

STATES OF JERSEY

r

STATES' EXPENDITURE: REDUCTION IN COST OF PUBLIC SECTOR WORKFORCE (P.90/2003) – AMENDMENTS

Lodged au Greffe on 8th July 2003
by the Connétable of St. Helier

STATES GREFFE

STATES EXPENDITURE: REDUCTION IN COST OF PUBLIC SECTOR WORKFORCE (P.90/2003) –
AMENDMENTS

- (1) *In paragraph (b) for the word “size” substitute the words “overall cost”.*
- (2) *In paragraph (b) after the word “workforce” add the words “and, in conjunction with the Privileges and Procedures Committee, of States members’ remuneration,”.*

CONNÉTABLE OF ST. HELIER

REPORT

Amendment (1)

Having lodged P.90/2003 I thought I would take the opportunity of clarifying two matters: first, that my proposal is designed to reduce the cost of the public sector rather than the size. Although this intention is borne out by the title of P.90, *States' Expenditure: reduction in cost of public sector workforce* and in the Report, the Proposition itself refers to 'size' and there would be a risk that while the number of posts was reduced in States' departments, cost-savings would not be achieved if work was simply contracted out.

The words "overall cost" are also intended to reflect my view that a 10% paybill saving across the board is not proposed. While part (a) of the Proposition charges all Committees to report back to Policy and Resources Committee with information about their staffing levels, parts (b) and (c) are intended to give that Committee the power to alter, i.e. increase or decrease, staffing levels in the public sector.

Amendment (2)

I believe that the States' Assembly should play its part in reducing the cost of government to the taxpayer. If approved this Amendment will require the Policy and Resources Committee to consult with the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the members of the States themselves over the best way to achieve this saving, whether that be through a reduction in the number of members or through adjustments to remuneration levels.

Finally, the lodging of these amendments gives me the opportunity to state that no criticism of States' Departments is intended in the Report accompanying P.90, in which, by way of example, I have referred to figures published in the most recent Manpower Report that was available to me at the time of drafting P.90. I am sure that some of the Departments referred to have achieved significant cuts in payroll costs since the period covered in that Report.

The financial and manpower implications are as set out in the report accompanying the proposition.