

STATES OF JERSEY



COMPOSITION AND ELECTION OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY (P.133/2016): COMMENTS

Presented to the States on 19th January 2017
by Privileges and Procedures Committee

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

Background

Since the report of the Review Panel on the Machinery of Government in Jersey was published in 2000, numerous Propositions have been brought to the States to reform the way in which the States Assembly is composed and elected. A summary document, setting out the various proposals is shown in the **Appendix**.

In February 2015, the Privileges and Procedures Committee ('PPC') established the Sub-Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly, of which the terms of reference were –

1. To seek to engage with all elected Members of the States Assembly on the issue of reform.
2. To consider whether all categories of elected States Members should be treated equally within the States of Jersey Law, as far as practicable.
3. To develop proposals in order to enhance voter equity through –
 - Reviewing constituency boundaries;
 - Reviewing the categories, numbers and distribution of elected States Members.
4. To consider the benefits and limitations of various voting systems.
5. To bring forward a proposal to the Assembly, by March 2016 at the latest, which could be acceptable to a majority of elected States Members.
6. To bring the process to a conclusion, with legislation passed into law, by Spring 2017 at the latest.

When considering various options for reform, the Privileges and Procedures Committee and its Sub-Committee has been limited by the outcome of the 2014 referendum when Islanders were asked whether the Connétables should remain as Members of the States as an automatic right. 62.4% of those Islanders who voted were in favour of retaining the Connétables.

The Sub-Committee (Connétable L. Norman of St. Clement, Senator P.F.C. Ozouf, Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence and Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier) supported by an officer group, comprising representatives from the States Greffe and the Community and Constitutional Affairs Department, held a number of workshops with States Members during 2015 and 2016. The sessions covered the number and categories of States Members; constituency boundaries; voter equity and voting systems. Various questions were put to those States Members that attended the workshops in order to provide the underlying principles, based upon majority responses, from which the Sub-Committee could begin to build proposals for reform.

However, the views that were expressed by States Members did not, in their entirety, demonstrate a desire to deviate from the current system in any significant way and were not sufficiently polarised to provide a clear steer on reform –

- Over 74% agreed that it was very important or quite important to reform the current system.
- Over 75% strongly agreed or slightly agreed with the outcome of the referendum on the role of the Connétables (and over 80% strongly agreed or slightly agreed that the outcome should be adopted).
- Over 64% felt it was very important or quite important to maintain the role of Senator.
- Over 71% felt it was very important or quite important to maintain the role of Deputy.
- Over 55% felt that the total number of States Members was about right.
- Over 41% felt that the total number of Senators was about right and over 44% felt that the total number of Deputies was about right.
- Over 69% felt that voters should be able to vote for the same number of representatives.
- Over 61% felt it was very important or quite important to maintain parish-based constituencies for Deputies.
- Over 51% indicated that their preference for calculating voter equity was on the basis of total population.
- Over 70% felt that it was very important or quite important to have a reformed system which followed the guidelines as set out in the Venice Commission.

The Venice Commission guidelines provide that constituency boundaries should be drawn in order that seats are distributed equally among constituencies, in accordance with specific apportionment criterion, for example: the number of residents in the constituency, the number of resident nationals (including minors), or the number of registered electors (equality in voting power). They also provide that each voter should have the same number of votes (equality in voting rights).

Jersey's electoral map is curious in the sense that it has been divided along almost purely historical lines. Aside from the obvious parish boundaries, the electoral districts of St. Helier, St. Saviour and St. Brelade were drawn up by dividing and amalgamating Vingtaines. As the statistics will later bear out, there is significant imbalance in representation across parishes/districts.

The following table breaks down population, eligible voters and registered voters by parish. The figures for population and eligible voters are based upon the 2014 Population Estimate, which was produced by the Statistics Unit using information from the 2011 Jersey Census and more recent data sources. The number of registered voters is a known number taken from the electoral roll of the 2014 General Election.

It should be noted that the figures for population and eligible voters are estimates. The Statistics Unit has not received new parish-level population information since the 2011 Census. The 2014 Population Estimate assumed that the population of each parish

had increased by the same proportion, which is unlikely to be true. Likewise, the number of eligible voters has simply been updated in line with the population figures.

Figure (1) – Population, Eligible Voters and Registered Voters by Parish/District

	Population 2014 Estimate	Eligible voters 2014 Estimate	% of population eligible	Registered voters Oct 2014	% of population registered	% of eligible population registered
St. Mary	1,805	1,380	76.48	1,378	76.36	99.83
St. John	2,999	2,349	78.32	2,158	71.97	91.89
Trinity	3,251	2,441	75.10	2,127	65.43	87.13
St. Brelade No. 1	3,485	2,860	82.07	2,418	69.39	84.55
St. Saviour No. 3	3,751	2,830	75.44	2,384	63.55	84.24
St. Martin	3,876	3,059	78.93	2,767	71.38	90.44
St. Ouen	4,220	3,296	78.11	3,100	73.46	94.05
St. Saviour No. 2	5,010	3,930	78.44	2,923	58.34	74.38
Grouville	5,012	3,986	79.53	3,478	69.39	87.25
St. Peter	5,153	4,131	80.15	3,608	70.01	87.35
St. Saviour No. 1	5,247	4,150	79.09	3,061	58.34	73.76
St. Lawrence	5,581	4,409	79.00	3,693	66.17	83.77
St. Brelade No. 2	7,410	5,990	80.83	5,165	69.70	86.23
St. Helier No. 2	9,038	7,310	80.88	4,338	48.00	59.34
St. Clement	9,498	7,386	77.76	6,244	65.74	84.54
St. Helier No. 1	10,316	8,260	80.07	5,333	51.70	64.56
St. Helier No. 3/4	15,147	12,110	79.95	8,382	55.34	69.22
TOTALS	100,800	79,877		62,557		
Average			79.24		62.06	78.32

Examining the figures, there does not appear to be a material difference between eligibility rates across parishes and districts. St. Brelade No. 1 is thought to possess the highest percentage of eligible voters with 82.07% of its population estimated to be entitled to vote. Trinity is believed to hold the smallest percentage of eligible voters, at 75.10%. Based on these approximations and their minor variations, population and eligible voters would likely deliver similar results when used as the foundation for the redistribution of representatives.

However, there is a significant disparity between population/eligible voters and the registered electorate itself. Whilst St. Mary achieves near complete registration, only 65.19% of eligible St. Helier residents are on the electoral roll. Indeed, in the district of

St. Helier No. 2 only 48% of eligible residents are registered. Generally speaking, country parishes outperform their larger, urban counterparts in terms of registration.

Therefore, country parishes would have a stronger claim to further representation under a registered electorate basis than a population / eligible voters basis. The contrary would be true for urban parishes like St. Helier and St. Saviour.

This section breaks down the above figures further, to show for each parish/district the number of residents / eligible voters / registered voters per Deputy.

Figure (2) – Population versus Deputorial representation by Parish/District

	Population 2014 Estimate	Current Deputies	Residents per Deputy	Deviation from Average
St. Mary	1,805	1	1,805	93%
St. Saviour No. 2	5,010	2	2,505	39%
St. Saviour No. 1	5,247	2	2,624	32%
St. Lawrence	5,581	2	2,790	25%
St. John	2,999	1	2,999	16%
St. Helier No. 2	9,038	3	3,013	15%
Trinity	3,251	1	3,251	7%
St. Helier No. 1	10,316	3	3,439	1%
St. Brelade No. 1	3,485	1	3,485	0%
St. Brelade No. 2	7,410	2	3,705	-6%
St. Saviour No. 3	3,751	1	3,751	-7%
St. Helier No. 3/4	15,147	4	3,787	-8%
St. Martin	3,876	1	3,876	-10%
St. Ouen	4,220	1	4,220	-18%
St. Clement	9,498	2	4,749	-27%
Grouville	5,012	1	5,012	-31%
St. Peter	5,153	1	5,153	-33%
TOTALS	100,800	29		
Average			3,476	

Under population, it is the larger country parishes that tend to encounter the least favourable ratio of residents per Deputy. St. Peter, Grouville and St. Ouen are all underrepresented by Venice Commission standards, wherein it was stated that “*the permissible departure from the average should not be more than 10%, and should certainly not exceed 15% except in special circumstances (protection of a concentrated minority, sparsely populated administrative entity.*” Compared to this standard, St. Peter, Grouville and St. Ouen deviate from the average by 33%, 31% and 18% respectively. The urban parish of St. Clement also faces statistically significant underrepresentation.

By contrast the small country parishes of St. Mary and St. John enjoy relative overrepresentation. This also applies to the urban districts of St. Saviour No. 1 and 2. Both are represented by 2 Deputies each, despite maintaining a population equivalent to Grouville and St. Peter. The same can be said of St. Lawrence.

There is considerable imbalance in representation across the board. Ten out of 17 parishes / districts exceed the maximum permissible departure from the average as outlined by the Venice Commission.

Figure (3) – Eligible voters versus Deputorial representation by parish/district

	Eligible voters 2014 Estimate	Current Deputies	Residents per Deputy	Deviation From Average
St. Mary	1,380	1	1,380	100%
St. Saviour No. 2	3,930	2	1,965	40%
St. Saviour No. 1	4,150	2	2,075	33%
St. Lawrence	4,409	2	2,204	25%
St John	2,349	1	2,349	17%
St. Helier No. 2	7,310	3	2,437	13%
Trinity	2,441	1	2,441	13%
St. Helier No. 1	8,260	3	2,753	0%
St. Saviour No. 3	2,830	1	2,830	-3%
St. Brelade No. 1	2,860	1	2,860	-4%
St. Brelade No. 2	5,990	2	2,995	-8%
St. Helier No. 3/4	12,110	4	3,028	-9%
St. Martin	3,059	1	3,059	-10%
St. Ouen	3,296	1	3,296	-16%
St. Clement	7,386	2	3,693	-25%
Grouville	3,986	1	3,986	-31%
St. Peter	4,131	1	4,131	-33%
TOTALS	79,877	29		
Average			2,754	

It was previously observed in Figure (1) that there did not appear to be a material difference between eligibility rates across parishes. As such, the base factor of ‘eligible voters’ delivers similar results to those experienced under population (Figure (2)).

It remains the case under eligible voters that the larger country parishes tend to encounter the least favourable ratio of residents per Deputy. St. Clement again faces a statistically significant level of underrepresentation. Once more this is contrasted by St. Mary, St. Saviour No. 1 and 2, St. Lawrence and St. John, all of whom enjoy relative overrepresentation.

There remains significant imbalance in representation across the map under the eligible voters metric. Nine out of 17 parishes / districts exceed the maximum permissible departure from the average as outlined by the Venice Commission.

Figure (4) – Registered voters versus Deputorial representation by parish/district

	Registered voters 2014 Estimate	Current Deputies	Residents per Deputy	Deviation from Average
St. Mary	1,378	1	1,378	57%
St. Helier No. 2	4,338	3	1,446	49%
St. Saviour No. 2	2,923	2	1,462	48%
St. Saviour No. 1	3,061	2	1,531	41%
St. Helier No. 1	5,333	3	1,778	21%
St. Lawrence	3,693	2	1,847	17%
St. Helier No. 3/4	8,382	4	2,096	3%
Trinity	2,127	1	2,127	1%
St. John	2,158	1	2,158	0%
St. Saviour No. 3	2,384	1	2,384	-10%
St. Brelade No. 1	2,418	1	2,418	-11%
St. Brelade No. 2	5,165	2	2,583	-16%
St. Martin	2,767	1	2,767	-22%
St. Ouen	3,100	1	3,100	-30%
St. Clement	6,244	2	3,122	-31%
Grouville	3,478	1	3,478	-38%
St. Peter	3,608	1	3,608	-40%
TOTALS	62,557	29		
Average			2,157	

It was previously observed in Figure (1) that there is a disparity between population / eligible voters and the registered electorate itself. Rates of registration vary across parishes, with country parishes generally outperforming their larger, urban counterparts.

As such, when registered voters is applied as the base factor for comparing representation by parish / district, different results are generated. The 3 St. Helier districts, which experienced a statistically normal level of representation under population/eligible voters, appear to be overrepresented under the registered voters metric. Indeed, under this measure, St. Helier No. 1 and 2 enjoy a level of overrepresentation beyond the permissible amount stated by the Venice Commission. Likewise, the magnitude of overrepresentation in St. Saviour No. 1 and 2 heightens. This phenomenon can be explained by the lower registration rates in St. Helier and St. Saviour, which stand at 65.19% and 76.72% of the eligible population respectively.

Meanwhile, due to their healthier registration rates, the country parishes appear to be less well represented under registered voters than population / eligible voters. Because of its near 100% registration rate, the scale of St. Mary's overrepresentation decreases substantially under this metric. Elsewhere, St. John, which was previously deemed to be overrepresented under population / eligible voters, now achieves a level of representation in line with the average. St. Martin, which was within the Venice Commission's permissible departure range under population / eligible voters, is underrepresented to a statistically significant level under registered electors.

Generally speaking then, country parishes would have a stronger claim to further representation under a registered electorate basis than a population / eligible voters basis. The contrary is true for urban parishes like St. Helier and St. Saviour.

The scale of imbalance is greater under registered electors than population / eligible voters. Twelve out of 17 parishes/districts exceed the maximum permissible departure from the average as outlined by the Venice Commission.

The findings of the Sub-Committee

Over the course of 2016, the Sub-Committee considered proposals for reform which aimed, as far as possible, to reflect the outcomes of the workshops. They also sought to achieve greater equality in voting power by re-allocating the Deputy seats in order to balance the inequality that arises from the retention of the Connétables in the States. The Sub-Committee subsequently agreed that 3 proposals should be put forward for the consideration of all States Members. All the proposals were independently assessed by a Professor of Politics at Oxford University and were deemed to be an improvement on the status quo.

A further workshop took place on 13th July 2016, which was attended by 26 States Members who provided feedback on their preferred option using voting buttons. 36% favoured the option which allowed for 8 Senators to be elected on an Island wide basis and 1 Connétable for each Parish. It divided the 29 Deputy seats across the 6 electoral districts, of near equal size, based on total population, with the intention of ‘offsetting’ the inequality in voting power, which was generated through having the Connétables automatically in the States Assembly. Parish boundaries were respected and each district was represented, as far as possible, by an equal total number of Deputies and Connétables.

Of the 3 options that were proposed at the workshop, this was the most compliant with the recommendations of the Venice Commission. 81.9% of the population are currently in non-compliant districts. This option reduces that number significantly to 14.4%. The 12 Connétables would continue to be elected from within the current Parish boundaries and the 29 Deputies would be elected from the following 6 large districts –

- District 1 – Vingtaine du Mont Cochon, Vingtaine du Mont à l’Abbé, Vingtaine de Haut du Mont au Prêtre and Vingtaine de Bas du Mont au Prêtre (St. Helier) (6 Deputies);
- District 2 – Cantons de Bas et de Haut de la Vingtaine de la Ville and Vingtaine du Rouge Bouillon (St. Helier) (6 Deputies);
- District 3 – St. Brelade and St. Peter (5 Deputies);
- District 4 – St. Ouen, St. Mary, St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (2 Deputies);
- District 5 – St. Martin and St. Saviour (5 Deputies);
- District 6 – St. Clement and Grouville (5 Deputies).



_____ Denotes Electoral District Boundary for Deputies

_____ Denotes Parish Boundary for the election of Connétables

At its meeting on 12th October 2016, the Sub-Committee favoured this proposal (hereinafter referred to as ‘**Option A**’), which retains the current number of States Members. It also asked the officer group to explore a reduction in the number of States Members to 43 (by effectively removing one Deputy from each district) (hereinafter referred to as ‘**Option A1**’); and a reduction in the number of States Members to 44 (by removing one Deputy from each district except District 4) (hereinafter referred to as ‘**Option A2**’).

Professor Iain Maclean, from Oxford University, who analysed the various proposals put forward in 2013, confirmed that all of these 3 options are more compliant with the recommendations of the Venice Commission than the current system. The most compliant is Option A.

Mindful of the so-called ‘Troy Rule’, which ensures that the Executive are always in a minority, Option A1 would limit the maximum number of Ministers and Assistant Ministers in an Assembly of 43 to 18, and Option A2 would limit the maximum number of Ministers and Assistant Ministers in an Assembly of 44 to 19.

However, all 3 options were poorly received by the main Committee and no clear consensus amongst the 7 members could be reached.

Given that it had set out in its Terms of Reference to seek to achieve a proposal ‘which could be acceptable to a majority of elected States Members’, the Committee does not feel that it can present any of the options as a plausible alternative to the status quo. This has been brought into focus by Deputy A.D. Lewis of St. Helier lodging his proposition [P.133/2016](#). The Committee recognises that this is essentially ‘Option B’ from the 2013 Referendum, with a slight modification. The Privileges and Procedures Committee of the time put forward Option B for implementation in 2013, but this

proposition was defeated and the Chairman of the Committee, the Connétable of St. Helier, resigned as a consequence.

In his election speech on 7th November 2014 the Chairman maintained, in relation to the Referendum outcome that *“We must respect that decision. We must build on that decision and work together to find the solution which has evaded us for so long. With one issue resolved we now need to tackle the future of the other roles: Senator and Deputy, and also how we will resolve the issue of proportionality and equality of representation in the light of the referendum result..... I will work with a grand coalition of Members, including the Chief Minister and officers from his department to seek out the solution which is fair, understandable, and meets the aspirations of the Members of this Assembly, but more importantly of the public.”*

This was repeated at each of the workshops, where the main focus of each session was to help the Sub-Committee to arrive at a position which a majority of States Members could support and to produce a Reform proposal which would be designed not by the Sub-Committee itself, but by the Assembly as a whole.

Unfortunately this has proven unattainable.

The current Committee has exhausted the consultation process and no clear direction was identified – the views of those members who participated were so strongly polarised that it was impossible to gain a steer from the responses given. The Committee is of the view that there would be no benefit in lodging any of the options which came out of the consultation. This view was validated by the results of the final workshop in July 2016 when 58% of those present indicated that they could not support any one of the options presented without amendment. In fact many members expressed a view that had they known what the outcome of the consultation would be, they would have given different responses to the questions in the beginning!

The Committee does not consider that it would be sensible to lodge something which is not reflective of the research results – not only would that undermine the work undertaken but it would also ignore the contributions of members who participated in all of the sessions.

The Committee does not believe that it should lodge an amendment or a stand-alone proposition simply for the sake of it.

The Committee also recognises that were it to lodge a proposal or indeed an amendment to Deputy Lewis’ proposition, there would be a strong likelihood that others would join the wave of amendments which would inevitably ensue. Members can see from the list attached at the **Appendix** that every time there has been a chance of a proposition which could make some improvements being adopted, a raft of amendments or alternatives have been lodged which have only served to dilute the strength of the original.

The Committee feels that the Assembly should have the chance to consider Deputy Lewis’ proposition and any amendments on their own merit and does not wish to complicate and confuse the situation by putting forward something which has received only lukewarm support from within its number. It has no particular view on the main proposition itself, save as to note that it is very closely aligned with what the public who voted in the 2013 Referendum chose as their preferred option. The decision of the Assembly not to implement the result of that Referendum has led to a sense of

disaffection between the electorate and States Members, with many committed voters choosing not to vote in the 2014 since they considered that the States ‘don’t listen’ to the public.

The Privileges and Procedures Committee asked Professor Iain Maclean to evaluate its own options, Deputy Lewis’ proposal for a new districting system for elections to the States Assembly of Jersey and the amendment of Senator P.F.C. Ozouf ([P.133/2016 Amd.](#)) with particular reference to their proportionality.

The advisory limits recommended by the Venice Commission is a maximum tolerance of +/- 15% from the average district size. None of the options fall within the Venice Commission’s advisory limits, apart from Option A, which was rejected by the Sub-Committee and the main Committee.

Table: The Schemes Rank-Ordered

Rank Order	% of population outside Venice limits
Best: Option A	14.4
Option A1	48.6
Option A2	48.6
Lewis	48.7
Ozouf	65.8
Worst: Current system	81.9

Standard Deviation

In statistics the standard deviation is a measure that is used to quantify the amount of variation or dispersion of a set of data values. A low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be close to the mean (average), while a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread out over a wider range of values.

In this case the mean is the average number of residents per representative. Each representative has been given equal weighting irrespective of whether they are Senator, Connétable or Deputy. In nearly all of the options apart from rejected Option A, St. Helier remains under represented.

Rank Order	Standard Deviation from the mean
Best: Option A	213
Option A1	258
Option A2	268
Lewis	347
Ozouf	581
Worst: Current system	642

Proposals on Electoral Reform

Date	Proposition/Report	Name	Proposal	Outcome
2000	Review Panel on the Machinery of Government in Jersey	'The Clothier Report'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of Senator to be abolished; - Constables to cease being ex-officio Members of the Assembly; - An Assembly of between 42 and 44 Members; - An Electoral Commission to re-assign the vacant seats amongst the parishes (seeking to even out the disproportionate representation of some parishes); - Members to hold the title 'Member of the States of Jersey'; 	Proposals for electoral reform not implemented
2001	P.179/2001 Machinery of Government: The Composition and Election of the States Assembly	Policy and Resources Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of Senator to be abolished; - Constables to cease being ex-officio Members of the Assembly; - An Electoral Commission to re-assign the vacant seats amongst the parishes (seeking to even out the disproportionate representation of some parishes); - As of 2005, all Members to be elected through a general election. 	Withdrawn
2002	P.6/2002 Draft States' Reform (Election of Senators) (Jersey) Law 200-	Policy and Resources Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As of 2005, all Members to be elected through a general election. 	Withdrawn
2002	P.186/2002 Machinery of Government: Composition and Election of the States Assembly	Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Senators to be reduced from 12 to 8; - An Assembly of 49 Members; - As of 2005, all Members to be elected through a general election. 	Withdrawn
2004	P.115/2004 Composition and Election of the States Assembly	Deputy F.J. Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of Senator to be abolished; - Constables to cease being ex-officio Members of the Assembly; - An Assembly of 42 Members; - Members to hold the title 'Senator'; - As of 2008, all Members to be elected through a general election and serve a term of 4 years. 	Withdrawn
2004	P.151/2004 Machinery of Government Reform – composition and election of the States Assembly	Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constables no longer Members by virtue of their office; - Office of Senator and Deputy to be abolished and replaced by a new category of member; - 47 States Members to be elected in six large constituencies. <p>Constituencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St Helier West: 8 Members - St Helier East: 8 Members - St Clement and Grouville: 7 Members - St Saviour and St Martin: 8 Members - St Brelade and St Peter: 8 Members 	Lost (9-41)

2004	P.151/2004 Machinery of Government Reform – composition and election of the States Assembly, 1st amendment	Deputy F.J. Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St Lawrence, St John, St Mary, St Ouen, Trinity: 8 Members - Constables no longer Members by virtue of their office; - Single category of Member known as 'Senator'; - 42 States Members elected along parish boundaries. <p><u>Constituencies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St. Helier: 12 Members - St. Saviour: 6 Members - St. Brelade: 4 Members - St. Clement: 4 Members - All other Parishes: 2 Members 	Lost (5-42)
2004	P.151/2004 Machinery of Government Reform – composition and election of the States Assembly, 2nd amendment	Deputy M.F. Dubras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constables no longer Members by virtue of their office; - Office of Senator and Deputy to be abolished and replaced by a new category of member; - 37 States Members to be elected in six constituencies. <p><u>Constituencies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St Helier West: 6 Members - St Helier East: 6 Members - St Clement and Grouville: 5 Members - St Saviour and St Martin: 7 Members - St Brelade and St Peter: 6 Members - St Lawrence, St John, St Mary, St Ouen, Trinity: 7 Members 	Lost (4-43)
2004	P.151/2004 Machinery of Government Reform – composition and election of the States Assembly, 3rd amendment	Deputy J.G. Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constables to remain; - Office of Senator and Deputy to be replaced by a single category of Member; - 47 States Members to be elected along parish boundaries. <p><u>Constituencies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - St. Helier – 12 Members - St. Lawrence – 2 Members - St. Peter – 2 Members - St. Brelade – 4 Members - St. Ouen – 4 Members - St. Mary – 1 Member - St. John – 1 Member - Trinity – 1 Member - St. Martin – 1 Member - Grouville – 2 Members - St. Saviour – 5 Members - St. Clement – 3 Members 	Lost (3-47)

2004	P.195/2004 Machinery of Government Reform: Election of Senators	Deputy S.C. Ferguson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As of 2008, a public election to be held following the general election to select 6 Senators from the elected pool of Deputies and Constables; - No Member may stand as Chief Minister or Minister who has not been elected as a Senator. 	Withdrawn
2004	P.227/2004 Senators and Deputies: Terms of Office	Deputy A. Breckon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Single election day for Senators and Deputies. 	Withdrawn
2005	P.1/2005 Referendum: Composition of the States Assembly	Commetable L. Norman	<p>Referendum to ask the following questions with a Yes/No option for each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you agree that the number of States Members should be reduced to between 42 and 44? - Do you agree that the office of Senator with its Island-wide mandate should be abolished? - Do you agree that the Commetables should no longer be entitled to sit in the States by virtue of their office but should be free to stand for election to the States if they so wished? 	Lost (19-27)
2005	P.177/2005 Senatorial Elections 2005: Reduced Term of Office	Deputy F.J. Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To agree that the term of office of the Senators elected in the senatorial elections to be held in October 2005 should be reduced from 6 years to 3 years, so that all Senators could be elected on a single day as of 2008. 	Lost (18-27)
2006	P.145/2006 Composition and Election of the States Assembly: Proposed Reform	Senator B.E. Shenton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As of 2008, all Members to be elected through a general election; - The number of Senators to be reduced from 12 to 8 following the 2008 general election; - Chief Minister should only be appointed from Members holding an island-wide mandate, namely the Senators. 	Lost (14-37)
2006	P.145/2006 Composition and Election of the States Assembly: Proposed Reform, 1st amendment	Deputy G.P. Southern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constables no longer Members by virtue of their office; - An additional 8 Deputies' positions to be created and distributed proportionately to population across the Parishes to make a total membership of 49 from the date of the 2008 general election. 	Lost (9-40)
2006	P.145/2006 Composition and Election of the States Assembly: Proposed Reform, 2nd amendment	Privileges and Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General election 'period' to be created whereby Senators and Commetables are elected on the same day, with Deputies elected shortly after. 	Lost (15-35)
2007	P.75/2007 Composition of the States: Revised Structure and Referendum	Privileges and Procedures Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Constables to remain; - 36 other Members to be elected in 6 large districts; - Proposals to be brought forward regarding boundaries and size of districts; - Reform proposal to be put to the public through a referendum. 	Lost (21-26)
2007	P.75/2007 Composition of the States: Revised Structure and Referendum, 1st amendment	Deputy G.C.L. Baudains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 36 other Members to be elected along parish boundaries, seats to be distributed as equitably as possible. 	Lost (15-27)
2007	P.75/2007 Composition of the States: Revised Structure and Referendum, 2nd amendment	Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For proposals to be adopted, a majority of those "eligible to vote" in the referendum must approve the changes. 	Lost (10-35)

2007	P.75/2007 Composition of the States: Revised Structure and Referendum, 3rd amendment	Deputy G.P. Southern	- 48 Members, to be known as Deputies, to be elected in 6 new large electoral districts.	Lost (2-42)
2007	P.86/2007 Composition of the States: Referendum	Senator, J.L. Perchard	- As of 2008, all Members to be elected through a general election. Referendum to seek the views of the electorate on 4 options for the future composition of the States, namely (i) an Assembly comprised of the 12 Connétables and 36 Deputies elected on a Parish or constituency basis; (ii) an Assembly comprised of the 12 Connétables and 36 Deputies elected in 6 new large electoral districts; (iii) an Assembly comprised of 12 Senators elected on an Island-wide basis and 36 Deputies; (iv) An Assembly comprised of 48 Deputies elected on a Parish or constituency basis. - Privileges and Procedures Committee to propose electoral district boundaries/re-apportion Deputies' seats across parishes.	Lost (13-32)
2009	P.72/2009 Composition and election of the States: revised structure	Privileges and Procedures Committee	- Membership of 49 comprising 12 Connétables and 37 other Members, to be known as Deputies, elected in 6 new large electoral districts; - As of 2011, all Members to be elected through a general election and serve a term of 4 years; - Reform proposals to be submitted to the electorate in a referendum; - Privileges and Procedures Committee to submit proposals regarding the precise boundaries and size of the proposed 6 large electoral districts.	Lost (10-38)
2009	P.72/2009 Composition and election of the States: revised structure, 1st amendment	Deputy F.J. Hill	- 49 Deputies to be elected in six large electoral districts.	Lost (6-37)
2009	P.72/2009 Composition and election of the States: revised structure, 2nd amendment	Connétable L. Norman	- 49 Deputies to be elected along parish boundaries.	Lost (14-33)
2009	P.72/2009 Composition and election of the States: revised structure, 3rd amendment	Deputy T.M. Pitman	- Membership of the Assembly to total 47.	Lost (15-30)
2009	P.72/2009 Composition and election of the States: revised structure, 4th amendment	Deputy D.A.J. Wimberley	- 37 Deputies to be elected on a single election day every 4 years; - 12 Senators to be elected, with 4 being elected each year.	Lost (12-33)
2009	P.109/2009 Composition and Election of the States: Single Election Day Each Year	Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre	- As of 2011, all Members to be elected through a general election.	Won (47-1)

2009	P.138/2009 Composition and Election of the States: Abolition of 6 Senatorial Positions in 2011	Deputy A.E. Jeune	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of Senators to be reduced from 12 to 6 following the 2011 election; - An Assembly of 47 Members. 	Withdrawn
2009	P.146/2009 Referendum – Position of the Connétables in the States	Deputy M. Tadier	<p>Referendum to ask the following question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you think that the 12 Parish Connétables should have an automatic seat in the States Assembly by virtue of their office? 	Lost (17-29)
2009	P.146/2009 Referendum – Position of the Connétables in the States, 1st amendment	Deputy F.J. Hill	<p>Referendum to ask the following additional question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you think that the position of Senator with its island-wide mandate should be maintained? 	Lost (16-26)
2009	P.146/2009 Referendum – Position of the Connétables in the States, 1st amendment	Deputy A.E. Jeune	<p>Referendum to ask the following additional question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you think that the number of elected States Members should be reduced by 6? Changes would only be implemented if there is a turnout in excess of 50% of the registered electorate voting in the referendum. 	Lost (6-34)
2010	P.118/2010 Composition of the States: Spring Election and Move to Four-year Term of Office	Privileges and Procedures Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Established Spring elections as of May 2018; - Reduced the number of Senators from 12 to 8; - An Assembly of 49 Members; - Legislation on number of Ministers/Assistant Ministers amended to maintain 'Troy' rule. 	Won (31-17)
2010	P.198/2010 Composition of the States: Reduction in Number of Senators Referendum	Senator F.E. Cohen	<p>Referendum to ask the following question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you agree that the number of Senators should be reduced from 12 to 8? 	Lost (19-29)
2010	P.198/2010 Composition of the States: Reduction in Number of Senators Referendum, 1st amendment	Senator A. Breckon	<p>Referendum to ask the following additional question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you think that the 12 Parish Connétables should have an automatic seat in the States Assembly by virtue of their office? 	Lost (10-37)
2010	P.198/2010 Composition of the States: Reduction in Number of Senators Referendum, 2nd amendment	Deputy T.M. Pitman	<p>Referendum to ask the following additional question with a Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you wish the number of Deputies representing your Parish to be reduced? 	Lost (19-29)
2011	P.2/2011 Composition of the States: Reduction in Number of Deputies	Deputy E.J. Noel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the number of Deputies from 29 to 21; - 21 Deputies should be elected in 5 new large electoral districts; - An Assembly of 41 Members. 	Withdrawn
2011	P.3/2011 Composition of the States: implementation of remaining Clothier reforms	Deputy S. Pitman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To implement the Clothier proposals regarding electoral reform following a referendum. 	Lost (20-27)

2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-	Privileges and Procedures Committee - Electoral Commission	To agree to hold a referendum on the composition of the States on 24th April 2013 asking the public to express their order of preference for the below electoral systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Reform Option A:</u> There will be 42 States Members, known as Deputies. There will be 6 large districts, each choosing 7 Deputies; - <u>Reform Option B:</u> There will be 42 States Members: 30 Deputies and 12 Parish Constables. There will be 6 large districts, each choosing 5 Deputies; - <u>No Change Option C:</u> The current system will remain. 	Won (37-12) Referendum held on 24th April 2013
2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-, 1st amendment	Deputy G.P. Southern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For only one question to be asked on the referendum ballot paper: 'Should the States Assembly be reformed so that it is comprised of 42 States Members known as Deputies, elected from 6 large districts with each district choosing 7 Deputies?' 	Lost (19-30)
2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-, 2nd amendment	Deputy T.M. Pitman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To remove the transferable vote element of the original proposal; - To replace Option C with a 'None of the above' option. 	Lost (17-30)
2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-, 3rd amendment	Deputy T.M. Pitman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To amend Option B so that the proposed St Helier districts 1 and 2 would each elect seven deputies. 	Lost (12-33)
2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-, 4th amendment	Deputy J.G. Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 48 Members of the States: <u>Option A:</u> 8 Deputies in 6 constituencies (no Constables) <u>Option B:</u> 6 Deputies in 6 constituencies (plus 12 Constables) 	Lost (16-31)
2013	P.5/2013 Draft Referendum (Reform of States Assembly) (Jersey) Act 201-, 5th amendment	Senator L.J. Farnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To add a 'None of the Above' option in addition to Options A, B and C. 	Lost (13-35)
2013	P.64/2013 Draft States of Jersey (Amendment No. 7) Law 201-	Privileges and Procedures Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To enact Reform Option B, thus establishing an Assembly of 42 Members comprising 30 Deputies and 12 Parish Constables; - Establish 6 large electoral districts, each electing 5 Deputies. 	Lost (21-28)
2013	P.86/2013 Public Elections: STV system and an AV system	Deputy M. Tadier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bring forward plans for the implementation of a Single Transferable Vote system for multi-member constituencies and an Alternative Vote system for single member constituencies in time for the 2014 elections. 	Withdrawn
2013	P.93/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 1	Senator P.F.C. Ozouf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 44 Members: 12 Constables and 32 Deputies; - Senatorial role to be abolished; - Six electoral districts. 	Lost (20-27)
2013	P.93/2013	Senator L.J.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assembly to be constituted of 6 Senators, 12 Constables and 27 Deputies; 	Lost

	Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 1, 1st amendment	Farnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Six Deputy Districts of varying numbers of representatives; - Chief Minister could only be elected from among the Senatorial benches. 	(14-32)
2013	P.93/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 1, amendment to 1st amendment	Deputy E.J. Noel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 26 Deputies to be elected in place of the suggested 27 by Senator Farnham; - Suggested Districts 1 and 2 to elect five Deputies each and not six; - District five to elect four Deputies and not three. 	Lost (6-40)
2013	P.93/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 1, 2nd amendment	Connétable J. Gallichan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four Constituencies for the election of Deputies, eight Members in each; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. St Brelade, St Peter, St Ouen 2. St Mary, St John, Trinity, St Helier 3&4 3. St Helier 2, part of St Saviour, St Martin, Grouville 4. St Clement, St Helier 1, St Saviour (Petite and Grande Longueville) - Constables to remain. 	Lost (3-41)
2013	P.93/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 1, 3rd amendment	Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 51 Members: 8 Senators, 12 Constables and 31 Deputies; - 17 Deputy districts. 	Lost (8-38)
2013	P.94/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 2	Deputy T.M. Pitman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the Assembly should comprise 46 Members - 12 Constables and 34 Deputies; - The office of Senator to be abolished; - Two St. Helier districts to elect seven Members and four other districts to elect five Members each (based on electoral commission boundaries. 	Lost (13-31)
2013	P.94/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 2, 1st amendment	Senator L.J. Farnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assembly to be constituted of 6 Senators, 12 Constables and 27 Deputies; - Six Deputy Districts of varying numbers of representatives; - Chief Minister must be elected from among the Senatorial benches. 	Withdrawn
2013	P.94/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 2, 2nd amendment	Connétable J. Gallichan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 47 States Members: 12 Constables and 35 Deputies; - Five Deputy Constituencies electing seven Deputies each. 	Lost (3-41)
2013	P.98/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly: Reform Proposal 3	Deputy G. P. Southern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adopt the Clothier recommendations; - Role of Senator to be abolished; - Connétables should no longer be entitled to sit in the States by virtue of their office but should be free to stand for election to the States if they so wished; - Members to hold the title 'Member of the States of Jersey. - To agree to hold a referendum on the composition of the States on the day of the 2014 elections. 	Lost (16-28)
2013	P.116/2013 Composition of the States Assembly: interim reform for 2014 and referendum on further reform	Privileges and Procedures Committee		Won (22-21)

2013	P.117/2013 Composition and election of the States Assembly Reform Proposal 4	Deputy A.K.F. Green M.B.E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 47 Members: 12 Constables, 7 Senators and 28 Deputies; - 7 constituencies each electing four Deputies. 	Lost (4-37)
2013	P.171/2013 Public Elections: introduction of STV and AV	Deputy M. Tadier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bring forward plans for the implementation of a Single Transferable Vote system for multi-member constituencies and an Alternative Vote system for single member constituencies in time for the 2014 elections. 	Lost (STV: 16-25, AV: 20-21)
2014	P.45/2014 Chief Minister election: Island-wide vote	Deputy S.Y. Mézec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To elect the Chief Minister through an Island-wide vote of registered electors from candidates proposed by Members of the States after each general election; - Alternative vote to be used as an electoral system in the event of more than two candidates being nominated. 	Lost (14-32)
2014	P.118/2014 Draft referendum (Composition of the States Assembly)	Privileges and Procedures Committee	<p>Referendum to propose the following electoral system with a single Yes/No option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There would be a single type of elected member of the States Assembly; - 49 Members would be elected; - The allocation of seats within parish districts would be proportional to the population. 	Modified by 2nd amendment
2014	P.118/2014 Draft referendum (Composition of the States Assembly), 1st amendment	Deputy P.J.D. Ryan	<p>Referendum to ask the following questions with a Yes/No option for each element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the 12 Parish Constables lose their automatic right to sit in the States Assembly? - Should Senators and the Island-wide elections cease to exist? - Should the total number of elected States Members be reduced to 44? 	Lost (13-35)
2014	P.118/2014 Draft referendum (Composition of the States Assembly), 2nd amendment	Deputy A.K.F. Green M.B.E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referendum question should be: "Should the Constables remain as Members of the States as an automatic right?" 	Won (29-20)
2014	P.118/2014 Draft referendum (Composition of the States Assembly), 3rd amendment	Senator Philip Ozouf	<p>Referendum to ask the following questions with a Yes/No option for each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the number of elected States Members be reduced to 42? - Should a minimum of 8 Senators continue to be Members? - Should the Constables remain as Members? - Should Deputies be elected on an equal and proportionate basis in larger districts to be determined by an Electoral Boundaries Commission? 	Lost (18-31)