

11. Consultation on Fireworks and other Pyrotechnics (P.111/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is Consultation on Fireworks and other Pyrotechnics lodged by Deputy Andrews. The main respondent is the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to request the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs to undertake a public consultation on the use of fireworks and other pyrotechnic articles in Jersey, to be commenced no later than December 2026, with the aim of – (a) gathering views from the public, animal welfare organisations, and other relevant stakeholders, regarding the impacts of fireworks and pyrotechnics, including the effects of noise and disturbance on pets, livestock, and individuals; (b) seeking views on whether current laws and administrative practices require reform on the sale, possession, and private use of fireworks; and (c) inviting feedback on possible measures to mitigate the negative impacts of fireworks and other pyrotechnic articles, including (but not limited to) – (i) the issuance of permits or licences for private fireworks displays; and (ii) mandating the use of quieter fireworks; and to present the findings of this consultation, together with any recommendations for future policy or legislation, to the States Assembly no later than June 2028 and prior to lodging any new Regulations under the Explosives (Jersey) Law 2014.

Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:

I would just like to declare that I know this is only a request for a consultation, but I ask your advice. I hold a bonfire night on closest to 5th November with a bonfire display on behalf of the Grouville Battle of Flowers Association. Should I declare that, or was it necessary to?

The Bailiff:

Guidance says you should err in the side of making a declaration. Obviously, it is not a financial interest, but you have declared that interest. Thank you very much.

11.1 Deputy M.B. Andrews of St. Helier North:

Firstly, I would like to extend my thanks to the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. It was probably about one year ago that I met her and her officer in Union Street. It was a brand-new building back then ... well it still is, but it must have only been the first few weeks that it was open. We discussed the issue of fireworks because many of my constituents have raised with me directly their concerns about the frequency of firework displays. But also a number of firework displays have been taking place and people have not been notified. So, there is a greater need to look at the Explosives (Jersey) Law. Obviously, the decision was taken to bring forward the 2014 law, but the regulations have not come into force. I think there is definitely a need for this proposition to be proposed and for the regulations to be brought forward. Also, we need revisions to the law. It is really important that, as politicians, we are attentive and we are listening to our constituents. Many of whom have shared videos with me of their animals being directly affected by a number of firework displays. In, I think it is 2024, November time, in fact, there was a constituent who lives in the area of Richelieu Park, and they complained to me about one particular firework display. They were complaining that the decibels that were being used were most likely illegal.

[14:45]

Where I live I could hear the fireworks display as well, and I live near Bellozanne. I also had a number of constituents come to me over the next 2 to 3 days complaining about firework displays taking place and people not being notified. So, there definitely is a need to ensure that there is better oversight. Personally, in terms of if somebody was to ask me about my own personal opinion, I do question whether people should be able to buy fireworks and for there to be private firework displays. But, of course, a number of people would probably oppose that position, and that is perfectly fine. This is the reason why we have a consultation. It is about giving people the opportunity to contribute to the consultation so we can be more informed about how the revisions to the law will be better enforced, because I think that is also another issue. There have been a number of animals that have been affected, and it is important that we are attentive to this, and we are taking this matter very seriously. Deputy Catherine Curtis, I think she shared on Facebook, a number of statistics regarding the use of fireworks, and it was very interesting looking at the quantitative data. For instance, the requirement to inform residents, 58 per cent of survey participants agreed that this should be a requirement, compared to about 3 to 4 per cent who said they opposed it. When we are looking at time limits on the sale and use of fireworks, and again this is something that one of the Connétables has also mentioned to me in discussions, there was about 51 per cent of people who agreed that this should be in place. Also limiting the amount of noise. Now this again, I think is in the law, however there have been a number of firework displays where I think it is probably only right that people have raised it with me because there have been concerns about the noise probably exceeding the decibels within the law. The next one, a ban on sale to the public. So, again, that is quite split, 23 per cent in favour and 28 against. Now, I am not imposing here that fireworks should be banned and they should not be sold to members of the public. I think it is important that the consultation takes place. We need to make sure that we then make an informed decision once all the evidence has been gathered, and then we take it from there. It will be whoever the next Minister for Justice and Home Affairs will be next term, who will then hopefully bring forward revisions to the Explosives (Jersey) Law and also the regulations will come into force as well. So, I would make the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]**

11.1.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North:

I thank the Deputy for bringing this proposition. Fireworks and the disturbance they create has become an issue in recent years. Each November, in particular, I and other Members receive correspondence from members of the public expressing concerns, and petitions in recent years have attracted relatively high levels of support. It is for this reason, acknowledging the strength of public feeling, that the Council of Ministers have accepted Deputy Andrew's proposition. Indeed, on becoming Minister, I had hoped we may have been able to make some progress on this matter, and as Deputy Andrew says, he has met with me in relation to this matter. However, other legislation projects have taken priority this term, and Members will no doubt see that there are a significant number of legislation items lodged by me at the next sitting. I stand by the decision to prioritise work on legislation that deals with public safety and risk, including the tall building regulations we will be debating later, which the fire service identified as there being a pressing need for. It must be acknowledged that this is not a simple matter. Several of my predecessors have worked on developing regulations for the supply, possession and use of fireworks under the Explosions (Jersey) Law 2014, which has yet to be brought into force. This included a significant consultation on draft regulations under the late Constable Norman, and a significant engagement with relevant stakeholders, both up to and after the COVID pandemic. I have also met with a number of members of the public who have contacted me about this and have heard their views, and the views on both sides. The comments paper presented sets out some further detail on both the complexities and the previous work undertaken. I also expect some of our colleagues on the Constables' benches may have their own recollections to share. Turning to Deputy Andrew's proposition, it asks the Minister to consult on the use of fireworks starting before the end of this year. Deputy Andrews includes certain things he would like that consultation to include. I would flag for Members that it is important when consulting not to prejudge the outcome of any consultation. Any consultation will have to ensure that information is provided to Islanders to ensure they can offer informed contributions and that allows for the expression of all views on the matter. So, we will seek views on a broad range of options. While it will be for the next Minister to implement actions as a result of the consultation, I would stress that there is a need for balance on this issue. I am very sympathetic to the difficulties faced by those with animals, and particularly livestock, having been brought up on a farm myself and still today have animals. It can be very difficult to manage, especially with unannounced displays, and we do have a responsibility for the welfare of animals. There will also be those people in our community who, for whatever reason, find the noise of fireworks particularly distressing. Members will also have received a representation from a member of the fireworks industry setting out their view. They rightly point out that many Islanders currently enjoy fireworks and would wish to be able to continue to do so. Equally, many of those setting off fireworks are responsible and considerate in their use. That submission also highlights the potential harm to businesses within that industry from increased regulation, something that will need to be carefully considered. This proposition is not really about my view, but from my perspective, I would support a tightening of regulations on the use and supply of fireworks, which still achieves the right balance. If Members vote in favour, I will look forward to following the progress on this in the next term.

11.1.2 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

I was reading the report to this proposition, and the Deputy mentions carrying out an online poll. What I could not see any mention of, and it said about 300 people responded, but what was not mentioned was the Jersey Opinion and Lifestyle Survey, which was carried out in 2025 by Statistics Jersey. I think my concern is that, and I do not think the Deputy would have much control of this now, but the actual way his proposition is worded, it seems to be treading ground that has been uncovered by a statistical survey, which generally are more representative of population than an online poll. This, in fact, did identify certain things, such as 71 per cent of men and 78 per cent of women supported time limits on the sale of fireworks, 83 per cent of men and 90 per cent of women wanted a requirement to inform local residents before a display. I am just trying to seek a bit more

in terms of clarity about what he thinks that this proposition will achieve in terms of providing information that the actual survey has not.

11.1.3 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

I would like to declare that I am an active member of the Gorey Fête and Bonfire Committee, and every November we hold a very well-organised and well-publicised public bonfire event. I think we are about the only one in the Island now, and we attract over 6,000 people to our Village Green for spectacular fireworks and a bonfire. However, as a Constable, and I hope that with this proposition, which I do support, something like that where we publicise it well in advance and on all media and on everything else, something like that can go ahead because we have raised tens of thousands of pounds for charities. But, as a Constable, I am very well aware of private displays which are unannounced, which do cause unbelievable distress to some people and to the pets, and it is these small, unannounced firework displays. Some of them are not that small. Some of the ones which have happened in the Parish in the last year, the people who have held the wedding or the event that they are celebrating can spend up to about £7,000 on the display, so they are not letting off a few fireworks in your garden. So, I am for this. I hope that the well-organised public displays would not be stopped, but I would support legislation to have people declare that they are having a bonfire and a firework display and make sure that all neighbours and those in their Parish are aware of it.

11.1.4 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central:

The issue of fireworks is divisive with both supporters and detractors. There are those who enjoy fireworks, but there are also the legitimate concerns around human and animal welfare. My own dog gets very scared of any firework noise. The Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel has frequently questioned the Minister on this matter, both in previous and current Government, and there were always more urgent matters taking up legislation time. We did, however, ask that questions on fireworks be included in the Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey, and we drafted those questions, and with some editing they were accepted. There has been an Island-wide survey, a very recent one, and as referred to briefly already, responses showed that the majority of adults were in support of requiring organisers to inform local residents, time limits on the sale and use of fireworks, and limiting the amount of noise that fireworks can make. The majority were also opposed to a ban on fireworks. I just hope that this can be progressed in the next Assembly.

11.1.5 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

Not much to say on this one given it is for a consultation. We should welcome the Minister's comments on a consultation being fair and open. I do want to make 2 comments, that I hope I am included in said consultation, as it is likely to be approved. I should declare I organised, a good number of years back, the university I went to fireworks which was attended by, yes, many thousands of people; was a good night and I did have my training for that. What I think is important in any consultation on this is separating, and to the Connétable of St. Martin, what one constitutes a private event and what one considers a personal event. I think the issues we see right now are those of people spending many thousands on professional events for private purposes. Those are things one can easily regulate, one that can have a big impact because you can put a lot of money behind a professional organisation to cause a lot of impact. I had a lot of fun with fireworks and French firecrackers, petards, or whatever you would like to call them, growing up. I am sure many of us have. I think what would be a great shame is if we do not recognise that the scale of impact I think is low; I think we have to judge people's freedoms to operate fireworks personally. When I say "personally", I mean to light the wick itself or to, if they are ambitious, programme the automatic electric firing, which is very unlikely. I think the scale that is involved in personal firework displays, so this is where people come together, light the fireworks, is a very different matter to private events. Any consultation into this should consider that because the impact and scale that one could organise with people personally lighting fireworks is very different to a modern display. I say that having our

fireworks display, having been 20 minutes' long with hundreds of lightings and they were all done by hand, it is a limit you can push and it is nothing compared to what these modern systems can do with electric firing. I think we should in any consultation on these restrictions consider the personal liberties of people doing things for themselves without procuring a professional service. I hope that is taken into consideration.

11.1.6 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I was pleased to hear the Minister say that she is open for a consultation but she stressed the point that there needs to be balance in this, and I completely agree with that. We know that the J.O.L.S. (Jersey Opinions and Lifestyle Survey) survey has already been referred to. We know there is a balance here to be struck between an age-old tradition where people enjoy to go out on special occasions, one thinks of New Year's Eve into New Year's Day, fireworks night, 5th November.

[15:00]

I am not sure all Catholics necessarily feel the same about 5th November; that is perhaps something for another time. There are key dates obviously in other cultures in Jersey as well which have that tradition of fireworks. We did also get some correspondence I think from somebody in the industry. There are very few people in Jersey who supply fireworks. I think it is important that we also listen to those voices, not just because they have a business interest, because they have expertise and they deal with these matters on a daily basis often. It was pointed out to me that Jersey is perhaps an outlier in the sense that we do not have any organised government or indeed centralised or partnership organisation for fireworks at New Year's Eve into New Year's Day. I think Madeira has got a very well-known and well-established fireworks display that indeed brings people there specifically for New Year to see their fireworks. Dare I say that even Guernsey has its own New Year firework display. I also notice looking on line that the G.S.P.C.A. (Guernsey Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) puts out advice. It says: "Beware that there is going to be a fireworks display at 7.00 p.m. in St. Martin and there is going to be the main one around about midnight, so make sure you take responsibility for your animals." I do also sympathise with the animal owners, whether it is dogs, cats or horses. Indeed, many people in Jersey have animals. It has to be said that animals act differently and they can act differently to fireworks at different times. I have got a dog who does not seem that fazed by fireworks but he does get put off by the neighbour's bin when the bin is being rolled out. He does not get put off by our bin. He does not like the postman coming round; it does tend to be a man. But if I took him out to see the postman he will just be quiet and lick the postman, so there is no real rhyme or reason to it. I think pet owners do also have a responsibility to make sure that they are not leaving pets. Often I think that it is much more likely a pet might react adversely if they are left on their own, but if they know that they have got their owner and family with them they may well act differently. I think there is a balance that needs to be struck; I do not think we can speak in terms of generalisations. That said, the mover of this proposition of course has an absolute right to do that. I think it is also perhaps incumbent on him in the summing up; he must have his own desired outcome for this. We do not just ask for a consultation if we want the status quo to remain, so there must be changes that Deputy Andrews would like to see in this. I do not think there is anything wrong with that but perhaps he could explain what he thinks are the possible outcomes from this and how we balance those competing needs in our community.

11.1.7 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I thank Deputy Andrews for bringing this proposition and to the Minister for agreeing to the consultation. I do think if anybody has a firework display at the moment, it would be a very, very good idea to let all the neighbours know that that is going to happen so that they can take control of their animals. I do think it needs to be balanced because our family really quite enjoy having sparklers. They do not make a bang, we just wave them in the air and it is quite fun. I just think we should bear in mind that not every firework is really dangerous.

11.1.8 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:

To reply immediately to Deputy Howell, she makes the obvious point that if you are having a fireworks display, one should tell neighbours; that element of courtesy which should apply to your daughter's 21st birthday as well. It seems to have gone out of fashion but that is obviously a sensible point. The good old question there is as to how you give that notice given that the noise of fireworks will spread over a long distance. I am somewhat concerned that the Parish Halls might be obliged to give notice. I just do not know how it will work, and I would simply ask that the consultation take that into account. Again, it has been pointed out there is a major difference between private firework displays, which I suspect are the main culprit. Indeed, in my first year as a Deputy one of my parishioners lost a horse due to problems on fireworks night. It is not a theoretical problem. Someone also mentioned weddings. I suggest that rather than wait until this consultation is out, I think that where weddings take place on private properties, the Registrar and the Constable concerned has to approve that site. I suggest that might be managed within our own regulations to ensure that conditions are put on about fireworks. I recently approved one in my own Parish and I raised the question of fireworks, was told, no, they were not having them, but if they had I would have been, I think, able to put on certain conditions. That, I think, is a lever one might think of using. Yes, I shall be approving the proposition and I just think there are certain very wide areas within the consultation which might be difficult to address.

11.1.9 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I would like to just start with declaring a conflict of interest, if you could call it that, in that I am a purveyor of marine pyrotechnics. Now they do come under the Explosives Law and the only brush with that would be that sometimes fireworks let off on land can be construed as a marine distress, and that is something which Ports deal with. In an allied point, the operators will communicate with the airport whose operations, once again, can be compromised by fireworks going high. I think we have to bear in mind we have one commercial operator, to my knowledge, in the Island and we need to be cognisant of any changes which are decided upon that could have an effect on the business model of that operator. I am not particularly defending that person but it could well be a consequence. The risk is if that business becomes unviable, we will not have an operator in the Island and any display would require the importation of expertise. At the moment, the Comité des Connétables agrees on the sale periods. In agreement with the operator, the sale periods are generally around before 5th November, so the sale periods are restricted but we do not have controls over the sales to private individuals by that one operator who tends to be the principal supplier over here. I am always concerned because, as Constables, we get complaints and the principal complaints tend to be, as others have alluded to, animals, horses, quite seriously, apart from smaller pets. There is also the complaint about sleep disturbance. Of course, not everybody stays up late, others will be doing shift work and get quite perturbed if their sleep gets disturbed and we will know about that. The noise of course can be dictated by the direction of wind, and that is something which is really difficult to predict from the operational point of view. I can say that with displays which go on St. Brelade's Bay, a southerly wind will kick off a lot of complaints from those living around about whereas if the wind is in the other direction, they will hardly hear it. It is something that is really difficult to accommodate. It may be that there needs to be better controls on the operator. I can say that some months ago several Constables were given a display of noisy fireworks by the operator. It was explained as to the effect of the differences. There are different grades of fireworks. The lower grades which tend to be sold to the private public, if I can call them that, are more acceptable but, when you get to the higher grades, they are noisy. I think my view would be that that area needs work. There is often a suggestion that there should be silent fireworks. Now there is no such thing as a silent firework, there will be a less noisy firework, and this may be an area that a review could explore further. I am aware that many members of the public do enjoy a firework display and I can say that the firework display that took place at St. Ouen on New Year's Eve was, I thought, very good. Certainly, because the wind was in the right direction, I did not receive much in the way of

complaints. As regards the Connétables, I think the communications between the operator and the Parish Halls is not that good. I think we need to know better when these displays take place because at the moment we understand that the operator does a letter drop around and about but that is probably not good enough in this day and age. We can easily put these displays on our websites, if we know about them, and do our best to communicate that to affected, or potentially affected, parishioners. I think we would be happy to have more steer, if you like, from a consultation. It would help us make judgments should those applications for a display come to us, which I believe they should.

11.1.10 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

I am pleased to follow the Constable of St. Mary and the previous Constable of St. Brelade because they talked about how there is some control over fireworks now and there is a lack of communication and control over sale and so on, so that issue was already raised. It also got me thinking, I think it was in the 17th century, there was a stable owner who used to offer people the choice of the first horse by the door or none at all. I think the stable owner was called Hobson, thus the phrase “Hobson’s choice”. You get a choice on something or nothing at all. I am going to talk about the proposition, not about the outcome of the survey which we have not even had yet. The proposition says we would start something in December 2026. I can agree that, we can agree anything for the next Assembly, that is absolutely fine by me. Get on with it. You better get it done otherwise you will be terrible. We can agree that in 2026 nothing has to come back until June 2028. If something comes back, the Minister is absolutely correct, it takes time and there is always a legislative priority, particularly when it comes to safety and so on in terms of some of the laws that we have had to pass. Therefore, nothing is likely to happen until 2029 with the beginning of legislation. The election after that is in 2030, so if nothing happens then we will get right near to 2030, perhaps January 2030. It is on Hansard, I will have a little bet, 2030 there will be another proposition to say: “We really should be talking about fireworks and doing something about it.” But we have had a J.O.L.S. survey, we know what is going on. I would like to see a little bit more work being done just addressing the issues that we all know. Children having fireworks. Schools have to deal with it every single year. I remember it from my time in school, I remember it now. Children get hold of fireworks, they take them into school, it creates an incident, it is very dangerous. We have to deal with it all the time. There are certain things that we can just get on with. I have to make one final point on this, which is we have had so many people talking about spending and we should not be spending as much money. But we are all going to agree on another consultation to tell us a lot of information that we probably already know and it will cost us money that we are willing to spend. Of course we accept it, we have Hobson’s choice, but I just hope we get something done this time. I might abstain again; I have done it once, I do not usually, I am getting into the habit of it.

11.1.11 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South:

I am just standing to say, the Constable of St. Brelade mentioned about the professional company over here. I reached out to him in response to the email that we all received and asked questions around fireworks that are presently available for purchase. They come into 4 categories: F1, F2, F3 and F4. F4 are the ones for the professionals, F1 can generally be used as staged pyrotechnics inside and then it is the 2s and 3s which get into the points of the small domestic displays. Now, as my colleague, Rob Ward, has just stated, this fact is already existing. We already know that we could say that F4 is only for professionals. We can say that F1 and 2 are able to be just sold to the public and we can then remove F3 from the public sale and maybe they are only for professionals. There are elements to this that we already know. Why we are again wasting time and money, staff timing and money, on a consultation that we seem to already know the answers to seems a little bit unnecessary to me. That was one email that I got from the professional who does this and it is there. Simple as that. All we need is a will. This proposition could have been quite easily brought back to this Assembly saying to ban the sale of F3 category fireworks to the public, then people would have been able to have their fountains and their Catherine wheels in their gardens but they might not have

been allowed to have rockets. That is the only issue I have with fireworks in the hands of the public, are the rockets. They are unpredictable, they can come off at random and they are there at any point. People are not going to be running around the street letting off the sparkler ones in hand because it does not quite have the same effect as firing a rocket out of the passenger side of your car, which I have seen a video of that happening in Jersey along the Five Mile Road, quite a few years ago.

[15:15]

It is that idiotic behaviour which is why we need to take rockets out of the hands of the public. I will take this opportunity to give the operator of the large private displays credit because that organisation, if you follow them on Facebook, they advertise not only when the event is going to happen, the day, the time, but they also say the duration that that display is going to happen. People have to be prepared to allow the public to enjoy these celebrations that we have. That could have been another part of the proposition, to make it the legal requirement that anybody who is having a private display of fireworks or a professional display of fireworks has to advertise it. We have social media which makes it quick, easy and cheap. All of the Parishes hand out their gazettes, the magazines. These are all things that are available to us. We could be saving ourselves a lot of time and a lot of money. It is not that I do not think we need to change the laws on fireworks but is the right way the consultation which is not bound to the next Assembly? The next Assembly could come in and say: “No” but they are not going to be able to follow it up.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on this proposition? Deputy Andrews.

11.1.12 Deputy M.B. Andrews:

Thank you to the Members who have contributed to this proposition. It goes without saying whenever legislation is going to be brought forward the Minister responsible would have to consult. There have been many consultations that have taken place across this term in office, and that is the right way to go about it. You cannot be a Minister bringing forward legislation and you are not consulting, for instance, with industry or you are not consulting with the people who may be directly affected. I believe this proposition is the right way to go about it. Of course, there will always be a cost when consultations take place. If people are to be complaining about consultations, then how in God’s earth are they supposed to be delivering legislation ...

The Bailiff:

I think God’s earth might be unparliamentary, so recall that.

Deputy M.B. Andrews:

I take that back. How they are supposed to be delivering legislation if they are not then going to consult? They will have a canvas that they have not delivered anything, and that is the reason why I believe that this is the right approach. It is about engaging with animal organisations but it is also about engaging with people who are the owners of pets because they are probably the most vocal group who do want revisions made to this law. In response to Deputy Tadier, he mentioned about what I would like to see happen. I think that is a different thing in terms of what the consultation is purposed for. I personally would prefer it if there were restrictions in terms of when fireworks could be sold but also when they could be used as well throughout the year. I think that is probably better because then at least we have got more controls in place. However, I think as the Minister said, it is best if a consultation is impartial, as it will be. I know the officers are very capable and they will make sure that all areas are covered in the consultation, all voices are heard. Then we can make an informed decision in terms of how we go about making revisions to the Explosives (Jersey) Law and also by the bringing forward of the regulations as well. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The proposition has been adopted:

POUR: 34		CONTRE: 2		ABSTAINED: 8
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of Grouville
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy K.L. Moore		Deputy R.J. Ward
Connétable of Trinity				Deputy T.A. Coles
Connétable of St. Peter				Deputy D.J. Warr
Connétable of St. Martin				Deputy M.R. Scott
Connétable of St. John				Deputy L.V. Feltham
Connétable of St. Clement				Deputy R.S. Kovacs
Connétable of St. Mary				Deputy A.F. Curtis
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				

Deputy M.B. Andrews				
---------------------	--	--	--	--

12. Extension to Jersey of the PCT, Hague Agreement, Madrid Protocol and Nice Agreement (P.117/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Extension to Jersey of the PCT, Hague Agreement, Madrid Protocol and Nice Agreement lodged by the Minister for External Relations. The main respondent is the chair of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – (a) to refer to the text of the Patent Cooperation Treaty, as set out in Appendix 1 to the accompanying report, and to agree that the Minister for External Relations should request the extension of the treaty from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Bailiwick of Jersey; (b) to refer to the text of the Geneva Act (1999) of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs, as set out in Appendix 2 to the accompanying report, and to agree that the Minister for External Relations should request the extension of the treaty from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Bailiwick of Jersey; (c) to refer to the text of the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, as set out in Appendix 3 to the accompanying report, and to agree that the Minister for External Relations should request the extension of the treaty from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Bailiwick of Jersey; and (d) to refer to the text of the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks, as set out in Appendix 4 to the accompanying report, and to agree that the Minister for External Relations should request the extension of the treaty from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Bailiwick of Jersey.

Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (The Minister for External Relations):

My Assistant Minister, Deputy Scott, will be acting as rapporteur as she has delegated responsibility for this area.

12.1 Deputy M.R. Scott (Assistant Minister for External Relations - rapporteur):

This proposition follows on from the States Assembly’s approval of 2 pieces of intellectual property legislation in 2024 and 2025 respectively as part of the ongoing programme of work to modernise Jersey’s intellectual property framework. The proposition seeks the formal approval of the States Assembly for the Minister for External Relations to request the extension of 4 intellectual property treaties from the United Kingdom to Jersey. In September 2024 the States Assembly approved the Patents Law and Registered Designs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 2024 and more recently in November 2025 the Assembly also adopted the Trade Marks (Jersey) Law. As explained in accompanying reports and during the related debates, a key objective of these legislative changes was to enable the Island to seek the extension of a number of beneficial international intellectual property treaties to lay the foundations for the modernisation of its intellectual property regime. The text of these treaties have been lodged for Members’ reference as appendices to the proposition. They are the Patent Co-operation Treaty, to which I will refer as “the P.C.T.”, the Geneva Act 1999 of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs, to which I will refer as the “Hague Agreement”, the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, to which I will refer to as the “Madrid Protocol”, and the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks, to which I will refer as the “Nice Agreement”. Some Members may be wondering why I appear to be retreading old ground in seeking approval for the extension of the 4

treaties. The Minister for External Relations has been sensitive to the provisions of the Draft Treaties (Jersey) Law lodged by the Chief Minister for debate during the next sitting of the Assembly. If approved, the draft law will introduce a new procedure whereby a Minister seeking the extension of an international treaty must first obtain the approval of the States Assembly before making that request. The purpose of this proposition is to progress the extension of these important treaties in the spirit of the Draft Treaties Law without further delay. Although I have set out in detail the benefits of each of the treaties to which this proposition relates during earlier debates, it may be helpful for me to remind Members how the 4 treaties will deliver an important priority of the Common Strategic Policy: to support the Island's economic well-being by reducing red tape, enhancing opportunities for businesses and strengthening Jersey's international reputation. Although the P.C.T., Hague Agreement and Madrid Protocol cover very different types of intellectual property, namely patents, registered designs and trade marks respectively, their purposes are largely the same, namely, to create international systems that allow users to achieve intellectual property protection in a large number of countries worldwide by finding a single application with multinational reach. This replaces the need to file several separate applications, saving users time and money by enabling them to easily and swiftly acquire intellectual property protection in multiple markets. Once the extension process has been completed, residents and businesses in Jersey will be able to benefit from the associated convenient, efficient and cost-effective solutions for registering and managing their intellectual property on an international scale that can typically be expected from a modern, open economy. The Nice Agreement has a different purpose and establishes a common classification system for trade marks known as the Nice Classification. The Nice Classification is globally recognised and used by many trade mark offices worldwide to organise trade marks based on the types of goods and services they cover. Jersey's participation in the Nice Agreement would therefore allow the Island's new intellectual property office to offer an internationally consistent and user-friendly experience for trade mark owners. The extension of the 4 treaties also will assist in moving Jersey forward in complying with the provisions of modern free-trade agreements should Members consider participation in free-trade agreements to be in Jersey's best interests in the future following the trade disruptions associated with the U.K.'s Brexit decision. When this Assembly previously demonstrated its commitment to modernising the Island's intellectual property framework by approving the Patents Law and Registered Designs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 2024 and adopting the Trade Marks (Jersey) Law, Members recognised the importance of ensuring that Jersey's legislation is appropriately aligned with internationally-recognised standards. Approval of this proposition by the Assembly today would represent a further and important step in that process, one that I hope will be viewed as a natural progression from the legislative changes already agreed by this Assembly. Finally, I would like to thank the Members and officers of the Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel for their helpful comments and their continued support for all aspects of Jersey's I.P. (intellectual property) modernisation work. I hope all Members will give this proposition their full support. I move the proposition.

The Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the proposition?

12.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I was not going to speak for long. It is just to say that our panel has looked at it, as the rapporteur has announced, and we are quite happy to support the proposals. We have issued a comments paper which is relatively brief, a few days ago. Members can obviously read that for themselves. We do think that this is in line with the propositions that were passed earlier in the year relating to trade marks and I.P. legislation. It does tie in with, of course, the goals of this Government, so happy to support this.

12.1.2 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

May I, first of all, express my appreciation to the Minister for External Relations for bringing these 4 international agreements to the Assembly and, as the Assistant Minister has said, for anticipating the coming into force of the Treaties Law, which the Assembly will be debating in due course. It is I think a very useful prototype for the future. International obligations are important for the Assembly to understand because a failure to comply with an international obligation under some treaty or international agreement might involve placing the United Kingdom in breach of its international obligations, which could of course have constitutional implications for Jersey.

[15:30]

I appreciate the way in which the Minister has approached this matter, which he was not yet obliged to do. So far as these international agreements are concerned, I just have 2 questions I think for the Assistant Minister because the Assembly has already approved, as she has said, the legislation which gives effect to our domestic obligations under the agreements. The first question is whether there are any financial implications from acceding to these international agreements. Are there any fees to be paid or possibly to be paid to the international organisations concerned? Secondly, are there any administrative obligations which will follow from the accession to these agreements? Will we, for example, have to file annual reports with the depository of the international agreements? If so, will those have any adverse implications so far as work to be done by the civil service is concerned?

12.1.3 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Yes, it is a very small point. I do think it is quite interesting that we are signing up to 4 international agreements, tying us into a rules-based order at a time when that kind of rules-based order is increasingly under threat. I wonder whether it might even be seen in some quarters as a small act of defiance that we are indeed willing and keen to do so. For my part, I welcome it very much. I think these kind of agreements are the bedrock of how a small jurisdiction can integrate itself into the global economy and function well within it. I welcome it and would commend the Minister and Assistant Minister for bringing it.

The Bailiff:

Does any other Member wish to speak on this proposition? Accordingly, I call upon the Assistant Minister to reply.

12.1.4 Deputy M.R. Scott:

I thank all Members for their contributions. Again, I thank the chair of the Economic and International Affairs Panel for their support and Members. Just to respond to the questions that have been raised. I thank Deputy Bailhache, not only for his questions, but also for directing the Assembly's attention more to this idea that we need to consider treaties carefully before we ask for their extension. To respond to the actual question that Deputy Bailhache asked about: the financial implications from acceding to the treaties. We did discuss this matter at length when we debated the laws, but just to go through that. There is a commitment of contracting parties to cover costs, which is apportioned according to the amount of intellectual rights that they register. Having done the risk assessment, having consulted with other Crown Dependencies, it is anticipated that should the U.K. ever be expected to pay contributions to cover any deficit, bearing in mind that generally the costs are covered by the fees of the intellectual property offices, in turn it would look to apportioning an amount of its share to Jersey. Given the small amount that we anticipate of intellectual property that would be registered through us, we really do not anticipate there being any contribution at all. Having consulted with other Crown Dependencies who already have had the relevant treaties extended to them, they have confirmed they are not aware of a request of such costs ever having arisen. In the few of the offices who have looked at this, the risk of cost exposure for Jersey is an extremely low risk, if it even exists at all. Then there was the administrative obligations, a question about whether there would be a need for offices to file annual reports. Again, we come back to the Jersey Financial

Services Commission who would be acting as the I.P. Registrar. There are no annual reports that need filing with the W.I.P.O (World Intellectual Property Organisation) itself, basically the world-wide organisation that administers the intellectual property registration. We do expect the Financial Services Commission to produce reports, and that would be covered by the fees that it charges, so there are few administrative requirements for contracting States. Then Deputy Renouf, a rules-based order sounds very good to me. Thank you for the questions. I think basically I am just going to propose the proposition as a whole given that I have explained how all these treaties are basically dealing with different types of intellectual property that more or less do the same thing. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the proposition has been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 41	CONTRE: 0	ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		
Connétable of St. Brelade		
Connétable of St. Peter		
Connétable of St. Martin		
Connétable of St. John		
Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Mary		
Connétable of St. Saviour		
Deputy G.P. Southern		
Deputy M. Tadier		
Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy K.F. Morel		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy R.J. Ward		
Deputy C.S. Alves		
Deputy I. Gardiner		
Deputy I.J. Gorst		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache		
Deputy T.A. Coles		
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		

Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

13. Draft Elections (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.119/2025)

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the Draft Elections (Consequential Amendments) Amendment Regulations lodged by the Privileges and Procedures Committee. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Elections (Consequential Amendments) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Article 72B of the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002.

13.1 Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

P.P.C. brings this proposition, which is the final step required to reinstate the Senators to this Assembly at the forthcoming elections. These regulations do not in themselves alter the membership of this Assembly and so any Members who were thinking this debate provides one last-ditch attempt to halt the reinstatement of Senators will be disappointed to learn that it does not. **[Laughter]** When we approved the Draft Elections (Senators) Amendment Law, P.56, in September last year, we approved a citation at the end which brought into force several of the amended Articles with effect from 1st February 2026. Whether we approve these regulations or not today, the membership of the Assembly will still include 9 Senators from 7th June. These regulations simply tidy up the loose ends administratively. When we approved the so-called Senators Law last September, 2 other elections-related laws had been adopted but had yet to receive Royal Assent or been registered in the Royal Court. Those were the Elections (Electoral Registers) Amendment Law, P.27/2025, and the Elections Amendment Law, P.28/2025. These consequential amendments ensure those laws now include reference to the Senators. There is also an amendment to a provision of the Regulation of Care Law, which some Members may have thought was somewhat out of place here but is required, as references to Senators are necessary in that piece of legislation. I make the principles.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the principles? Those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much; the principles are adopted. Deputy Miles, do you wish to scrutinise this matter?

Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade (Chair, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel):

No, thank you.

The Bailiff:

Chair, how do you wish to propose the regulations in Second Reading?

13.2 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

I would like to take the regulations *en bloc*.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading? Those in favour, kindly show. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the draft regulations have been adopted unanimously in Second Reading:

POUR: 39		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				

Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Chair, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

13.3 Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations as adopted in Second Reading seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak in Third Reading on the regulations as adopted? Is the appel called for?

Deputy S.M. Ahier:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. The draft regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 40		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of St. Martin				

Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

14. Draft Fire Safety (Tall Residential Buildings) (Jersey) Regulations 202- (P.120/2025)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Fire Safety (Tall Residential Buildings) Regulations lodged by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs. The main respondent is the chair of the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Fire Safety (Tall Residential Buildings) (Jersey) Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under the Order in Council dated 28th March 1771 and the Order in Council dated 14th April 1884.

14.1 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat of St. Helier North (The Minister for Justice and Home Affairs):

I am pleased to bring these regulations before the Assembly today. As many of you will know, when a fire occurs in a tall block of flats it can create higher risks. This is because of the number of residents living in that building. The tragic fire at Grenfell Tower showed the devastating consequences that can occur when a fire spreads beyond its flat of origin. Tall blocks of flats are built with a range of safety features; however, the Grenfell Tower Inquiry showed that several of these features did not work when they were most needed. This included the fire doors and the firefighter lifts. Our tall blocks of flats are not immune from these issues. Currently, there is no fire safety law which requires Jersey's approximately 140 tall blocks of flats to maintain their fire safety features. This is unacceptable and we have fallen a long way behind other countries in our legal protections for the residents of these buildings. Today we can change this situation and ensure the important lessons from the Grenfell Tower fire are implemented in our buildings. These regulations are not about requiring major upgrades to any building. Residents should be confident that their building was built with good fire safety features. Instead, these regulations will simply require fire safety features in the building to be regularly checked. This gives them the best chance of working effectively during a fire. They also require better information to be provided to residents and firefighters to help them in the event of a fire. Members may wonder why the regulations focus on tall blocks of flats. In fire safety terms, these buildings are considered higher risk due to the volume of residents that live within them and the difficulties in external rescues from above the fourth floor. For context, a tall block of flats is more than 11 metres tall or typically 5 storeys.

[15:45]

In Jersey, other high-risk buildings fall under our main fire safety law. This is known as the Fire Precautions Law. This includes the hospital, care homes and hotels. The law requires these buildings to maintain fire safety standards; however, this law does not extend to tall blocks of flats. This means there is no legal backstop to ensure minimum fire safety standards are maintained. This is clearly not appropriate given that approximately 8,500 Islanders live in these buildings. A second reason for focusing on tall blocks of flats is due to the findings of the Grenfell Tower Inquiry. This created new knowledge about how to improve fire safety in these buildings. I want our buildings to benefit from this learning to ensure they are well-equipped if a serious fire occurs. I would now like to talk a little about the regulations. They are sensible and logical and relate to things you might already expect to be taking place. I would like to highlight several important benefits they will bring. Firstly, plans of the building must be provided to the fire service. At the moment, firefighters do not receive these. This can lead to time being lost trying to understand the building when they arrive at a fire. This also prevents them from planning ahead. The provision of plans will prevent these issues and assist in training. They are also an extremely useful tool for incident commanders at the scene who use them to co-ordinate firefighters, develop tactics and manage evacuations. Another important requirement introduced is the duty to conduct regular checks of important firefighting equipment in the building. This includes features like firefighting lifts and rising fire mains which provide water

to every floor. The basic checks are designed to complement the professional servicing regime. The Grenfell Tower Inquiry demonstrated the importance of more frequent simple checks to help resolve basic issues more quickly. The other benefit is that the fire service must be informed if a piece of firefighting equipment is not working. This allows firefighters to adapt their tactics in advance of arriving at the scene and saves valuable minutes. Fire doors must also be regularly checked for the first time. This includes communal doors and flat entrance doors. The role of these doors is often underestimated. They are essential in holding back fire and preventing it from spreading. The self-closing device is there to ensure the doors close when residents evacuate. The main aim of the fire door check is to ensure the self-closing device is working. At Grenfell Tower many doors did not have working self-closing devices. This allowed smoke and fire to quickly spread through the building. This check will also require a simple visual check for clear and obvious damage. This will be supported by guidance. I want all residents of our tall buildings to be confident that their fire doors will work when they are needed. At the moment if a door is damaged, the fire service has no power to require these to be repaired. This is not right and these regulations will change that. Finally, the regulations will require better information to be provided to residents. This was an issue at Grenfell Tower, and it is also an issue in Jersey. This information will help residents know what to do during a fire. It will also explain the importance of fire doors. I want to briefly explain how we have developed these regulations. In 2023 the U.K. Government introduced similar rules to address the Grenfell Tower Inquiry's recommendations. The following year we began a voluntary scheme to help buildings meet the same rules. This saw some good progress, with many buildings working towards those requirements. Over the past year we have spoken regularly with building owners and managers. This has helped us to understand their views on the voluntary scheme and fire safety more generally. This work has helped us to modify the regulations to make them more appropriate for Jersey. This has been well-received and feedback has shown broad support from residents and other stakeholders. There are 2 examples I want to highlight where we have altered the regulations to better suit Jersey. The first is related to external walls. The English rules require buildings to provide information about the materials used on their external walls. This information helps firefighters to assess risk during a fire; however, anecdotal evidence has shown that this information has been costly and challenging for buildings to obtain. Jersey's regulations will not include this requirement; instead the fire service will visit all buildings to obtain this information. This will significantly reduce the cost and burden to building owners, while ensuring the same information is obtained. The second area where we have adopted the English regulations relates to building height. In England, buildings over 18 metres tall or 7 storeys are required to comply with all the rules. Buildings over 11 metres or typically 5 storeys must only comply with some of the rules. We are taking a different approach by applying all the regulations to buildings over 11 metres. This is because during a tall building fire Jersey cannot call on the same number of firefighters as U.K. colleagues. This is unavoidable and is due to being on an Island without neighbouring services to help us. This decision will ensure firefighters are given every possible assistance during their fire and rescue operations. I strongly feel these changes make the regulations more appropriate for our Island. I now briefly want to explain why I believe these regulations will be successfully implemented. The first reason is because building owners and managers have been well engaged in this process. They largely accept the need for the rules and welcome the creation of guidance. As I mentioned earlier, many buildings have already been making positive steps on a voluntary basis. If the regulations are passed they will not come into force until April 2027. This provides time for buildings to implement the requirements and plan their finances. This timescale also provides time for guidance to be created. It is fair to say that some financial investment will be required from building owners to comply with the regulations. I believe this is necessary to ensure these important safety measures are achieved. Where a building does not participate in the voluntary scheme, we estimate the total cost will be between £6,500 and £8,200 for the entire building during year one. After this, annual costs are expected to be between £330 to £770. These costs are expected to be achievable for all buildings. Enforcement will be fair and proportionate. In 2027 every effort will be made to support buildings to comply. From 2028 the

fire service would begin a full inspection programme. This will aim to visit up to 50 buildings per year and inspect all buildings by 2031. This will be achieved within the fire service's existing resources. Where issues are found, efforts will be made to deal with them informally. If this is ineffective, formal improvement notices exist to ensure action is taken. Before concluding, I just want to address why these regulations are being created as a standalone piece of legislation instead of regulations under Jersey's existing Fire Precautions Law. Under Jersey's Fire Precautions Law a building must have a fire certificate before regulations can be created for it. This is inflexible and shows the outdated nature of this law. The fire certificate process is highly detailed and creates significant requirements for buildings and the fire service. I have no desire to require tall blocks of flats to require fire certificates. This is not the right option for them and it would not help achieve the aims of these regulations. Creating these regulations as a standalone piece of legislation allows for positive changes to be achieved without creating disproportionate burdens for building owners. Although technically these regulations will need to be approved again in April 2030, I hope that the Fire Precautions Law will be modernised by then. This will allow these regulations to fall under it without requiring reapproval every 3 years. A first draft of this more modernised law has been developed but it still requires significant development and consultation. We must ensure Jersey's residents are as safe as possible in their homes. These regulations will make a genuine difference in the event of a serious fire. These regulations take practical steps to ensure the failings which occurred at Grenfell Tower are prevented here. They also provide inspection enforcement powers to the Fire Service. This ensures minimum standards are consistently maintained across all buildings for the benefit of residents. I, therefore, ask the Assembly to give their support and I propose these regulations.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the principles?

14.1.1 Deputy C.D. Curtis of St. Helier Central (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel):

Just very briefly, the regulations provide a sensible first step to fire safety regulation in tall buildings. There was extensive consultation with broad support from stakeholders. The panel has received briefings on this matter, including a visit to a high-rise building to see the safety requirements in operation. The panel is supportive of the legislation.

14.1.2 Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement:

I have just got 2 things to add, really. One is, for the benefit of any reporting on this, if the Minister could confirm that when she talks about a building being 11 metres in height, the height is defined within the law as being the lower level of the top habitable storey. That is just so if anybody is reporting on this they do not say buildings are just 11 metres high, which would capture a large number of buildings that do not fall under these regulations. The height is, in particular, that of one where the lower level of the highest floor that is occupied. I just hope that the communication will be clear enough that those who have buildings 11 metres high but the highest floor, say, is 8.5 metres do not start worrying that they fall under that. It is a small point to make. The second one is the principle of applying this to 2 or more separate domestic premises. If the Minister in her summing up on the principles could explain the principle behind choosing 2 or more separate domestic premises, that would be appreciated. It would be interesting to know what the knock-on impact is for a range of Victorian properties that may well have a separate occupied lower floor and then occupation above, and whether those fall into this. That is not the case with me, I do not have anything to declare on that one but I just think it would be interesting to understand; 2 domestic premises in one building is quite a low number and I wanted to know if there was any clarification as to the policy decision that went into that.

14.1.3 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

Again, just a couple of clarification points on this one. Looking at the records here I understand only 19 per cent of buildings are currently compliant; just to get confirmation on that figure. Obviously this has significant financial implications for certain buildings. What I would like to know from a practical point of view is how many levels does 11 metres look like? How many buildings are, therefore, captured under this regulation? To confirm that timeframe to be compliant is by 2030. Finally, what happens if a building owner just simply cannot afford to meet the compliance?

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

14.1.4 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Thank you to the 2 who asked the questions. In relation to Deputy Curtis's question, yes, this is correct. From the floor height at the highest level. The reason for 2 or more domestic premises is to ensure it applies to all blocks of flats; unlikely there will be many with just 2 actual premises. In relation to Deputy Warr's question, typically - as I said in my speech - it is 5 storeys is roughly equivalent to what 11 metres would be, and as I mentioned earlier, approximately 140 buildings. The timeframe to be compliant is April 2027 but the things I was talking about in relation to the timescales thereafter is obviously the fire service will need to go and check all of the different premises around the Island, so obviously will not necessarily know about compliance until they have checked all those premises. On that note I call for the appel.

Deputy D.J. Warr:

Sorry, Minister, the final ...

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Sorry, I had not finished.

Deputy D.J. Warr:

Sorry, final question was just around what happens if you cannot meet compliance.

The Bailiff:

Would you be prepared to give way to Deputy Warr?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, certainly.

Deputy D.J. Warr:

It was just to answer my final question, that was all, and that was about what happens if the building owner just simply cannot afford compliance. Does the building just simply get shut down?

[16:00]

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

This is why there is such a long timescale. What is evident over the last period of time since this has been a voluntary scheme is a lot of people have already done a lot of work. As the chair of the Scrutiny Panel has said - and they visited one, as I have also visited one - all of the necessary work has already been done. This is why there is such a long timeframe in relation to this. The costs are roughly, as we estimated, between £6,500 and £8,200 and so, therefore, over the period of time they have already had, and the fact that they have already got another year from now until 2027 when the law is coming in, that gives quite a long period of time. There was a number of other matters that it was agreed that we would not include in this legislation because we were mindful that some of the extra piece would have been burdensome on these premises. Just to reiterate, we have had significant consultation with both building owners and the associations, and also residents, and all of those have

been positive about these changes. There has been, as far as I am aware, no concerns about the financial implications. I, therefore, call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 40		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				

Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Deputy Catherine Curtis, can you confirm your panel do not wish to scrutinise this matter any further?

Deputy C.D. Curtis:

Correct.

The Bailiff:

Thank you very much. Minister, how do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

14.2 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

En bloc please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading? Those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much, the regulations are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

14.3 Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Articles as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading? Is the appel called for?

Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat:

Yes, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 41		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				

Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				

Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

15. Draft Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-(P.1/2026)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Employment and Discrimination Tribunal Amendment Regulations lodged by the Minister for Social Security. The main respondent is the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these regulations under Articles 82 and 104 of the Employment (Jersey) Law 2003.

15.1 Deputy LV. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

The amendments to the Employment Tribunal Regulations are relatively minor, but nonetheless important changes. There are 3 main amendments. Each is designed to improve the effectiveness of the Tribunal and its processes and also emphasise its judicial and operational independence. New Regulation 2 increases the minimum and maximum pool of lay members of the Tribunal. There have been issues with the ability of the Tribunal to hear claims in a timely way because of the current small pool and, in some cases, the growing complexity of claims. Increasing the pool of lay members will give the Tribunal the opportunity to hear claims in a more timely way. New Regulation 3 deals with the appointment of members of the Tribunal. The Assembly is currently required to approve their appointment. In my view, and in the view of some Assembly Members expressed to me at the time, the Assembly considered the last group of appointees. It is important that the Tribunal, as a judicial body, is seen to be independent of the political process. I propose that the Assembly should in future not be required to approve the appointment of tribunal members. Amended Regulation 3 also clarifies the role of the Jersey Appointments Commission in the recruitment of new members of the Tribunal. The effect of the amendment is to make clear that the role of the J.A.C. (Jersey Appointments Commission) is to ensure a fair recruitment process and not the suitability of candidates for appointment. That task is undertaken by the recruitment interviewing panel whose recommendations for appointment will continue to be made to the Minister, who will need to be satisfied by the interviewing panel that the prospective appointees have the necessary qualifications and experience. The final substantive amendment concerns the makeup of individual panels to hear claims under employment and/or discrimination legislation. As the law currently stands, those panel members recruited for their discrimination law experience can only hear claims relating solely to discrimination issues. These are few and far between and represent a barrier to the effective utilisation of lay members with this expertise. Far more frequent are mixed claims, which involve elements of both employment and discrimination law, but from which discrimination panel members are currently barred. Amended Regulation 5 would enable the chair of the Tribunal to appoint a discrimination panel member to sit on a mixed claim in place of a member with employment law experience. The amendment would enable the best use to be made of the skills and expertise of a currently underused group of lay members. I commend the amendment to the Assembly and maintain the principles.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? [**Seconded**] Does any Member wish to speak on the principles?

15.1.1 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Deputy Doublet has had to go home ill so I, as the vice-chair of the panel, am the *rapporteur*, if you like, from the panel's point of view. I do want to place on record one item which has only just occurred to me as I have been put into this role in the last hour or 2, which is that a family member is currently pursuing a case at the Employment Tribunal. I do not think it constitutes a conflict in that I do not think anything that we will be deciding here today will affect the outcome or be seen to influence the proceedings of the body, but I just wanted to make that clear to Members. In terms of the proposition before us, the panel has had limited time to scrutinise but, as the notes will make clear if Members have had a chance to read them, we are content with all 3 elements of the changes that are proposed. With that I do not have anything further to add and we will not be calling them in.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles of these regulations? I call upon the Minister to reply.

15.1.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I would like to say thank you to the panel because I know they expedited the delivery of their comments so that we could debate these regulations today, so I would like to put on record my thanks to the panel for that and their support. On that note I will call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 42		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				

Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Deputy Renouf, can you confirm that your panel do not wish to scrutinise the matter any further?

Deputy J. Renouf (Vice-Chair, Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):

That is correct.

The Bailiff:

Minister, how do you propose the matter in Second Reading?

15.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

En bloc, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? [**Seconded**] Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading?

15.2.1 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

I support the proposal that appointments should be made by the Minister and not by the States. But I would like to address a short point on Regulation 3. Regulation 3 empowers the Minister to appoint individuals who are the chair and deputy chair of the Tribunal. The regulations separately require the chair and deputy chair to have a qualification in law. It is obviously important that the holders of those offices should be competent lawyers and fit to hold quasi-judicial office. It may be that the Minister for Social Security from time to time will have the ability to form a judgment on the ability of a legally qualified chair, but it may equally not be the case. If the Minister had not been in such a rush with this proposition I would have liked to lodge an amendment to require the Minister to consult with the Bailiff before making an appointment. The Bailiff sees advocates in action and has the ability to make enquiries as to professional ability and character, all of which I think would be useful information for a Minister to have before the Minister made the appointment. I would, therefore, in default of any amendment ask the Minister to consider whether she would in practice make it a habit of consulting the Bailiff before a quasi-judicial appointment of this kind is made.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak in Second Reading? Minister.

15.2.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I will just correct the Deputy because I was not in a rush to debate this particular set of regulations, I did it in good faith and collegiately because I know that we have got a lot of work coming on in the next few sittings. It was for that reason only that I requested that we take this debate at this sitting. With regard to Regulation 3 specifically, of course in the current regulation it is not incumbent on the Minister or indeed any Member of the Assembly to seek any advice from the Bailiff. I would leave it to the Minister at the time to decide whether they have enough information before them. Obviously if I or a future Minister thought that they required additional information or advice from the Bailiff, who happens to head up the judiciary, I am sure that they would get it, and this legislation does not preclude them getting that advice. I hope that answers the Deputy's questions.

The Bailiff:

Do you call for the appel?

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Second Reading:

POUR: 42		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				

Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

15.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, Sir.

[16:15]

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Articles as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading? Is the appel called for? Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 42		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				

Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

16. Draft Social Security (Health and Christmas Bonus) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.2/2026)

The Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Social Security (Health and Christmas Bonus) Amendment Regulations, lodged by the same Minister. The main respondent is the Chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Social Security (Health and Christmas Bonus) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Articles 2 and 3 of the Social Security (Bonus) (Jersey) Law 2014.

16.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

I am pleased to be bringing this legislation to the Assembly today. Following the Budget debate in December this Assembly approved the Government’s commitment to expand healthcare support to the Island’s pensioners as part of the wider Supporting Islanders and Strengthening Communities project. I have moved quickly to get these proposals lodged in order to make these changes as soon as possible. The Pension Plus Scheme is a means-tested tax-funded benefit that is currently available to lower income pensioners with no income tax liability, and less than £64,000 in savings, excluding the value of their home. The scheme provides financial support for dental, chiropody, and optical check-ups and treatments. In addition, anyone eligible for the scheme can access the Health Access Scheme and receive discounted visits to general practitioners. If agreed, these proposals will extend the eligibility to the scheme and the Health Access Scheme to pensioners with a tax liability of up to £1,000 in the previous year. It is estimated that this could bring up to 1,300 additional pensioners into the scheme at an estimated additional cost of up to £625,000 a year. The potential additions to the health scheme fall within the agreed limits of that scheme, with the cost being met from the Health Insurance Fund. At present the same income test is applied to the Pension Plus Scheme and the Christmas Bonus payment. While the eligibility is being widened for the Pension Plus Scheme, the

Christmas Bonus scheme will stay as is; that is, it is available to pensioners who do not have a tax liability. At present the Christmas Bonus rules rely on the Pension Plus eligibility as a proxy for including the rules themselves in the Christmas Bonus Regulations. The changes being debated today now explicitly set out the existing Christmas Bonus rules in the Christmas Bonus Regulations. This will have no impact at all on the existing pensioners who benefit from the Pension Plus Scheme and the Christmas Bonus. They will continue to receive the same benefits as now. Separating out the eligibility rules in this way provides more flexibility about how pensioner benefits can be phased and avoid an all-or-nothing approach to benefit eligibility. Pensioners with no tax liability can get help with heating costs, health costs and a Christmas Bonus. The change today will mean that pensioners with a tax liability of up to £1,000 will now be able to get extra help with health costs. Finally, support remains in place for pensioners who do not receive income support but have a tax liability of less than £2,735. That support is available through the Community Costs Bonus scheme. As I explained in the written report that accompanied the legislation, there are multiple ways these proposals make changes. To change the allowable tax income can be made by a Ministerial Order, while the updated rules for eligibility for the Christmas Bonus require regulations. The qualification for the Health Access Scheme does not have a legislative link. I have put these proposals together as one package so that Members have a holistic view of what is being proposed. Subject to Members' support today, the intention is to bring these regulations into force to align the target of these changes going live at the end of March. Thank you, I propose the principles.

The Bailiff:

Thank you, Minister. Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the principles?

16.1.1 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

Round 2 of my standing in, and even shorter than the last time I think. We had a brief chance to look at these proposals. They enact things that have already been agreed in the Budget and when we requested any further information in *lieu* of a briefing we were basically told it is all in the report and there is nothing really further to add, and I think that is fair enough. It is a very simple set of regulatory changes that effectively bring into effect decisions that have already been taken. We are happy as a panel to support them.

16.1.2 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

I am pleased to support this proposition, which - as the Minister mentioned - advances a priority in the Common Strategic Policy: health and well-being and affordable living. It takes forward a proposition that I brought in 2022 regarding the Pension Plus Scheme. I was persuaded to withdraw it by the Minister for Social Security at the time, now the Minister for Treasury and Resources, while a review was to be carried out of social security benefits. The reason why I brought this proposition came from a constituent of mine who - before I even was elected - came to a surgery I was holding, disclosed her personal financial details to me, and pointed out certain benefits that have been taken away from pensioners, including what used to be an extra allowance for people over the age of 70. Even though she had 2 pensions, having been a public employee, she was struggling with the increase of the cost of living and covering everything, and getting more and more scared that she would have to at some point ask for States help that she never anticipated asking for. Then on top of that I had another call from an irate pensioner saying: "What are you doing about pensioners?" So basically I was waiting for a result to see whether we might address what was pointed out as an inequity in the Pension Plus Scheme; that inequity being that if you had somebody who had their own house and was not paying income tax they could get Pension Plus, whereas if you had somebody who was paying rent - and an enormous amount of rent - even if that person only had £1,000 or taxable income that was absorbed by that rent, they would not get Pension Plus. So that was the basic inequity; the difference between having a house and not having taxable income beyond the actual threshold, and

paying rent from when you had income that attracted a small amount of tax. I am really glad and pleased that this is being addressed but, nevertheless - and this is what I asked the Minister - I had understood there was something more holistic going on. What still remains is an element of inequity. For example, as is mentioned in the report, if you have got up to £64,000 of savings in your own house you can get Pension Plus, but you might have the most amazing house. I mean, it might be worth £2 million. The difficulties with this scheme remain. Another question I have for the Minister relates to the way in which these changes are being funded. Again, thrilled by them, but are they sustainable? It has come from a Budget amendment that did divert some income from the Social Security Grant, I believe. But how confident are we it is sustainable? Unlike the Scrutiny Panel, which seems to have been happy with the report, I think there are these questions that need to be asked for the benefit of my constituents. In addition, because the report also says that current - and this is put in italics - eligibility criteria, that basically having Pension Plus gives you access to the Christmas Bonus. So “current” suggests we are going to take this away. I want to thank the officers of Social Security who helped me with this particular individual in terms of pointing out some support that was available, but I would also be grateful if the Minister would answer these questions because I suspect my constituents will be asking them of me.

16.1.3 Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache of St. Clement:

I too support these principles because it is obviously, in principle, desirable to allow pensioners who pay a small amount of tax to benefit from the Christmas Bonus and other allowances which are currently only paid to pensioners who pay no tax. The question is: can we afford it? The Minister has given us the figure and made provision in the budget for those benefits which are paid from central funds. The report states that figure is £625,000 and that seems to me to be a reasonable cost for the benefit on the other side of the equation to more than 1,000 low-income pensioners. What the Minister has not given us is the figure for the change to the Health Access Scheme, which is funded not from the general revenues but from the Health Insurance Fund. I would like to ask the Minister what effect this change is going to have upon the Health Insurance Fund. We are once again putting burdens on the fund without making any compensating arrangements for the income to the fund. The Minister will recall that she opposed my amendment to the Budget which would have put the Health Insurance Fund in a rather more healthy state. In 2026 the amount available in the Health Insurance Fund was £101 million. In 2029 that will have reduced to £61 million. What I would like to ask the Minister is what the Health Insurance Fund will contain in 2029 after these additional payments have been taken into consideration.

16.1.4 Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:

A couple of quick questions, please, for the Minister. I too welcome the introduction of these measures; I just had a couple of questions around the commencement and implementation. Will pensioners receive this automatically or are they going to have to make an application? What measures have been taken by the department to communicate this change to eligible pensioners?

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

[16:30]

16.1.5 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Firstly I thank the panel again for getting its comments in, in such a timely manner, despite the bringing forward of this particular debate. I will try and answer the questions that I have noted down. Deputy Scott, in answer to your constituents who are worried about financial support; I do want to give the message loud and clear that people should never be worried about coming in and claiming benefits that they are eligible for. It is one of the things that I have been working hard on as a Minister to ensure that we remove any stigma that really should not be there around people claiming benefits.

With regard to the Deputy's concerns about inequity around homeowners and people that rent, I would remind the Deputy that when it comes to income support eligibility, that does take into consideration the cost of renting. Indeed, some homeowners feel that is inequitable to them, so I am working on changes with regard to that as well. But the thing around these changes is this is about smoothing out what was very much a cliff edge where people were eligible to practically everything or nothing, and making these changes to legislation today ... the change to unhook Christmas Bonus eligibility from Pension Plus eligibility helps us to be clear around that and have more flexibility around the different qualification criteria for different benefits. Deputy Bailhache asked about the pensioners that would now become eligible for the Health Access Scheme. My understanding is that the additional cost to the H.I.F. (Health Insurance Fund) with this change is considered or estimated to be around £260,000 a year. While that might be seen as a cost to the Health Insurance Fund, I think it is really important to remember that, especially as people get older, the quicker they can get access to primary care and the more barriers we remove to people accessing primary care, that should enable us to save money in the longer run when it comes to things like hospital treatments and things like that. It is really important that we get people seeking early intervention to enable them to keep healthy and have healthy lives as they continue to age. Deputy Miles asked about implementation. Obviously we need to be careful around communications ahead of this legislation going through. I was conscious there was still a political decision to be made. The communications will start and commence after this decision of the Assembly today. There will be a leaflet sent out to all pensioners in the coming weeks, which will outline all of the benefits that are available to all pensioners, and encourage them to contact my department if they think that there is a benefit that they should be eligible for that they are not receiving. I have asked my department - and hopefully some of the Constables have had contact from my department already - to go and meet with Parishes, update Parishes on benefits as a whole but also hopefully do some kind of drop-in sessions in the Parishes in the community. We are hoping that communication will help as well. My direction to the department is always to try and automate payments and application processes as much as possible. I was trying to recall when Deputy Miles made the request to me and where we had got to with the discussion in terms of this. My understanding is - and I can provide more detail to the Deputy outside of the Chamber - my department does have a data-sharing agreement with the Tax Department, and similar to the Community Costs Bonus and how we work, because the rules are very similar, we should have some form of automatic implementation. I do not want to promise things on the floor of the Chamber but that is definitely what we were working towards. I think I have answered any questions as best as I could. Again, I would remind the Assembly that the changes to the legislation today do just enact what we all agreed within the Budget debate at the end of last year, and I hope everybody will support them because they will make a real difference to pensioners. Thank you. I call for the appel.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the principles have been adopted:

POUR: 43		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy M.B. Andrews		
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				

Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				

The Bailiff:

Deputy Renouf, can you confirm that your panel do not wish to scrutinise the matter any further?

Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade (Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel):

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Minister, how do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

16.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

En bloc, please, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading? Those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much, the regulations are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you propose the regulations in Third Reading?

16.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are those regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the regulations as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading? Is the appel called for? The appel has been called for, Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted in Third Reading:

POUR: 43		CONTRE: 1		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Deputy M.B. Andrews		
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				

Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				

17. Draft Employment and Discrimination (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.4/2026)

The Bailiff:

We now move on to the Draft Employment and Discrimination Amendment Law, lodged by the Minister for Social Security. The main respondent is the chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Employment and Discrimination (Jersey) Amendment Law 202-. A law to amend further the Employment (Jersey) Law 2003 and the Discrimination (Jersey) Law 2013. The States, subject to the sanction of His Most Excellent Majesty in Council, have adopted the following law.

17.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

The changes to the Employment and Discrimination Laws, which I am bringing to the Assembly today, could be described as good housekeeping as they clarify the law in 3 separate areas. The first area of amendment applies to both the Employment Law and Discrimination Law. The new wording clarifies the calculation of the time allowed for claims to be lodged with the Employment Tribunal. There have been examples of claims deemed to be out of time because an incorrect calculation of the deadline has been made. The new wording in the laws is an attempt to present a simpler and more effective way of expressing deadlines. The second area tidies up an oversight in previous amendments and removes the term “maternity leave” in the requirement for written terms and conditions. Since the reforms to parental leave rights first introduced in 2018, this term is now outdated and of no legal effect. The term “parental leave” has been substituted. The opportunity has also been taken to rewrite and simplify the wording of the Employment Law in terms of setting minimum wage rates. As with the other 2 changes, the intent is to clarify the wording of the legislation and not to make any policy changes. Thank you. I maintain the principles.

The Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the principles?

17.1.1 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

As with the previous 2, I would like to point out that we have not had as much time as we would normally have to scrutinise, but within those constraints we are content with the changes that the Minister has outlined and, in particular, endorsed the view that they are essentially housekeeping. There is one area which I certainly felt could do with a little clarification and I would welcome the Minister’s attempt to do so if she has the opportunity, which is the new Article 17A(2). The aim of these is to simplify and clarify but I found it confusing to read that: “Article 17A(2) sets out that Orders may provide that trainees be paid a different rate, and that a different rate may also be paid by reason of a person’s age.” To have that followed by: “The law does not currently provide for and will not provide for, and will not provide for by virtue of these amendments, differential minimum wage rates for different age bands.” I think it is because we are talking about 2 different things, one is a trainee rate and one is a minimum wage rate, but it could be easy to confuse and think that there is almost a contradiction there. So I would welcome the Minister’s chance to clarify that, but - as I say - given the time available, we found no further major issues.

The Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? Minister.

17.1.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

I do thank the panel again for providing its comments at more speed than it would have usually done. I just want to allay the vice-chair’s concerns. The purpose of the changes is not policy changes, it was to seek to clarify that there was a separate trainee rate as well as if a future Minister did want to introduce an age rate that provision is still there. But it does not introduce any different policy into the legislation; it just sought to clarify the differences between that trainee rate and the minimum wage as well. There are references as well to school leaving age, and these changes were made to simplify and also clarify those different rates that do exist in provisions in the legislation and could be used by Ministers in the future.

The Bailiff:

Do you call for the appel?

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes please.

The Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If Members have had the opportunity to cast their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				

Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Bailiff:

Deputy Renouf, can you confirm that your panel do not wish to scrutinise the matter any further? Thank you very much. Minister, do you propose the Articles in Second Reading?

17.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, Sir.

The Bailiff:

Are the Articles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does any Member wish to speak on the Articles in Second Reading? Those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much, the Articles are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you propose the Articles in Third Reading?

17.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, please.

The Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the Articles as adopted in Second Reading, in Third Reading. Is the appel called for? The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats and I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the law has been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAINED: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				

Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy Sir P.M. Bailhache				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy A.F. Curtis				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business for this meeting and I ask the chair of P.P.C. to propose the Arrangement of Public Business for Future Meetings.

18. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

I am sure Members will be surprised by the brevity of this sitting but I can assure them it is the lull before the storm. **[Laughter]** Today we deferred the Draft Marriage and Civil Partnership (Dissolution and Separation) Law, P.85, which will be debated at the next meeting. An item that was on the next meeting, P.14, Treating Children as Children, proposed by Deputy Bailhache, he will be requesting that it is deferred to 10th March. There are a number of other items that have been added to the Consolidated Order Paper: P.20, Comptroller and Auditor General: appointment; P.21, Draft Sea Fisheries (Atlantic Bluefin Tuna); P.22, Draft Planning and Building Amendment; P.23, Ministerial Office: independent support to Ministers. There are obviously some substantial items coming up for the next meeting and I would expect all continuation days to be used. With that, I propose the order of business.

[16:45]

The Bailiff:

Are Members content to proceed as proposed by the chair of P.P.C.? Are Members content now to adjourn? The Assembly stands adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on 24th February.

ADJOURNMENT

[16:46]