



**Committee on Standards and Privileges**

# **Report on a complaint against Mr Timothy Gaston MLA**

Ordered by the Committee on Standards and Privileges to be published 7 May 2025.

This report is embargoed until noon on 9 May 2025
---

Report: NIA 73/22-27 Committee on Standards and Privileges.

# Contents

Powers and Membership.....	3
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms used in this Report .....	5
Introduction .....	6
Role of the Committee.....	6
Background.....	7
The relevant Rules in the Members' Code of Conduct.....	9
The Commissioner's findings and reasoned decisions .....	9
The Committee's considerations and conclusions .....	12
Rule of Conduct 15: points to prove .....	13
The Convention and relevant jurisprudence.....	14
Examination of the allegations .....	15
The Principles of Conduct .....	18
Recommendations .....	19
Links to Appendices .....	20
Appendix 1: The Commissioner for Standards Report on a complaint against Mr Timothy Gaston MLA .....	20
Appendix 2: Written submission from Mr Timothy Gaston MLA .....	20
Appendix 3: Correspondence from Ms Paula Bradshaw MLA .....	20
Appendix 4: Minutes of Proceedings.....	20

# **Powers and Membership**

## **Powers**

The Committee on Standards and Privileges is a Standing Committee of the Northern Ireland Assembly established in accordance with paragraph 10 of Strand One of the Belfast Agreement and under Assembly Standing Order Nos. 51 and 57. Further provisions on the Committee's functions are also included in Standing Orders 69, 69A, 69B, 69C and 70.

The Committee has power:

- To consider specific matters relating to privilege referred to it by the Assembly;
- To oversee the work of the Assembly Clerk of Standards;
- To examine the arrangements for the compilation, maintenance and accessibility of the Register of Members' Interests and any other register of interests established by the Assembly, and to review from time to time the form and content of those registers;
- To consider any specific complaints made in relation to the registering of declaring of interests referred to it;
- To consider any matter relating to the conduct of Members; and
- To recommend any modifications to any Assembly code of conduct as may from time to time appear to be necessary.

The Committee is appointed at the start of every Assembly, and has power to send for persons, papers and records that are relevant to its inquiries.

# Membership

The Committee has 9 members, including a Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson, and a quorum of five members. The membership of the Committee is as follows:

- Cathy Mason MLA (Chairperson)<sup>1</sup>
- Connie Egan MLA (Deputy Chairperson)<sup>2</sup>
- Stewart Dickson MLA
- Jemma Dolan MLA
- Brian Kingston MLA<sup>3</sup>
- Paul Frew MLA
- Harry Harvey MLA
- Declan McAleer MLA<sup>4</sup>
- Colin McGrath MLA

---

<sup>1</sup> From 3 February 2025 Ms Cathy Mason replaced Ms Carál Ní Chuilín as Chairperson.

<sup>2</sup> From 8 November 2024 Ms Connie Egan replaced Mr Stewart Dickson as Deputy Chairperson.

<sup>3</sup> From 8 April 2024 Mr Brian Kingston replaced Mr Stephen Dunne as a member of the Committee.

<sup>4</sup> From 10 February 2025 Mr Declan McAleer replaced Ms Carál Ní Chuilín as a member of the Committee.

# List of Abbreviations and Acronyms used in this Report

MLA:	Member of the Legislative Assembly
TEO Committee:	Committee for The Executive Office
The Assembly:	Northern Ireland Assembly
The Code:	Assembly Members' Code of Conduct
The Commissioner:	Assembly Commissioner for Standards
The Committee:	Committee on Standards and Privileges
The Convention:	The European Convention on Human Rights

# Introduction

1. The Committee on Standards and Privileges (“the Committee”) has considered a report from the Assembly Commissioner for Standards (“the Commissioner”) on her investigation into a complaint against Mr Timothy Gaston MLA (“the respondent”) of alleged breaches of the Assembly Members’ Code of Conduct (“the Code”).
2. A link to the Commissioner’s investigation report, which includes a copy of the complaint correspondence, together with the evidence gathered during the investigation, is included at **Appendix 1** (a certain amount of information has been redacted from the Commissioner’s report to accord with legal obligations). The written submission from Mr Gaston in response to the Commissioner’s investigation report is included at **Appendix 2**. In addition, a response from Ms Paula Bradshaw to points raised in Mr Gaston’s response to the Commissioner’s report is included at **Appendix 3**. Finally, a link to the applicable minutes of proceedings of the Committee is included at **Appendix 4**.

## Role of the Committee

3. The arrangements for regulating the standards of conduct of MLAs include: the role of the independent Commissioner in investigating complaints of alleged breaches of the Code; the role of the Committee in considering the Commissioner’s investigation reports and adjudicating in light of the Commissioner’s findings and any other evidence or information obtained; and the role of the Assembly in plenary in deciding upon sanctions recommended by the Committee where applicable.
4. It is the Committee which ultimately decides on whether any breach of the Code is established, on the basis of the evidence, the facts and the legal position in respect of each allegation.
5. It is important to note at this juncture that, to inform its decision-making on individual complaint cases, the Committee may seek additional advice and information to supplement evidence and findings presented by the Commissioner. As outlined below, the Committee obtained legal advice on

various aspects of this complaint case in order to inform its decision-making and to ensure that it discharges relevant legal obligations.

## Background

6. On 22 October 2024, the Commissioner received a complaint from Dr Paschal McKeown, Director, Age NI (“the complainant”) that the respondent had breached Rules 13 and 15 of the Code.
7. The complaint related to a meeting of the Committee for The Executive Office (“TEO Committee”) on 25 September 2024, when Dr Paschal McKeown and Dr Kellie Turtle attended on behalf of Age NI to provide oral evidence in relation to the Committee’s inquiry into gaps in equality legislation for older people. During questioning by members, Mr Gaston asked several questions to the panel, the last two of which are the main subject of complaint, notably the one specifically directed at Dr Turtle in relation to comments posted on her X (previously known as Twitter) account.

The exchange between Mr Gaston and Dr Turtle was recorded in Hansard as follows:

*“Mr Gaston: I have a final point for Age NI. If an elderly person in a care home insisted that they be given a bed bath by someone of the same biological sex, would that be viewed as transphobic by Age NI?”*

*Ms Ní Chuilín: Jesus Christ.*

*Dr McKeown: We cannot comment on an individual case without knowing what the circumstances are. We are not in a position to comment on that.*

*Mr Gaston: Kellie, as head of policy for Age NI, is your Twitter account in conflict with Age NI?*

*Dr Turtle: My personal social media has absolutely nothing to do with my professional role.*

*Mr Gaston: Even though you are listed as head of policy for Age NI?*

*Dr Turtle: It does not say that.*

*Mr Gaston: I just find —.*

*Dr Turtle: It does not say that on my personal Twitter. I find this line of questioning quite inappropriate.*

*Ms Hoy: So do I.*

*Ms Ní Chuilín: So do I. He is consistent.*

*Mr Gaston: I will let you reflect on what you have on your Twitter account.*

*I find that it does not comply with what Age NI is trying to do.*

*Ms Ní Chuilín: Chair, that is ridiculous. Seriously, it is ridiculous.*

*The Chairperson (Ms Bradshaw): I know.*

*Ms McLaughlin: It is stupid.*

*The Chairperson (Ms Bradshaw): Are you content for us to move on?*

*Dr Turtle: Very much so.*

*The Chairperson (Ms Bradshaw): Apologies if any offence was caused.”*

8. Following this exchange, questioning continued by other members and, at the end of the evidence session, a further brief exchange took place during which other members of the Committee expressed their disapproval of Mr Gaston’s approach to questioning Dr Turtle (Appendix 1).
9. The Commissioner considered the complaint and decided it was admissible before commencing her investigation on 5 November 2024. On 19 January 2025, the Commissioner forwarded her report on the investigation to the Committee for consideration.
10. Prior to the Committee commencing its adjudication and in accordance with its established disclosure process, the Committee Clerk sent the Commissioner’s full investigation report to the respondent for written comment in respect of any matters raised within the report (where applicable, any written comments received from the respondent in such complaint cases are provided to the Committee at the same time as it receives the Commissioner’s investigation report). The respondent was also offered the opportunity to appear before the Committee to make comments in person and to answer any questions members may have.
11. The respondent made a written response to the Commissioner’s investigation report (Appendix 2) but did not avail of the opportunity to appear before the Committee.



## **The relevant Rules in the Members' Code of Conduct**

12. The relevant rules of conduct cited in the complaint against Mr Gaston are as follows:

**Rule 13:** You shall not act in any way which improperly interferes, or is intended or is likely to improperly interfere, with the performance by the Assembly of its functions or the performance by a Member, officer or staff of the Assembly of their duties.

**Rule 15:** You shall not subject anyone to unreasonable and excessive personal attack.

## **The Commissioner's findings and reasoned decisions**

13. In her investigation report (Appendix 1), the Commissioner has detailed the approach to the investigation, the evidence considered, her findings of fact, analysis and reasoning and her conclusions on the allegations contained in the complaint (as well as wider observations and recommendations). The Committee noted the following elements of the investigation report in particular, in terms of the Commissioner's main findings and decisions.

### **Allegation 1 – alleged breach of Rule 13**

14. The complainant alleged that the comments made by Mr Gaston breached Rule 13 by distracting and diverting the Committee away from the matter that Dr Turtle and others were invited to speak about and therefore interfered with the performance of the Committee in carrying out its function during this meeting. However, the Commissioner did not believe that Mr Gaston, in asking the questions to Dr Turtle as he did, improperly interfered with the performance by the Assembly of its functions.
15. The following extract from the investigation report outlines the Commissioner's reasoning as to why she did not uphold the complainant's allegation of a breach of Rule 13:

*'The Committee is a scrutiny committee. It is Mr Gaston's role, as a member of that Committee, to ask questions of witnesses that appear before it. Irrespective of whether Mr Gaston's questions are believed to be relevant or not, and/or any negative impact those questions may have on witnesses or prospective witness attendance, I do not believe in the context of this complaint that it can be said that Mr Gaston has improperly interfered with the performance of the Assembly of its functions in breach of Rule 13'.<sup>5</sup>*

## **Allegation 2 – alleged breach of Rule 15**

16. In considering if there had been a breach of Rule 15, the Commissioner noted that the rule prohibits MLAs from subjecting anyone to an “unreasonable and excessive personal attack”. As such, the Commissioner has explained that she had to be satisfied that, when Mr Gaston asked Dr Turtle questions about the personal views that she had posted on her X account, that those questions were an “attack” that was “personal” and “unreasonable” and “excessive”.
17. For the purpose of interpretation, the Commissioner has applied the following definitions from the Concise Oxford English Dictionary (11th Ed): “attack” being “to criticise or oppose fiercely and publicly”; “excessive” being “more than is necessary, normal or desirable”; and “unreasonable” being “beyond the limits of acceptability”.
18. In relation to whether Mr Gaston's questioning of Dr Turtle was an “attack”, the Commissioner acknowledged that Dr Turtle felt personally attacked but was not convinced that the questions posed by Mr Gaston amounted to an attack defined as “fiercely” criticising or opposing.<sup>6</sup>
19. In terms of whether Mr Gaston's questions were excessive, the Commissioner has explained that Mr Gaston appeared to be cross-examining Dr Turtle's personally held views on transgender and gender diverse issues while she was attending the Committee meeting as a representative of Age NI. However, the Commissioner has pointed out that Dr Turtle was not present at the TEO Committee to be interrogated about her personal views on transgender and

---

<sup>5</sup> Appendix 1, paragraph 29.

<sup>6</sup> Appendix 1, paragraphs 33-36.

gender diverse issues and how or whether her views complied with her employer's mission. The Commissioner has taken the view that Mr Gaston's conduct, in interrogating Dr Turtle about her personal views and in implying that her personal views did not comply with Age NI's mission, was unwarranted, was not "necessary, normal or desirable" in the context of the meeting, and was therefore excessive.<sup>7</sup>

20. When considering whether Mr Gaston's questions were unreasonable, the Commissioner noted that Mr Gaston's voice was "calm and non-aggressive" throughout his exchange with Dr Turtle and that the manner of the exchange was not "beyond the limits of acceptability". The Commissioner also considered that, in a committee setting, it would not be unreasonable to consider previous publications of a witness and to then follow-up with the witness in person at a meeting, as Mr Gaston did with Dr Turtle in relation to her posts on X. The Commissioner also noted that it would not be unreasonable for a witness, in this case Dr Turtle, to refuse to answer such questions.<sup>8</sup>

21. The Commissioner summarised her reasoning for not upholding the complainant's allegation of a breach of Rule 15 as follows:

*"I do not believe Mr Gaston's conduct has met the threshold required to be in breach of Rule 15 of the Code. It is my view that it was excessive but not unreasonable or an attack on Dr Turtle to have asked the questions; Rule 15 does not preclude questions that are irrelevant, foolish, discourteous or inappropriate."*<sup>9</sup>

22. The Committee noted other points arising from the Commissioner's considerations. These include the fact that, because she did not find Mr Gaston's conduct to have breached Rule 15 of the Code, the Commissioner was not required to consider the provisions on freedom of expression and protected political speech under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights ("the Convention"). The Commissioner also pointed out that,

---

<sup>7</sup> Appendix 1, paragraphs 37-38.

<sup>8</sup> Appendix 1, paragraphs 39-43.

<sup>9</sup> Appendix 1, paragraph 44.

even if she had found Mr Gaston's questioning of Dr Turtle to be in breach of Rule 15:

*"...the case law is clear that political speech is afforded enhanced protection which includes the right to say that which could be considered dangerous, disturbing, irresponsible or shocking. If the Code restricted the ability of members of the Assembly to ask a question about gender identity in the context of a committee inquiry into equality legislation, it would represent an obvious interference with political expression."*<sup>10</sup>

23. A further point of note was the Commissioner's conclusion regarding the issues of power imbalance, emotional distress, stress and anxiety raised by and on behalf of Dr Turtle after the event. The Commissioner expressed her empathy with the fact that Mr Gaston's questioning had caused Dr Turtle anxiety, frustration and emotional distress, which had had an impact on her well-being. In this regard, however, the Commissioner ultimately resolved that "emotional distress is a foreseeable consequence of robust political expression" and that to "use the Code to prohibit questions which might cause emotional distress or reputational damage would be an unjustifiable limitation on political speech".<sup>11</sup>
24. The considerations and implications arising from the enhanced protection afforded to political speech are examined in more detail in the next section.

## **The Committee's considerations and conclusions**

25. After receiving the Commissioner's oral briefing on her investigation report on 12 February 2025, the Committee commissioned legal advice on various aspects of the complaint case. The issues included, inter alia, the considerations in relation to Rule 15 and Mr Gaston's right to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the Convention and how (if at all) this right should inform the Committee's decision on what steps it takes. The Committee was mindful that, as an organ of the Assembly, the Committee is itself a public

---

<sup>10</sup> Appendix 1, paragraph 45.

<sup>11</sup> Appendix 1, paragraphs 46-48.

authority subject to the Human Rights Act 1998, which means that it has a freestanding obligation to ensure that its actions are compatible with the Convention.

26. The legal advice was considered at the Committee's meeting on 26 March 2025 and this informed the Committee's subsequent deliberation on the complaint case.

## **Rule of Conduct 15: points to prove**

27. As set out above, Rule 15 prohibits MLAs from subjecting anyone to 'unreasonable and excessive personal attack'. The Committee has previously established, on the basis of legal advice, that the four elements of this type of misconduct are conjunctive, not disjunctive. As such, for the Committee to uphold an allegation of a breach of Rule 15, there must be an evidential basis for proving an 'attack' by the Member complained about, it must be 'personal', and the nature of that personal attack must be 'unreasonable' and 'excessive'. The necessity of each of these four elements to be substantiated for a finding of a breach of Rule 15 is notwithstanding any additional considerations in relation to the Member's right of freedom of expression.
28. The Committee is mindful that Rule 15 sets a high threshold, including in terms of the conjunctive nature of the points to prove for a finding of a breach of the Rule. However, as indicated below, this high threshold aligns with the enhanced protection afforded to political expression and the fact that the Code expressly upholds Members' right to freedom of expression.<sup>12</sup>
29. The Committee is also aware that the high threshold set out in Rule 15 is a deliberate product of careful consideration by a predecessor Committee which, following a review of the Code in 2015, made clear that:

*"Members should not feel inhibited from subjecting witnesses to challenging questioning... It would be entirely wrong if the [Code] required members to*

---

<sup>12</sup> See paragraph 2.3 of the Code: <https://www.niassembly.gov.uk/your-mlas/code-of-conduct/the-code-of-conduct-and-the-guide-to-the-rules-as-amended-on-23-march-2021/>

*modify their behaviour in committee in a way that undermined the democratic process”.*<sup>13</sup>

## **The Convention and relevant jurisprudence**

30. The Committee noted from its legal advice the following relevant points arising from Article 10 of the Convention and related case law:

- Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right includes the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority.
- It is a qualified right and is subject to such formalities, conditions and restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society.
- A finding that a Member breached the Code, where applicable, could amount to a restriction on their right to freedom of expression.
- Any interference with Article 10 rights requires the closest scrutiny, particularly in the political context.
- Political and public interest expression is given the highest level of protection under the Convention because of its fundamental importance in a democratic society.
- The enhanced protection for political expression covers not only the substance of what is said, but also the form, tone or manner in which it is conveyed.
- In the political context, protected speech includes expression which could offend, shock or disturb (including political opinion, which could be regarded as unpopular or offensive).
- While there is higher level of acceptable criticism for politicians and public figures who knowingly expose themselves to higher levels of

---

<sup>13</sup> See paragraph 101 of the review report:  
<https://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/standards-and-privileges-2011-2016/report/review-of-code-of-conduct.pdf>

scrutiny, private individuals and associations who engage in political or public interest debate must also demonstrate a higher level of tolerance to criticism.

- Political expression, however, does not extend to gratuitous personal comments.

31. The Committee was also clear from its legal advice that, for it to uphold a breach of the Code, the following three tests needed to be met:

- (a) Whether the Committee can find, as a matter of fact, that Mr Gaston's conduct in respect of the allegation was in breach of the Code;
- (b) If so, whether that finding is in itself prima facie a breach of Article 10(1) of the Convention (and thus a restriction on Mr Gaston's freedom of expression); and
- (c) If so, whether the restriction arising from that finding is justified by reason of the requirements of Article 10(2) of the Convention (i.e. is it "prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the reputation or rights of others"?)

32. As part of its reasoning process, the Committee therefore examined each allegation separately having regard to these three tests as applicable.

## **Examination of the allegations**

33. At its meeting on 26 March 2025, the Committee deliberated on each of the two allegations in light of: the evidence; the findings of fact and reasoned decisions of the Commissioner as set out in her investigation report; the Commissioner's oral briefing on her investigation report; the legal advice received by the Committee; and the written submission by Mr Gaston. In undertaking its adjudication function, the Committee remains mindful that Members will only have found to have breached the Code when they have breached one of the Rules of Conduct.

34. In relation to **allegation 1**, that Mr Gaston had breached Rule 13 of the Code, the Committee noted the Commissioner's analysis and reasoning as outlined

above. The Committee accepted the Commissioner's point that, in the context of this complaint, Mr Gaston acting as a member of a scrutiny committee and asking questions of a witness, irrespective of the relevance or otherwise of the questions and any negative impact on the witness, cannot be regarded as improperly interfering with the performance of the Assembly/Committee of its functions.

35. Also, in terms of the background and intended purpose of Rule 13, the Committee is mindful that the Rule was introduced following the abovementioned review of the Code in 2015. During that review, the then Committee considered the type of conduct which could engage Rule 13 and amount to improper interference in the exercise of the Assembly's functions, including in the context of Assembly committees. This would include, for example: leaking committee reports; interrupting or disturbing committee proceedings; deliberately attempting to mislead a committee; and participating in committee proceedings where to do so runs contrary to the principles of natural justice (e.g. when a Member has a conflict of interest).<sup>14</sup> In that regard, the Committee did not consider that Mr Gaston's questioning of Dr Turtle fell within the scope of Rule 13.
36. The Committee therefore concurred with the Commissioner's reasoning and decision on this issue. As such, **in relation to allegation 1, the Committee did not find, as a matter of fact, that the respondent's conduct was in breach of Rule 13.** The Committee was not, therefore, required to consider the tests outlined at paragraph 31(b) and (c) above.
37. In relation to **allegation 2**, that Mr Gaston had breached Rule 15 of the Code, the Committee noted that the Commissioner, while concluding that Mr Gaston's conduct was excessive, found that it was not unreasonable or a personal attack on Dr Turtle to have asked the questions and therefore, Mr Gaston's conduct had not met the threshold required to be in breach of Rule 15.

---

<sup>14</sup> See paragraphs 196-208 of the review report:  
<https://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/standards-and-privileges-2011-2016/report/review-of-code-of-conduct.pdf>



38. From the separate legal advice which it received, the Committee was clear that in order to uphold a breach of Rule 15, it must be satisfied on a factual basis that each of the abovementioned elements of the Rule have been breached (i.e. the comments must be unreasonable and an excessive personal attack). In line with the approach taken by the Commissioner, the Committee's deliberations focussed on the ordinary meaning of the elements contained within the wording of Rule 15 (as there is no particular legal interpretation which should apply to the wording) and did not amend or dilute that meaning by introducing different criteria such as inappropriate, unacceptable, harassed or intimidated.
39. The Committee concurred with the Commissioner's reasoning that Mr Gaston's comments, though excessive, were not unreasonable and that, while they resulted in Dr Turtle feeling personally attacked, they did not constitute a personal attack. The Committee also noted in particular: that Mr Gaston did not provide any detail as to Dr Turtle's views (he instead inferred that, having viewed her X account, that it would conflict with the position held by Age NI); that Dr Turtle refused to respond to Mr Gaston's comments (which is her right to do so); the public status of Dr Turtle's X account, which included specific reference to older people in the "bio"; and the fact that Mr Gaston did not persist with the questioning.
40. The Committee was also clear from its legal advice that it cannot adjudicate on a breach on the basis of how a witness felt. Rather, the Committee needed to conduct an objective assessment of Mr Gaston's conduct and how it applies to Rule 15, as opposed to the impact it may or may not have had on Dr Turtle. On this point, the Committee also concurred with the Commissioner's conclusion that "to analyse compliance with the Code by reference only to the reaction of a witness to challenging questions would be unworkable and would necessarily flow backwards into preventing protected political expression."<sup>15</sup>
41. In conclusion, the Committee concurred with the Commissioner's reasoning and decision on this issue. As such, **in relation to allegation 2, the Committee did not find, as a matter of fact, that the respondent's conduct was in breach of Rule 15.**

---

<sup>15</sup> Appendix 1, paragraph 48.

42. If the Committee had found, as a matter of fact, that Mr Gaston had breached Rule 15, it would have then been required to conduct a balancing exercise in terms of considering between protecting Mr Gaston's Article 10 rights and protecting Dr Turtle's rights (such as the Article 8 right to a private life) and her reputation. However, as the Committee did not find a breach of Rule 15 it was not required to consider the tests outlined at paragraph 31(b) and (c).
43. **Therefore, the two allegations against Mr Gaston have not been upheld and the Committee has concluded that he did not breach the Assembly Code of Conduct.**

## **The Principles of Conduct**

44. As part of its deliberations, the Committee also considered the Principles of Conduct contained within the Code, which all MLAs are expected to observe. In particular, the Committee noted the Principle of Respect which states, "Members should show respect and consideration for others at all time" (Principle 10).<sup>16</sup>
45. As alluded to above, the Committee has concurred with the Commissioner's conclusion that Mr Gaston's behaviour was excessive (i.e. being "more than is necessary, normal or desirable"), in terms of interrogating Dr Turtle about her personally held views and, whilst doing so, implying that her views did not comply with what her employer, Age NI, "is trying to do". By engaging in such excessive behaviour, **Mr Gaston did not show consideration for Dr Turtle at all times and therefore failed to observe the Respect Principle. Whilst this does not mean that Mr Gaston's behaviour amounted to a breach of the Code – as the Principles of Conduct are aspirational rather than enforceable – the Committee believes that this complaint case highlights the importance of all Members observing the Principles of Conduct contained in the Code. The Principles of Conduct reflect the spirit of the Code and represent the ethical standards to which all Members should aspire, whether that be when they engage with witnesses during**

---

<sup>16</sup> See page 6 [https://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/your\\_mlas/code-of-conduct/the-code-of-conduct-and-the-guide-to-the-rules-relating-to-the-conduct-of-members---march-2021.pdf](https://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/your_mlas/code-of-conduct/the-code-of-conduct-and-the-guide-to-the-rules-relating-to-the-conduct-of-members---march-2021.pdf)

**committee proceedings specifically or in their conduct as Assembly Members generally.**

## **Recommendations**

46. The Committee noted the wider observations and recommendations offered by the Commissioner in her report, in respect of the guidance provided to witnesses appearing before Assembly committees. In particular, the Commissioner has recommended that the freedom of expression protections afforded to Members is made clear in the information and guidance sent to witnesses prior to their attendance at Assembly committees.
47. The Committee has agreed to support this recommendation and will seek to progress the proposed revision of the existing guidance for witnesses as appropriate.

# Links to Appendices

## **Appendix 1: The Commissioner for Standards Report on a complaint against Mr Timothy Gaston MLA**

[View the Commissioner for Standards Report](#)

## **Appendix 2: Written submission from Mr Timothy Gaston MLA**

[View written submission from Mr Timothy Gaston MLA](#)

## **Appendix 3: Correspondence from Ms Paula Bradshaw MLA**

[View correspondence from Ms Paula Bradshaw MLA](#)

## **Appendix 4: Minutes of Proceedings**

[View Minutes of Proceedings related to the report](#)

You may re-use this publication (not including images or logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Northern Ireland Assembly Licence.

[Find out more about the Open Northern Ireland Assembly Licence.](#)

This Report can be made available in a range of formats including large print, Braille etc. For more information please contact:

Committee on Standards and Privileges

Shane McAteer, Committee Clerk

Northern Ireland Assembly

Parliament Buildings

Ballymiscaw

Stormont

Belfast BT4 3XX

Telephone: 028 90 521843

Email: [committee.standardsprivileges@niassembly.gov.uk](mailto:committee.standardsprivileges@niassembly.gov.uk)