

If the motivation for this exercise were truly 'voter equality', all island voting would be the answer and it would be consistent with the fact that most States decisions affect the whole island. Connétables, as the people best placed to know local implications, should be retained to highlight those implications.

This would be less damaging to the parish system than super-constituencies, which I oppose in any permutation.

Super-constituencies do not actually achieve voter equality and, by definition of their justification, would be a temporary solution subject to future housing developments..

They are an insidious erosion of parish identity and attack the heart of the island by redefining communities. Better to ignore the boundaries for this purpose than have some parishes subsumed into others.

It is probable they would result in effective disenfranchisement of the smaller parishes.

Where is the evidence that larger constituencies will improve the quality of candidates?

It is not valid to claim someone elected unopposed is un-elected.

The proposal is based on the flawed starting point that the referendum showed the island wanted super-constituencies. As voting in the referendum had been choosing the least bad option and the result was not even a majority of the ones who voted, let alone the electorate, this was a flawed starting point so it would have been a miracle if it had produced a good solution.

There is a danger that people will vote for anything that invokes 'improved democracy' because questioning if this will actually improve things will be portrayed superficially as being anti-democracy and therefore a bad thing. This applies to a States vote or badly formed referendum or Mori poll and the island really needs States members to think about the implication of the laws they are passing rather than be driven by sound bite thinking and ill-informed social media attacks.

This exercise appears to be a red herring to distract from the manifest failure of the current system of government which has signally failed the island. Compare the state of the island now with how it was before the decade or so of paid politicians and ministerial government. You could be forgiven for thinking they have produced a States that thinks it justifies its salary by the number of laws it passes, irrespective of whether they are needed, apply to the local administration or their negative implications. Somewhere in this, you have to ask what our taxes are used for, if there is a need to pay for basic services for which taxes normally pay. This needs to be fixed and then worry about how many Members are appropriate.

It is very difficult to avoid the conclusion the justification of the proposal hides a thinly veiled attack on the parish system, the only accountable government we have in the island. As this system keeps its spending under control, it makes an uncomfortable contrast for the States. If Venice is being cited, it should be remembered it also talks of respecting traditional boundaries and it is disingenuous to claim the parishes have been safeguarding because the Connétables were retained. Choosing a location for these meetings is a current example of the issue.

Thank you
Maxine Fergusson