

# **STATES OF JERSEY**



## **MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT REFORM: COMPOSITION AND ELECTION OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 14th September 2004  
by the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## PROPOSITION

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

- (a) to agree in principle that –
  - (i) all members of the States should be elected on a single general election day and for a fixed term of office of 4 years;
  - (ii) the general election should be held in the Spring with effect from next set of elections after 2005;
  - (iii) the 12 Parish Connétables should no longer be members of the States by virtue of their office;
  - (iv) the present positions of Senator and Deputy should be abolished and replaced with a new category of States member elected in 6 new constituencies as described in paragraph 7.5 of the report of the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly dated 2nd September 2004, with a total of 47 members elected in each of the new constituencies as follows –

1.	St. Helier West	8 members;
2.	St. Helier East	8 members;
3.	St. Clement and Grouville	7 members;
4.	St. Saviour and St. Martin	8 members;
5.	St. Brelade and St. Peter	8 members;
6.	St. Lawrence, St. John, St. Mary, Trinity and St. Ouen	8 members.
- (b) to agree that the proposals in paragraphs (a) above should be considered by the electorate in a referendum before they are implemented;
- (c) to charge the Privileges and Procedures Committee, in conjunction with other Committees as necessary, to take all necessary steps to implement the changes following the referendum and, in particular, to ensure that appropriate transitional arrangements are put in place to enable all of the proposals to come into effect no later than 2008.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE COMPOSITION AND ELECTION OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY**

## **REPORT**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The terms of reference for the Special Committee are to consider –
- (a) whether there should be changes to the existing composition of the States Assembly;
  - (b) whether the constituencies of elected members should be amended and, if so, how;
  - (c) whether the term of office of elected members should be amended and, if so, how;
  - (d) how and when members should be elected to the States;
  - (e) whether there should be a maximum level of election expenses for candidates standing for the States;
  - (f) whether all candidates standing for election to the States should be required to produce a policy statement and, if so, how this should be defined and controlled;
  - (g) whether a Chief Electoral Officer should be appointed by the States and, if so, what the duties of such an Officer should be;
  - (h) whether there should be a central register of voters and, if so, how this should be defined and managed.
- 1.2 On 8th June 2004 the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly presented R.C.25/2004 to the States setting out, for consultation purposes, various alternative proposals on the future composition of the States Assembly. The Committee was disappointed with the lack of response to the report and has concluded that the most appropriate way to progress this issue is to lodge this report and proposition setting out firm proposals for the Assembly to debate.
- 1.3 As members will be aware the Committee itself has struggled to reach agreement on the best way forward and the Committee's work has shown that there is unlikely to be any general consensus among members of the States on this issue. Nevertheless the Committee accepts that it was appointed by the States to consider the issues and bring forward proposals and, for that reason, it is appropriate to present definite ideas for change that members can adopt, amend or reject as they see fit. The Committee hopes that members will accept that there is a need to change the present composition of the States which, as shown below, cannot be said to be truly fair or representative. It should also be able to respond to changing political and governmental realities. It is therefore important that an alternative, more equitable, system is put in place as soon as possible.
- 1.4 For convenience, and to avoid the need for members to refer to different documents, the Committee has repeated in this report much of the research and reasoning set out in R.C.25/2004 where that information is relevant to these proposals.

### **2 The need for change in the Constitution of the Assembly.**

- 2.1 The Committee shares many of the conclusions of the Clothier Panel on the need for change. As stated in the Foreword to R.C.25/2004 the Committee believes that –
- (i) there is a perception that the system is no longer fully representative or, some argue, legitimate, as reflected in declining turnout figures;
  - (ii) there are gross disparities between the representation afforded to different parish constituencies;
  - (iii) the public is frustrated by an inability to bring about a change of government;

- (iv) there is confusion as to how members derive their political mandates;
- (v) voters are confused as to the division of rôles for members between municipal and States' functions.

2.2 At a very simple level it is, in relation to (ii) above, clear that the present discrepancies in the sizes of the Deputies' constituencies lead to an imbalance which the Committee believes is unsustainable and must be addressed. As an example the Parishes of Grouville and St. Lawrence both had, by coincidence, an identical population in the 2001 census (4,702 inhabitants), yet the former is represented by only one Deputy whereas St. Lawrence has 2. The Deputy of St. Mary represents a Parish with a population of c 1,591 in the 2001 census, just over a third of the population represented by the Deputy of Grouville. The full breakdown of the present electoral districts for Deputy is as follows –

Table 2.2

	<b>Population 2001 Census</b>	<b>Electors March 2004</b>	<b>Current Deputies</b>	<b>Residents per Deputy</b>	<b>Electors per Deputy</b>
St. Helier	28,310	13,750	10	2,831	1,375
St. Lawrence	4,702	3,001	2	2,351	1,501
St. Peter	4,293	2,538	1	4,293	2,538
St. Brelade	10,134	6,268	3	3,378	2,089
St. Ouen	3,803	2,261	1	3,803	2,261
St. Mary	1,591	1,096	1	1,591	1,096
St. John	2,618	1,664	1	2,618	1,664
Trinity	2,718	1,733	1	2,718	1,733
St. Martin	3,628	2,348	1	3,628	2,348
Grouville	4,702	2,933	1	4,702	2,933
St. Saviour	12,491	6,548	5	2,498	1,310
St. Clement	8,196	4,621	2	4,098	2,311
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>48,761</b>	<b>29</b>		
<b>Average</b>				<b>3,006</b>	<b>1,681</b>

2.3 Although it might be possible to rectify such discrepancies to a certain extent by redefining constituency boundaries, the Committee believes that more radical change is required to reinvigorate the electoral process in the Island and to put in place an Assembly that will be more appropriate for the new system of government. In addition the Committee believes that steps must be taken to address the current electoral apathy which it believes is partly due to the current complex election process with elections occurring at different times for the 3 different categories of members.

2.4 The issues that have inevitably dominated the work of the 3 Special Committees are –

- Should there be a 'general election' for all members of the States on one day?
- Should the present 3-year term of office be changed?
- Should Connétables remain as members of the States by virtue of their office?<sup>[1]</sup>
- Should the Island-wide mandate be retained?
- Should the position of Deputy remain in its present form?

- 2.5 It has become clear throughout the Committee’s deliberations that it is necessary to consider the relative priority of proposals in relation to the above matters and to consider the feasibility of combinations of those proposals in one overall package. Certain proposals, however attractive in isolation, are simply not feasible if combined. As an example the Committee does not believe it would be practical or desirable on a long-term basis to retain the positions of Senator and Deputy in their present form alongside the introduction of a common election day and identical term of office for both positions. In the Committee’s view this would devalue the position of Senator, would lead to confusion with the electors, and would detract from the parochial and district campaigns being conducted by prospective Deputies as media and public attention would almost certainly be dominated by the senatorial hustings ‘roadshow’. In addition it is not clear whether the position of Senator would continue to be attractive to sitting Deputies as a ‘progression’ to a more ‘senior’ position if the advantage of a longer term of office was lost.
- 2.6 The Committee is confident that the combination of proposals in this proposition is a ‘package’ that will work together without conflict.

**3 A single general election day held every 4 years – Paragraph (a)(i)**

- 3.1 The Committee believes that the Island would best be served if all members of the Assembly were elected at a single general election. The Committee notes that this recommendation, which was made by the Clothier Panel, has received widespread support in the various consultation processes undertaken since the publication of that report although there have been concerns about practical implementation. The concept of a general election also gained considerable support in the MORI poll commissioned by the Clothier Panel –

*Q22. States members are elected for varying terms of office. Do you think there should be –*

Single general election for all members	62%
Separate elections as at present	33%
Other/don’t know	5%

- 3.2 In the Committee’s view the current system of election, where 3 different categories of elected members are elected at different times, and, in the case of the Senators, for a different term of office, is unwieldy, leading to voter apathy and, in addition, frustration for the public who face a prolonged period every 3 years during which States members’ attention is divided between electioneering and maintaining the normal business of the States.
- 3.3 The Committee believes that the electorate should be able to make an effective change in the composition of the Assembly should it wish to do so. The present ‘general elections’ that take place every 3 years do not involve over one third of the members of the Assembly (6 Senators and 12 Connétables) and the electorate are therefore entitled to believe that it is difficult to make any significant change by taking the trouble to vote. This problem is, of course, compounded with individual Connétable’s elections that are held at various times throughout the electoral cycle. The Committee is convinced that the ability to renew the entire membership of the Assembly on one day would enhance the significance of the occasion and stimulate renewed interest in the electoral process. At present it would take many elections (2 senatoria elections, 12 Connétables’ elections and the Deputies’ elections) to renew the entire membership of the Assembly over a 6-year period. The Committee’s recommendation that there should only be one category of member in the Assembly in the future will, of course, make it simple to achieve the objective of a single general election.
- 3.4 In addition the Committee believes it would be desirable to ensure that the States did not meet during the election campaign period and this would be more easily achievable with a single election date in the spring than in the present system when the election period runs from September until late November.
- 3.5 In relation to the term of office the Committee notes that the Clothier Panel recommended that the term of

office for all elected members of the States should be between 4 and 5 years, which is the practice in most other jurisdictions. The Committee agrees that the present 3-year term is not long enough to allow proper development of long-term policy within the electoral cycle.

3.6 The Committee accepts that a 5-year term of office would give members a significant period of certainty but has concluded that this must be weighed against the need to allow the public to express their views through the ballot box at regular intervals. The Committee has noted that although MPs are elected to the House of Commons for a 5-year term it is almost inevitably the practice of the U.K. Prime Minister to seek a dissolution before that full term and the actual term served is usually therefore between 4 and 5 years. The Committee has therefore concluded that a fixed 4-year term of office for all members would be appropriate for Jersey.

#### **4. Spring Elections – Paragraph (a)(ii)**

4.1 The Special Committee supports the recommendation to move current autumn elections to the spring when there are longer hours of daylight and the weather is generally more favourable than in October and November. It is mindful that this period, with moveable dates for Easter, a number of Bank Holidays and the potential impact on the budgetary timetable, is not without its difficulties in selecting a suitable date.

4.2 Easter Sunday can fall on any date between 22nd March and 25th April and it will therefore be necessary to fix an election date that does not conflict with that date whilst avoiding the school half-term holiday at the end of May. The Committee's view is that a date in the middle of May in every 4th year would be suitable but accepts that further research needs to be undertaken to ensure that no unforeseen problems would be caused by the choice of this date. A schedule of possible election dates from 2008 to 2060 showing the interaction with Easter (on the assumption that elections continue to be held on a Wednesday) is given in Appendix 1.

4.3 It would not be possible for the necessary legislative changes to be in place in time for a spring election in 2005 and the Committee therefore recommends that Spring elections should be introduced from 2008.

#### **5. Connétables to no longer be members of the States by virtue of their office – Paragraph (a)(iii)**

5.1 The Special Committee is aware of the high regard in which the Connétables are held in the Island. Traditionally, Connétables have represented the particular interests of their parishioners on any topic coming before the States. The suggestion by the Clothier Panel that they should cease to be members of the States by virtue of their office was one of the most controversial of its recommendations and the attempt by the Policy and Resources Committee to push forward this reform as part of its report and proposition (P.179/2001) was considered at the Parish meetings throughout the Island referred to above with a strong movement of support for retaining the right of Connétables to sit in the Assembly.

5.2 The original Special Committee recommended that the Connétables should remain in the States to represent the views of their Parish and to reinforce the current Parish system. It felt that *'it was premature at this stage to remove them from the States on the unproven assumption that it was impossible to combine the two roles of States member and head of the Parish'*.

5.3 The Committee nevertheless considers that Connétables have a significant workload in their Parishes and that this may impact on their ability to participate fully in the new system in their *ex-officio* capacity as members of the States. Recent experience in relation to the membership of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels has shown that some Connétables have difficulty combining parish duties with active participation in committee work for the States. In addition very few major Presidencies have been held by Connétables since 1966 (see Table 6.9 below). The Committee is concerned that if the 12 Connétables are unable to participate fully in the Executive or in the scrutiny function in the new system of government that new system will not operate effectively or with due accountability. It is of particular concern that the scrutiny function could be seriously weakened if any Connétables were unwilling to serve on the Panels.

5.4 The Special Committee pointed out in R.C.25/2004 that it was divided on this issue but it has now decide

to follow the recommendation in the Clothier report that Connétables should no longer serve as members of the States by virtue of their office so that there would only be one class of member elected. It has become apparent in recent years that the work of a States member, without additional parish duties, is effectively a full-time position and the Committee does not believe it is sustainable in the long term to have 12 members of the Assembly who cannot devote themselves entirely to the business of the States.

- 5.5 Connétables would, of course, be free to stand alongside other candidates if they wished to sit in the States as a member in one of the new electoral districts as well as serving as Connétables of their Parish. Any Connétable doing so would be giving a public commitment to the electorate that he or she could undertake the full range of duties as a States member and, if a majority of the electorate were satisfied that the Connétable could undertake both rôles, he or she would no doubt stand a good chance of being elected. Traditionally many Connétables have been elected or, particularly, re-elected unopposed which is perhaps acceptable at Parish level but not appropriate with wider mandates.
- 5.6 The Committee does not believe that the adoption by the States on 25th May 2004 of the proposition of the Policy and Resources Committee on the relationship between the Parishes and the Executive (Machinery of Government: relationship between the Parishes and the Executive – P.40/2004) affects the recommendation to remove the Connétables from the States. In itself the decision to establish a Conseil des Connétables is not an impediment to these changes proposed to the constitution of the States Assembly. Indeed, it can be argued that it provides a forum for Connétables which, if extended, can discuss matters of both Parish and States concern. The principal changes set out in this proposition will take effect from 2008, and the Policy and Resources Committee has been charged to prepare the necessary legislative changes to enable the proposals on the future relationship between the Parishes and the Executive to be implemented in time for the 2006/7 accounting year.
- 5.7 Although it is not strictly relevant for this proposition the Special Committee has considered the recommendation made in P.40/2004 that consideration should be given to establishing a single election day for Connétables, resulting in a new Conseil des Connétables being elected every 3 years. The Special Committee agrees that the Connétables should be elected on the single general election day even though, if they are not *ex-officio* members of the States, it would be illogical for this to be the same day as the general election for all members. If this proposition were amended with the result that Connétables were to remain as members of the States by virtue of their office the Committee recommends that they should be elected in the general election as all other States members.

## **6. The abolition of the present positions of Senator and Deputy – Paragraph (a)(iv)**

- 6.1 The Special Committee has concluded that the positions of Senator and Deputy in their present form should be abolished and replaced with a new category of States member as described in Section 7 below.

### **The position of Senator**

- 6.2 The Committee accepts that in the various consultation processes that have taken place since the publication of the Clothier report, which recommended the abolition of the position of Senator, strong views have been expressed by some members of the States and members of the public in favour of retaining the Island-wide mandate.
- 6.3 Although the Policy and Resources Committee recommended that the position of Senator should be abolished this recommendation was, of course, withdrawn following a series of public meetings held in early 2002 which produced nearly unanimous votes in favour of the retention of Senators.
- 6.4 Some of those against retaining the position of Senator have tried to claim that these public meetings were not representative of public opinion as a whole but it has become clear to the Committee during its work that it is very difficult to know with any certainty what the general view of the electorate is on these issues. The Clothier Panel itself commissioned a MORI poll which was conducted in a scientific manner from a sample of 1,000 residents by that polling organisation. The results from that poll on options for removing or reducing States members were –

Q21 If it were decided to reduce the number of States members, would you prefer to remove or reduce –

Deputies	37% Reduce	5% Remove
Constables	13% Reduce	17% Remove
Senators	16% Reduce	3% Remove

On the issue of whether the overall numbers of members should be reduced the results were as follows –

The Island-wide mandate was considered in a question about constituencies –

Q23. At present some members are elected by the whole island, while others are elected on a local basis. Do you think that –

All members should be elected on an <i>Island-wide</i> basis	46%
The present arrangements should continue	32%
All members should be elected on a <i>local</i> basis	19%
Other/don't know	3%

6.5 An alternative, albeit unscientific, attempt to judge public opinion was conducted by the Jersey Evening Post who published the results of a telephone poll on 21st February 2001. The relevant results of that poll, which received 1,629 responses, were as follows–

Should ...	YES	NO
The size of the States be reduced from 53 Members to 42-44?	89%	11%
The Constables be removed from the States?	68%	32%
The distinction between Senators and Deputies be removed, with all elections on a parish or constituency basis and none on an Island-wide basis?	67%	32%
The titles of Senator and Deputy be scrapped and replaced by that of Member of the States of Jersey?	60%	39%
One general election be held on the same day, both for all States Members and the parish Constables?	76%	23%
General elections be held at intervals of 4-5 years, instead of the present three?	78%	22%

6.6 The Special Committee's conclusion is that there is no accurate way to state what the electorate really thinks on these issues at the present time and it should not attempt to second-guess public opinion. The Committee believes that the appropriate way to proceed is for proposals which have been debated 'in principle' by the States to be put to the public in a referendum as described below where, after a campaign in which all viewpoints can be expressed, all electors will be entitled to express their views on the proposals before the final decisions are taken by the States. The Committee believes that this will be the only way to assess the public's views in a systematic and accurate way.

6.7 A common argument used in favour of retaining the Island-wide mandate is that electors appreciate the ability to influence the election of a significant number of members of the Assembly but the Committee



does not believe that this feature of the present system is sufficient in itself to retain the position of Senator. Furthermore, while electors speak of their ability to vote for a large number of candidates, they also increasingly speak of their inability to influence the policy these candidates will pursue and their inability (in the absence of a general election and party politics) to fundamentally change the composition and therefore, by extension, the policies of the States. In addition, as shown by the recent J.E.P. analysis of the views expressed by senatorial candidates in 2002 on sales tax, there is no guarantee that statements made by candidates on the election platform are carried forward into policy development.

6.8 It has been stated that the electors in a small Parish such as St. Mary would be disadvantaged if they lose the ability to vote for several members of the States. The Committee believes that this view must be considered alongside the fact that, in an island-wide election, the total votes from a small Parish have very little, if any, influence on the overall result which is largely dependent on the results from larger Parishes although each single vote cast does, of course, have the same value in the overall total. The analysis of the results of all senatorial ‘general’ elections since the present 6-year term was introduced in 1966 given in R.C.25/2004 showed this very clearly. The figures in that report showed that no single result of a senatorial ‘general election’ had been affected since 1966 by the total votes in St. Mary although the final order of the 6 successful candidates has been influenced on many occasions by the St. Helier total with the actual result of the 6th placed candidate being affected in 1993. In addition an analysis of senatorial results shows that the fact that a candidate has received a large number of votes because of the all island election process does not necessarily mean that he or she has received support from a significant *percentage* of voters. This can be shown most graphically from the results of the 6 successful candidates in the 1999 senatorial elections when only the top 2 candidates received votes from more than half of those who voted –

Table 6.8

<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Registered Electors</b>	<b>Voters voting</b>	<b>% of voters voting</b>	<b>% of registered electors</b>
Syvret	15,212	51,414	21,879	70	30
Lakeman	12,806	51,414	21,879	59	25
Le Sueur	10,471	51,414	21,879	48	20
Le Claire	8,287	51,414	21,879	38	16
Le Maistre	7,796	51,414	21,879	36	15
Bailhache	7,295	51,414	21,879	33	14

6.9 In the Clothier report it was stated that the Senators no longer occupy the most senior positions in the States. The Committee’s research has shown that this was in fact an incorrect assertion although the years 1987, 1990 and 1993 show a low number of Senators in senior Presidencies. Appendix 2 lists the Presidents elected to the 12 most senior presidencies (in the order they were appointed by the States) after each general election since 1966. The Appendix shows that Senators have been appointed to the ‘top 2’ Presidencies on every single occasion since 1966 and the breakdown between the 3 categories of members for the top 12 presidencies is as follows –

Table 6.9

	<i>Senators</i>	<i>Deputies</i>	<i>Connétables</i>
2002	8	4	0
1999	7	5	0
1996	7	4	1
1993	4	6	2
1990	4	6	2

1987	5	6	1
1984	6	5	1
1981	8	4	0
1978	9	3	0
1975	10	2	0
1972	7	5	0
1969	6	6	0
1966	7	5	0
Total	88	61	7
%	56.4	39.1	4.5

- 6.10 The conclusion to be drawn from the figures is clearly that Senators have been viewed as more ‘senior’ when appointments have been made to presidencies. The Committee believes that it would nevertheless be incorrect to imply that this seniority comes solely from their island-wide mandate. The 12 Senators have, on average, always had considerably longer periods of office in the States than Deputies and it is not therefore surprising that those members with more years’ service are appointed to senior positions by their colleagues. A snapshot at 10-year intervals of the average length of service of all Senators and Deputies in the States on the given date shows the following results –

Table 6.10

<b>DATE</b>	<b>Senators</b>	<b>Deputies</b>
January 1974	16.6 years	5.7 years
January 1984	14.6 years	5.3 years
January 1994	12.8 years	4.4 years
January 2004	10.9 years	5.3 years

- 6.11 The Committee believes that length of service, and consequential seniority, goes some considerable way towards explaining why a higher proportion of Senators have risen to positions of responsibility. It has always been accepted that Presidents are appointed by the States on the basis of a judgment about the suitability of a member for the position and there are many examples of Senators being appointed to presidencies they had already held as Deputies, for example –

Deputy R.R. Jeune – Education in 1969 – retained as Senator in 1972;  
Deputy W.J. Morvan – Harbours and Airport in 1972 – retained as Senator in 1975;  
Deputy T.A. Le Sueur – (Employment and) Social Security in 1993 and 1996 – retained as Senator in 1999

and, conversely, well known examples of Deputies regaining presidencies they had held before defeat in a senatorial election –

Senator C.S. Dupré – Tourism in 1966, 1969, 1972, 1975 – retained as Deputy in 1978;  
Senator C.G. Farley – Sewerage Board (RRB) 1966, 1969, 1972 – retained as Deputy in 1975

- 6.12 The Committee’s research has shown very clearly that, although Senators have held a higher percentage of Presidencies, there is no direct correlation between success in a senatorial election and appointment as a senior President. Appendix 3 shows the presidencies gained by senatorial candidates immediately after each senatorial ‘general election’ since 1966. The figures show that of the 13 ‘poll toppers’ in this period only one has ever been appointed to the most senior presidency immediately after his success (Senator Horsfall in 1996) whilst 5 did not receive a single presidency and 2 others gained minor presidencies that

do not even figure in the 12 most senior presidencies list shown in Appendix 2. A further difficulty that distances the appointment of Presidents from the election process is that many Senators are appointed or re-appointed as Presidents at the halfway point in their term of office when their ‘mandate’ from the electorate is already over 3 years old.

- 6.13 Having studied the evidence from the senatorial election results, the Committee has concluded that there is no valid reason to suggest that the island-wide mandate must be retained because it gives a greater ‘democratic’ mandate to senior Presidents. If this were the case the logical conclusion would be that no Deputy or Connétable should be eligible for a senior position.
- 6.14 The Committee recognises that there are some members who consider that new procedures should be put in place to make a link between electoral success and the appointment to ministerial office in the new system. The Committee does not share this view and does not believe it would be acceptable to a majority of members of the public as the tradition in the States has always been that Presidents are appointed and, if necessary, dismissed on the basis of their experience, ability and conduct. The Committee considers that this should continue in relation to the appointment of the Chief Minister and Ministers in the new system. There have been situations where Senators have clearly won on the basis of popular policies but this does not necessarily guarantee that they possess the executive skills to occupy a ministerial position.
- 6.15 The Committee has heard and considered views from members of the States, and from some members of the public who have attended its meetings on a regular basis, that the Island-wide mandate should be retained and that all members of the States should be elected on that basis. This would undoubtedly give Islanders the ability to influence the election of members in a very direct way and it would be clear, both in Jersey and outside, that members had a mandate from the whole electorate. The Committee can see merits in these arguments but has not been convinced that there is any practical way to run elections in an orderly fashion with the number of candidates that would stand in such an election. As a result the Committee has rejected this option although it believes that the proposed larger constituency model will go some considerable way towards ensuring that all members have a wide popular mandate. Under the 6 constituency model the mandates of the new members will be considerably larger than those held by the 29 Deputies at present even though the island-wide mandate of 12 members will be lost.
- 6.16 The Committee has concluded that the advantages of holding a general election with one new category of member to replace the present positions of Senators and Deputies outweigh any advantages of retaining the Island-wide mandate.

**The position of Deputy**

- 6.17 As mentioned in paragraph 2.2 above, the Committee has serious concerns about the discrepancies that exist between the current Deputies’ constituencies and believes that the present system is unsustainable if the Island electoral system is to be truly fair and representative. In addition the Committee believes that the present system, that allows some electors to choose up to 4 Deputies, whereas others only choose one is illogical and does not provide balanced representation. The present system inevitably means that there are considerable differences between the number of votes received by candidates because of the differences in the size of the electoral districts. This has the undesirable result that many unsuccessful candidates in large districts receive considerably more votes than successful candidates in smaller areas as shown from the 2002 results below –

Table 6.17

Candidate	District	Votes	% of voters voting	% of registered electors	
Hilton	St. Helier No. 3	1,359	62.1	20.8	Elected
Huet	St. Helier No. 3	1,289	58.9	19.8	Elected
Fox	St. Helier No. 3	1,233	56.4	18.9	Elected

De Faye	St. Helier No. 3	1,191	54.4	18.3	Elected
Taylor	St. Clement	1,024	63.1	22.0	Elected
Troy	St. Brelade No. 2	961	61.2	22.7	Elected
Voisin	St. Lawrence	877	70.9	30.3	Elected
Baudains	St. Clement	811	50.0	17.4	Elected
Carrol	St. Helier No. 3	793	36.3	12.2	
Bridge	St. Helier No. 2	785	68.7	22.3	Elected
Labey	Grouville	774	65.9	27.1	Elected
Dubras	St. Lawrence	743	60.1	25.7	Elected
Hill	St. Martin	725	57.1	32.3	Elected
Nicholls	St. Helier No. 3	724	33.1	11.1	
Ryan	St. Helier No. 1	720	69.9	20.7	Elected
Egré	St. Peter	711	67.5	28.5	Elected
Martin	St. Helier No. 1	660	64.1	18.9	Elected
Le Main	St. Helier No. 2	658	57.6	18.7	Elected
Bernstein	St. Brelade No. 2	640	40.8	15.1	Elected
Southern	St. Helier No. 2	609	53.3	17.3	Elected
Wakeham	St. Brelade No. 2	599	38.2	14.1	
Reed	St. Ouen	598	42.9	23.0	Elected
MacFirbhisigh	St. Helier No. 2	577	50.5	16.4	
Stayte	St. Clement	561	34.6	12.1	
Mezbourian	St. Lawrence	550	44.5	19.0	
Blackstone	St. Martin	539	42.4	24.0	
Scott Warren	St. Saviour No. 1	531	57.3	22.5	Elected
Duhamel	St. Saviour No. 1	519	56.0	22.0	Elected
Le Hérisssier	St. Saviour No. 3	500	82.8	27.4	Elected
Ferguson	St. Brelade No. 1	489	51.4	24.8	Elected
Dorey	St. Helier No. 1	488	47.4	14.0	Elected
Jennings	St. Helier No. 3	486	22.2	7.5	
Layzell	St. Brelade No. 1	455	47.8	23.1	
Pirouet	St. Clement	425	26.2	9.1	
Picot	Grouville	397	33.8	13.9	
Coutanche	St. Brelade No. 2	397	25.3	9.4	
Lewis	St. Saviour No. 1	374	40.3	15.9	
Pearce	St. Helier No. 1	352	34.2	10.1	
Le Maistre	St. Ouen	340	28.1	15.1	
Picot	St. Ouen	340	28.1	15.1	
L'Amy	St. Peter	338	32.1	13.6	
Grime	St. Mary	300	50.3	28.8	Elected
Gallichan	St. Mary	296	49.6	28.5	
Whitworth	St. Helier No. 1	252	24.5	7.2	
Mason	St. Saviour No. 1	240	25.9	10.2	
Gough	St. Brelade No. 2	193	12.3	4.6	
Green	St. Clement	163	10.0	3.5	
Stevens	St. Saviour No. 3	104	17.2	5.7	
Partridge	St. Brelade No. 2	92	5.9	2.1	

Whorral	St. Lawrence	66	5.3	2.3	
Breckon	St. Saviour No. 2	Unopposed			Elected
Crespel	Trinity	Unopposed			Elected
Farnham	St. Saviour No. 2	Unopposed			Elected
Rondel	St. John	Unopposed			Elected

- 6.18 The Committee has serious concerns, particularly with the move to the ministerial system, that the mandates of some Deputies are very small. It is well known that in by elections in urban areas Deputies can be elected with very few votes and as can be seen above 3 candidates were elected with 500 votes or less in 2002 and, perhaps of greater concern, 4, through no fault of their own, were elected unopposed although that figure was significantly less than the 9 Deputies elected unopposed in 1999, one of whom had never previously been elected to the Assembly).
- 6.19 The Committee has considered the suggestion made by the Clothier report and put forward by others (including the Deputy of St. Martin in P.115/2004) that there should be a sole class of States member elected on a parochial basis with a reallocation of the number of candidates per Parish to correct some of the present anomalies referred to in paragraph 2.2. The Committee does not accept that this system would be adequate if the Island-wide mandate is abolished. In an Island with a population of some 88,000 people and 48,761 registered electors it would be difficult to claim that a person with less than 500 votes could be said to represent the overall interests of the Island when conducting dealings on the international stage. Although it is, of course, the case in other jurisdictions that a Prime Minister can be elected by one out of, say, 600 constituencies it is important to recognise that in the majority of those jurisdictions this person is a member of a party and electors in other constituencies can, effectively, influence the election of the Prime Minister by deciding whether or not to support the relevant party in their own constituency. Some members believe that a party system may develop in the Island in future years but the Committee has had to put forward proposals which are consistent with the present non-party system and therefore believes that larger constituencies are necessary. The Committee believes that without larger constituencies being introduced a sitting Deputy with strong parish connections who was in a senior position in the new system could be re-elected on a regular basis because of those local connections even if his or her policies were unpopular across the Island and this could enable members to 'hide' from the electorate in small districts.
- 6.20 Another argument against the introduction of an 'all Deputies system' on a parish constituency basis is that the discrepancies identified in the table above draw attention to the fact that districts should, as far as practicable, be of similar sizes and the option of dividing the Island into a large number of single member constituencies, (with perhaps 10 to 12 electoral districts in St. Helier) would be extremely confusing.
- 6.21 If the position of Senator is to be abolished as recommended above, the Committee believes that the position of Deputy in its present form should also be abolished, with the creation of a new category of member to replace both positions as described below. The Committee does not have strong views on what the new members should be called although it notes that the suggestion of the Clothier Panel that members should be known as 'MSJs' has not met with widespread support. Some have suggested that it would be logical to call all members 'Deputies' whereas others, including the Deputy of St. Martin in P.115/2004 have proposed retaining the title of 'Senator'. The Committee believes that this detail can be resolved following consultation and discussion if the general principle of a single category of member is accepted.

## **7. Six new electoral districts – Paragraph (a)(iv)**

- 7.1 Having concluded that there should be a single category of members and that all members should be elected on one day, the Committee has given careful consideration to the manner in which this new category of States members should be elected in future.
- 7.2 The Committee recognises that many electors value the ability to vote for a number of candidates and believes that there would be considerable merit in retaining this facility in some way if possible. In

addition the Committee recognises that candidates will obtain a greater democratic mandate if elected in a larger constituency.

7.3 Having taken these 2 matters into account the Committee has concluded that the appropriate way forward is the division of the Island into a number of new electoral districts. These would, as far as possible, have a similar population and would each elect a similar number of members to the States. The Committee believes that, for practical reasons, the new constituencies must be based on existing Parish boundaries and it is therefore impossible to design any combination that leads to an exact equality of representation across the Island, although the proposed division in Table 7.5 below is a vast improvement on the inequity of the current system. The Committee has concluded that it is preferable to base its calculations principally on population figures and not on the number of registered electors as there are significant discrepancies across the Island on the percentage of residents registered and the Committee is hopeful that steps can be taken, as part of overall reform, to address these discrepancies. The following table gives an illustration of the discrepancies (albeit based on total population and not just those eligible to register) –

Table 7.3

	<b>Population 2001 Census</b>	<b>Electors March 2004</b>	<b>% of population registered</b>
Grouville	4,702	2,933	62.38
St. Brelade	10,134	6,268	61.85
St. Clement	8,196	4,621	56.38
St. Helier	28,310	13,750	48.57
St. John	2,618	1,664	63.56
St. Lawrence	4,702	3,001	63.82
St. Martin	3,628	2,348	64.72
St. Mary	1,591	1,096	68.89
St. Ouen	3,803	2,261	59.45
St. Peter	4,293	2,538	59.12
St. Saviour	12,491	6,548	52.42
Trinity	2,718	1,733	63.76
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>48,761</b>	
<b>Average</b>			55.93

7.4 Figures calculated by the Statistics Unit of the Policy and Resources Department prior to the 2002 elections show the low level of electoral registration in the Island when compared to an estimation of the number of potential electors (over 18 with at least 2 years' residence) on the basis of the 2001 census figures –

Table 7.4

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Estimated Electoral Roll</b>	<b>Total population</b>	<b>% of population</b>	<b>Rounded figures</b>
Grouville	3,659	4,702	78	3,700
St. Brelade	7,923	10,134	78	7,900
St. Clement	6,150	8,196	75	6,200
St. Helier	22,650	28,310	80	22,700
St. John	1,981	2,618	76	2,000
St. Lawrence	3,749	4,702	80	3,700

St. Martin	2,779	3,628	77	2,800
St. Mary	1,212	1,591	76	1,200
St. Ouen	2,882	3,803	76	2,900
St. Peter	3,366	4,293	78	3,400
St. Saviour	9,455	12,491	76	9,500
Trinity	2,114	2,718	78	2,100
<b>All Island</b>	<b>67,920</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>78</b>	67,900

- 7.5 In the Committee's report R.C.25/2004 proposals for 3 new large electoral districts were given with alternative models based on 6 districts or 7 districts also set out. During the consultation period, through oral representations received, it became clear that States members and others did not favour the three-constituency model. It was felt that it was impractical to elect up to 12 members in a single district because it would be almost impossible for hustings meetings to be held with so many candidates and the ballot paper would be extremely confusing for electors. The Committee has therefore decided to recommend a model based on a total of 47 members elected in 6 new districts made up as follows-

Table 7.5

	<b>Population</b>	<b>No. of members</b>	<b>Residents per member</b>
<b>District 1</b>			
St. Helier West*	<b>14,155</b>	8	1,769
<b>District 2</b>			
St. Helier East	<b>14,155</b>	8	1,769
<b>District 3</b>			
St. Clement	8,196		
Grouville	4,702		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,898</b>	7	1,842
<b>District 4</b>			
St. Saviour	12,491		
St. Martin	3,628		
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,119</b>	8	2,015
<b>District 5</b>			
St. Brelade	10,134		
St. Peter	4,293		
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,427</b>	8	1,803
<b>District 6</b>			
St. Lawrence	4,702		
St. John	2,618		
St. Mary	1,591		
Trinity	2,718		

St. Ouen	3,803		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,432</b>	8	1,929
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>47</b>	
	<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>1,855</b>

(\* It is accepted that the precise division of St. Helier into 2 districts will almost certainly need to take account of existing Vingtaine boundaries and the division into the 2 districts will not be as precise as the exact split into 2 equal parts as shown above.)

- 7.6 The proposed model would enable electors to vote for a number of individuals giving a broad choice of candidates and providing a viable alternative to the current position of Senator. It would be likely to remove the possibility of uncontested elections. The Special Committee considers that the larger constituency would enable States members to act more strategically and represent the Island as a whole.
- 7.7 Once elected, all members elected on this basis would have an equal status in the Assembly and there would, therefore, be no public expectation, as is possibly the case at present with Senators, that certain members should automatically achieve senior positions within the Assembly. In addition, whilst some will argue that the public is losing 12 members with Island-wide mandates, the senatorial results since 1966 show that a Senator can be elected with as few as 6,684 votes and the Committee hopes that with a general election and re-invigoration of the electoral process the number of votes cast for successful candidates in a new electoral district could be quite substantial in one new constituency alone.
- 7.8 The Committee accepts that some will see the loss of the direct link between Parishes and their Deputy or Deputies as a disadvantage of the new system particularly as Connétables would no longer sit in the Assembly. The Committee believes that it is likely that informal relationships will develop between members and different parts of their constituency to replace the current formal link between Deputy and the Parish especially in the early years of the new system. Members of the public would nevertheless have a number of elected representatives from their constituency to contact and would, of course, retain the ability to contact members from other parts of the Island if they were unable to receive a satisfactory response from any of their constituency representatives. The Committee is also conscious that, at present, any elector living in a single member Deputy constituency who does not wish to contact that Deputy for whatever reason has no other 'area' representative to contact except the Connétable.
- 7.9 The Committee totally refutes the suggestion made by some that its recommendations would 'destroy' the parish system. The proposals would, if adopted, simply change the method of election of members to the States and the Committee would point out that the parish system in the Island is about far more than the election of Deputies. The position of the Connétable in his or her Parish rôle, Procureurs du Bien Public, Parish and Ecclesiastical Assemblies, the honorary police, Roads Inspectors and Committees, the rating and welfare system, refuse collections, the branchage and 'Visites Royales', as well as parish social groups, magazines, twinnings with France and all other parish activities would be totally unchanged by the proposals and it is likely that some of the members elected in the new electoral districts would continue to be closely involved in local parish affairs in one or more of the parishes in their area. It would be necessary to consider how the new members could participate in Parish Assemblies to ensure the retention of the present provisions on such participation. The Committee would point out that 11 of the current 29 Deputies, well over a third, do not live in the parish or district they represent and there is no evidence that these members are unable to relate to their electors in a direct and effective way.
- 7.10 The Committee wishes to stress that it considers that the role of being a member of the States is not only about parish or district interests and with the move to ministerial government the need for all members to deal with all Island and international issues will become increasingly important.
- 8. The number of elected members – Paragraph (a)(iv)**
- 8.1 The Committee has been conscious throughout its deliberations that the view has been frequently



expressed that the number of members should be reduced as an Assembly of 53 members is too large for an island the size of Jersey. The Clothier Report recommended an Assembly of between 42 and 44 members. There was some support for a reduction in numbers in the MORI poll commissioned by the Clothier Panel –

*Q20. There are 53 States members. Do you think that this is too many, too few, or about right?*

Too many	46%
Too few	3%
About right	44%
Other/don't know	8%

8.2 The Committee considered whether it would be preferable to allow the ministerial system to begin before suggesting any reduction but concluded that the overall changes being proposed represented a 'one-off' opportunity to make significant changes and, if the number was not reduced at this stage, it would be more difficult to make changes later.

8.3 Following the adoption of an amendment of Deputy P.N. Troy of St. Brelade to the initial machinery of government proposals there will have to be a 'gap', equivalent to 10% of the total number of members, between the number of members in the Executive and those not involved in the Executive. The 'rounding' of the 10% figure to the nearest figure in accordance with the formula agreed by the States shows that the balance between the Executive and the non-Executive members is affected by the overall figure with, somewhat curiously, the actual gap sometimes being larger with a smaller number of members as shown below –

Table 8.3

TOTAL MEMBERS	'10% rule' (rounded as required)	Maximum in the Executive	Balance (members not in the Executive)	Actual 'gap'
40	4	18	22	4
41	5	18	23	5
42	5	18	24	6
43	5	19	24	5
44	5	19	25	6
45	5	20	25	5
46	5	20	26	6
47	5	21	26	5
48	5	21	27	6
49	5	22	27	5
50	5	22	28	6
51	6	22	29	7
52	6	23	29	6
53	6	23	30	7

8.4 In accordance with existing decisions of the States the minimum number of non-Executive members required to fill the positions already agreed is 22, made up as follows –

4 Scrutiny Panels (x 5 each) = 20  
 Chairman PAC = 1  
 President PPC = 1

With 10 Ministers, Assistant Ministers could be appointed up to the maximum number of the Executive

allowed in the table above.

- 8.5 The Committee believes that an appropriate reduction at this stage is from 53 to 47 and, as shown above, has used this number as the basis for its proposals on the future composition of the Assembly. An Assembly of 47, as shown in Table 8.4 above, gives a non-Executive majority of at least 26 members 5 more than the maximum of 21 allowed in the Executive. This would allow the appointment of up to 11 Assistant Ministers and the Committee believes this would be adequate.
- 8.6 The Committee notes that some members of the States believe that a greater reduction in the number of members should be made. In P.115/2004 the Deputy of St. Martin proposes a total of 42 members and, in a submission given at the last meeting of the Special Committee, Deputy M.F. Dubras proposed a reduction to 37 members. There are clearly alternative combinations of Parishes that could be used and it would also be possible to achieve a greater reduction in the overall number of members. The table below gives an alternative option based on a membership of 42 members–

Table 8.6

	<b>Population</b>	<b>No. of members</b>	<b>Residents per member</b>
<b>District 1</b>			
St. Helier West	<b>14,155</b>	7	2,022
<b>District 2</b>			
St. Helier East	<b>14,155</b>	7	2,022
<b>District 3</b>			
St. Clement	8,196		
Grouville	4,702		
St. Martin	3,628		
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,526</b>	8	2,065
<b>District 4</b>			
St. Saviour	12,491		
Trinity	2,718		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,209</b>	7	2,172
<b>District 5</b>			
St. Brelade	10,134		
St. Peter	4,293		
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,427</b>	7	2,061
<b>District 6</b>			
St. Lawrence	4,702		
St. John	2,618		
St. Mary	1,591		
St. Ouen	3,803		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,714</b>	6	2,119

<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>42</b>	
<b>AVERAGE</b>			<b>2,075</b>

8.7 The number of members could, of course, be allocated in different ways across the districts to achieve a different total as required.

## **9. Referendum – Paragraph (b)**

9.1 The Committee believes that as a first stage in the decision-making process the Assembly should consider and vote on these proposals in principle to indicate the direction States members are prepared to take. Although it is important for the States to take a lead on the issues involved, and it would not be worthwhile putting forward proposals to the electorate if the proposals had no support from members, it is nevertheless accepted that members have considerable self interest in these issues and it will be necessary for members to set aside personal considerations to allow these issues to go forward to the public.

9.2 The Committee believes that, once the States have deliberated on the principles of reforming the Assembly, the public should be given the opportunity to express their opinion in the shape of a referendum on whatever recommendations may be agreed by the States. Although the States Assembly itself should take the final decision on reforms it will undoubtedly wish to take due account of the views of the electorate as shown in results of the referendum. It will, of course, be vital to ensure that the wording of the referendum is clear and unambiguous.

## **10. Implementing the changes – Paragraph (c).**

10.1 The Special Committee proposes that the changes should be implemented by the Privileges and Procedures Committee, in conjunction with other Committees as necessary. As described in R.C.25/2004 the Special Committee accepts that it would be unrealistic for a first general election to be held in the autumn of 2005 and that, to complete the implementation of all the changes in an orderly fashion, it will be necessary to wait until spring 2008.

10.2 The Committee nevertheless believes it would be appropriate to take steps to introduce legislation to allow appropriate transitional arrangements to be made from 2005 onwards. This legislation would provide that Senators and Deputies elected in autumn 2005 would only serve until a first general election in spring 2008.

10.3 Members will be aware that the States are being asked to approve the draft States of Jersey Law 200- in the near future to enable the machinery of government reform process to proceed according to the agreed timetable. If these proposals are adopted it will clearly be necessary for further legislation to be brought forward to amend the provisions in that Law.

## **11. Other issues**

11.1 This report and proposition covers items (a) to (d) of the Committee's terms of reference as set out in paragraph 1.1 above. The Privileges and Procedures Committee has now set up a joint Working Party with the Legislation Committee, which currently has general responsibility for election matters, to address items (e) to (h) of its terms of reference. The Privileges and Procedures Committee is particularly keen to investigate matters such as preferential voting which could be used to ensure that the 6 electoral district model operates in the fairest way possible. The Committee is confident that appropriate recommendations on such issues can be brought forward well in advance of the first general election under the new system in 2008.

11.2 The Committee also believes that the position of the unelected members of the States should be addressed in the near future. The Committee is, for example, conscious that the recommendations of the Clothier Panel in relation to the position of the Bailiff have never been formally discussed by the States and is of

the view that this issue should be considered as part of the overall reform of the composition of the Assembly.

## **12. P.115/2004 – Composition and Election of the States Assembly**

- 12.1 After the presentation of R.C.25/2004 to the States, the Deputy of St. Martin lodged the above proposition 'au Greffe' on 15th June 2004.
- 12.2 The Committee believes that it would be more appropriate for members to consider this proposition rather than P.115/2004. As stated earlier the Special Committee was appointed by the States to bring forward recommendations on these issues and has undertaken considerable research before bringing forward recommendations.
- 12.3 Although many aspects of the Deputy of St. Martin's proposition (particularly if amended by the amendments lodged by Senator Norman on 20th July 2004) are identical to these proposals the Committee does not believe, particularly for the reasons given in paragraph 6.19 above, that it would be appropriate to abolish the position of Senator without increasing the size of the mandates of the remaining members. In addition, as shown in Appendix A accompanying his proposition, the Deputy of St. Martin has failed to remedy the current discrepancies in the size of the Deputies' constituencies through his proposals which would, if adopted, mean that a 'Senator' in the Parish of St. Mary would represent only just over a third of the number of residents represented by his or her colleague in the Parish of St. Lawrence. The Special Committee does not support the retention of small voting districts as proposed by the Deputy of St. Martin due to the inequality of representation.

## **13 Financial and manpower implications**

- 13.1 It is difficult to assess the overall implications of these proposals at this stage. There will, of course, be some direct cost if a referendum is organised but the change to a general election would save cost by avoiding the necessity to hold 2 separate elections as at present. In addition the longer term of office would mean that election costs are incurred every 4 years instead of every 3. There are likely to be savings if the overall number of members is reduced from 53 to 47 (potentially up to some £230,000 per annum). The Committee believes that the proposals, if implemented in full, would be likely to lead to a saving rather than additional expenditure.

2nd September 2004

## POSSIBLE SPRING ELECTION DATES 2008 – 2060

<i>Year</i>	<i>Easter Sunday</i> <i>[2]</i>	<i>Election Date</i> <i>(3rd Wednesday of May)</i>	<i>Spring Bank Holiday</i> <i>(Last Monday of May)</i>
2008	23rd March	21st May	26th May
2012	8th April	16th May	28th May
2016	27th March	18th May	30th May
2020	12th April	20th May	25th May
2024	31st March	15th May	27th May
2028	16th April	17th May	29th May
2032	28th March	19th May	31st May
2036	13th April	21st May	26th May
2040	1st April	16th May	28th May
2044	17th April	18th May	30th May
2048	5th April	20th May	25th May
2052	21st April	15th May	27th May
2056	2nd April	17th May	29th May
2060	18th April	19th May	31st May

## MOST SENIOR PRESIDENCIES AFTER EACH ELECTION

2002

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
POLICY AND RESOURCES	SENATOR WALKER F.	6TH IN ELECTION
PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURES	SENATOR LAKEMAN C.	2ND IN 1999 ELECTION
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR T. LE SUEUR	3RD IN 1999 ELECTION
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICES	DEPUTY DUBRAS M.	
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY G. VOISIN	
HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES	SENATOR SYVRET S.	1ST IN 1999 ELECTION
EDUCATION, SPORT AND CULTURE	SENATOR VIBERT M.	4TH IN ELECTION
HOME AFFAIRS	SENATOR KINNARD W.	2ND IN ELECTION
EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY	SENATOR ROUTIER P.	3RD IN ELECTION
HOUSING	DEPUTY T. LE MAIN	
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR NORMAN L.	5TH IN ELECTION
POSTAL ADMINISTRATION	DEPUTY P. RYAN	

1999

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
POLICY AND RESOURCES	SENATOR HORSFALL P.	1ST IN 1996 ELECTION
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR WALKER F.	5TH IN 1996 ELECTION
HUMAN RESOURCES	DEPUTY CRESPEL D.	
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT	SENATOR QUERÉE N.	6TH IN 1996 ELECTION
INDUSTRIES	DEPUTY M. DUBRAS	
HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES	SENATOR SYVRET S.	1ST IN ELECTION
EDUCATION	SENATOR NORMAN L.	3RD IN 1996 ELECTION
PUBLIC SERVICES	DEPUTY CROWCROFT S.	

<b>AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES</b>	<b>SENATOR J. LE MAISTRE</b>	<b>5TH IN ELECTION</b>
<b>TOURISM</b>	<b>DEPUTY I. NICHOLLS</b>	
<b>HOME AFFAIRS</b>	<b>DEPUTY A. LAYZELL</b>	
<b>EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY</b>	<b>SENATOR T. LE SUEUR</b>	<b>3RD IN ELECTION</b>

1996

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
POLICY AND RESOURCES	SENATOR HORSFALL P.	1ST IN ELECTION
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR WALKER F.	5TH IN ELECTION
ESTABLISHMENT	DEPUTY CRESPEL D.	
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT	SENATOR QUERÉE N.	6TH IN ELECTION
HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES	CONNETABLE ROCHE J.	
EDUCATION	SENATOR NORMAN L.	3RD IN ELECTION
PUBLIC SERVICES	SENATOR V. TOMES	1ST IN 1993 ELECTION
AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	DEPUTY J. DOREY	
TOURISM	SENATOR ROTHWELL J.	3RD IN 1993 ELECTION
DEFENCE	DEPUTY WAVELL M.	
EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY T. LE SUEUR	
HOUSING	SENATOR C. STEIN	2ND IN ELECTION

1993

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
POLICY AND RESOURCES	SENATOR R. JEUNE	3RD IN 1990 ELECTION
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR HORSFALL P.	2ND IN 1990 ELECTION
DEFENCE	DEPUTY WAVELL M.	
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	DEPUTY J. LE FONDRÉ	
PUBLIC SERVICES	DEPUTY D. CARTER	
EDUCATION	CONNETABLE I. LE FEUVRE	
PUBLIC HEALTH	CONNETABLE ROCHE J.	
AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	SENATOR ROTHWELL J.	3RD IN ELECTION
TOURISM	SENATOR SHENTON R.	6TH IN ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY T. LE	



	<b>SUEUR</b>	
<b>ISLAND DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>DEPUTY C. HINAULT</b>	
<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>DEPUTY L. NORMAN</b>	

1990

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
<b>POLICY AND RESOURCES</b>	<b>SENATOR R. JEUNE</b>	<b>3RD IN ELECTION</b>
<b>FINANCE AND ECONOMICS</b>	<b>SENATOR P. HORSFALL</b>	<b>2ND IN ELECTION</b>
<b>DEFENCE</b>	<b>DEPUTY M. WAVELL</b>	
<b>HARBOURS AND AIRPORT</b>	<b>DEPUTY J. LE FONDRÉ</b>	
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>	<b>DEPUTY D. CARTER</b>	
<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>CONNÉTABLE I. LE FEUVRE</b>	
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH</b>	<b>CONNÉTABLE J. ROCHE</b>	
<b>AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES</b>	<b>SENATOR J. ROTHWELL</b>	<b>6TH IN 1987 ELECTION</b>
<b>TOURISM</b>	<b>SENATOR R. SHENTON</b>	<b>1ST IN 1987 ELECTION</b>
<b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b>	<b>DEPUTY T. LE SUEUR</b>	
<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>DEPUTY L. NORMAN</b>	
<b>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>DEPUTY R. RUMBOLL</b>	

1987

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
<b>FINANCE AND ECONOMICS</b>	<b>SENATOR R. JEUNE</b>	<b>2ND IN 1984 ELECTION</b>
<b>DEFENCE</b>	<b>SENATOR R. SHENTON</b>	<b>1ST IN ELECTION</b>
<b>HARBOURS AND AIRPORT</b>	<b>SENATOR B. BINNINGTON</b>	<b>3RD IN ELECTION</b>
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>	<b>DEPUTY J. LE GALLAIS</b>	
<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>DEPUTY R. RUMBOLL</b>	
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH</b>	<b>DEPUTY J. ROCHE</b>	
<b>AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES</b>	<b>SENATOR P. HORSFALL</b>	<b>3RD IN 1984 ELECTION</b>
<b>TOURISM</b>	<b>SENATOR J. ROTHWELL</b>	<b>6TH IN ELECTION</b>
<b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b>	<b>DEPUTY L. NORMAN</b>	
<b>ISLAND DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>CONNÉTABLE J. LE SUEUR</b>	
<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>DEPUTY H. VANDERVLIT</b>	
<b>RESOURCES RECOVERY</b>	<b>DEPUTY D. DE LA HAYE</b>	

1984

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR R. JEUNE	2ND IN ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR J. ELLIS	6TH IN ELECTION
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR B. BINNINGTON	5TH IN 1981 ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	DEPUTY D. FILLEUL	
EDUCATION	DEPUTY P. MOURANT	
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	4TH IN 1981 ELECTION
AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	SENATOR P. HORSFALL	3RD IN ELECTION
TOURISM	SENATOR J. ROTHWELL	6TH IN 1981 ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY F. MOREL	
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	CONNÉTABLE J. LE SUEUR	
HOUSING	DEPUTY H. VANDERVLIT	
RESOURCES RECOVERY	DEPUTY J. LE GALLAIS	

1981

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR R. VIBERT	2ND IN ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR J. ELLIS	BY ELECTION – JUNE 1981
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR B. BINNINGTON	5TH IN ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	DEPUTY D. FILLEUL	
EDUCATION	SENATOR R. JEUNE	6TH IN 1978 ELECTION
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	4TH IN ELECTION
AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	SENATOR R. SHENTON	1ST IN ELECTION
TOURISM	SENATOR J. ROTHWELL	6TH IN ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY F. MOREL	
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY N. LE BROcq	
HOUSING	SENATOR J. SANDEMAN	2ND IN 1978 ELECTION
RESOURCES RECOVERY	DEPUTY J. LE GALLAIS	

1978

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR C. LE MARQUAND	3RD IN ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR J. RILEY	6TH IN 1975 ELECTION
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR W. MORVAN	4TH IN ELECTION
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR G. HUELIN	5TH IN 1975 ELECTION
AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES	SENATOR B. BINNINGTON	3RD IN 1975 ELECTION
EDUCATION	SENATOR R. JEUNE	6TH IN ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	SENATOR J. AVERTY	5TH IN ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY F. MOREL	
TOURISM	DEPUTY C. DUPRE	
HOUSING	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	4TH IN 1975 ELECTION
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY P. HORSFALL	
RESOURCES RECOVERY	SENATOR R. SHENTON	1ST IN 1975 ELECTION

1975

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR C. LE MARQUAND	3RD IN 1972 ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR J. RILEY	6TH IN ELECTION
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR W. MORVAN	BY ELECTION – SEP 1975
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR G. HUELIN	5TH IN ELECTION
AGRICULTURE	SENATOR B. BINNINGTON	3RD IN ELECTION
EDUCATION	SENATOR R. JEUNE	4TH IN 1972 ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	4TH IN ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY M. THOMAS	
TOURISM	SENATOR C. DUPRE	5TH IN 1972 ELECTION
HOUSING	SENATOR J. AVERTY	1ST IN 1972 ELECTION
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	SENATOR R. SHENTON	1ST IN ELECTION
RESOURCES RECOVERY	DEPUTY C. FARLEY	



1972

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR C. LE MARQUAND	3RD IN ELECTION
DEFENCE	DEPUTY J. RILEY	
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	DEPUTY W. MORVAN	
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR G. HUELIN	3RD IN 1969 ELECTION
AGRICULTURE	DEPUTY B. BINNINGTON	
EDUCATION	SENATOR R. JEUNE	4TH IN ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	4TH IN 1969 ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY M. THOMAS	
TOURISM	SENATOR C. DUPRÉ	5TH IN ELECTION
HOUSING	SENATOR J. AVERTY	1ST IN ELECTION
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY P. DE VEULLE	
RESOURCES RECOVERY	SENATOR C. FARLEY	6TH IN 1969 ELECTION

1969

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE AND ECONOMICS	SENATOR C. LE MARQUAND	2ND IN 1966 ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR W. KRICHEFSKI	5TH IN ELECTION
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	DEPUTY J. ELLIS	
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR G. HUELIN	3RD IN ELECTION
AGRICULTURE	DEPUTY J. RILEY	
EDUCATION	DEPUTY R. JEUNE	
PUBLIC WORKS	SENATOR L. WHITE	BY ELECTION
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY M. THOMAS	
TOURISM	SENATOR C. DUPRÉ	1ST IN 1963 ELECTION
HOUSING	DEPUTY A. QUERÉE	
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY P. DE VEULLE	
SEWERAGE BOARD	SENATOR C. FARLEY	6TH IN ELECTION

COMMITTEE	PRESIDENT	ELECTION RESULT FOR SENATORS
FINANCE	SENATOR C. LE MARQUAND	2ND IN ELECTION
DEFENCE	SENATOR R. VIBERT	3RD IN ELECTION
HARBOURS AND AIRPORT	SENATOR W. KRICHEFSKI	3RD IN 1960 ELECTION
PUBLIC HEALTH	SENATOR G. HUELIN	4TH IN ELECTION
AGRICULTURE	DEPUTY V. TOMES	
EDUCATION	SENATOR J. LE MARQUAND	1ST IN 1960 ELECTION
PUBLIC WORKS	DEPUTY R. JEUNE	
SOCIAL SECURITY	DEPUTY A. CLARKE	
TOURISM	SENATOR C. DUPRÉ	1ST IN 1963 ELECTION
HOUSING	DEPUTY J. GAUDIN	
ISLAND DEVELOPMENT	DEPUTY M. LETTO	
SEWERAGE BOARD	SENATOR C. FARLEY	4TH IN 1960 ELECTION

## SENATORS ELECTED AND PRESIDENCIES HELD IMMEDIATELY AFTER EACH ELECTION

2002

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>OZOUF P.</b>	<b>14,442</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>KINNARD W.</b>	<b>12,230</b>	<b>HOME AFFAIRS</b>
<b>ROUTIER P.</b>	<b>11,687</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY AND TELECOMS</b>
<b>VIBERT M.</b>	<b>10,624</b>	<b>EDUCATION SPORT AND CULTURE</b>
<b>NORMAN L.</b>	<b>10,192</b>	<b>HARBOURS AND AIRPORT</b>
<b>WALKER F.</b>	<b>9,377</b>	<b>POLICY AND RESOURCES</b>

1999

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>SYVRET S.</b>	<b>15,212</b>	<b>HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES</b>
<b>LAKEMAN C.</b>	<b>12,806</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>LE SUEUR T.</b>	<b>10,471</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY</b>
<b>LE CLAIRE P.</b>	<b>8,287</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>LE MAISTRE J.</b>	<b>7,796</b>	<b>AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES</b>
<b>BAILHACHE A.</b>	<b>7,295</b>	<b>NONE</b>

1996

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>HORSFALL P.</b>	<b>14,681</b>	<b>POLICY AND RESOURCES</b>
<b>STEIN C.</b>	<b>11,213</b>	<b>HOUSING</b>
<b>NORMAN L.</b>	<b>11,017</b>	<b>EDUCATION</b>
<b>KINNARD W.</b>	<b>10,520</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>WALKER F.</b>	<b>10,305</b>	<b>FINANCE AND ECONOMICS AND POSTAL</b>
<b>QUEREE N.</b>	<b>9,761</b>	<b>PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT AND TELECOMS</b>

1993

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>TOMES V.</b>	<b>16,392</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>SYVRET S.</b>	<b>14,388</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>ROTHWELL J.</b>	<b>9,586</b>	<b>AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES</b>
<b>BAILHACHE A.</b>	<b>9,020</b>	<b>OVERSEAS AID</b>
<b>LE MAISTRE J.</b>	<b>8,934</b>	<b>SPORT LEISURE AND RECREATION</b>
<b>SHENTON R.</b>	<b>8,755</b>	<b>TOURISM</b>



1990

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
STEIN C.	12,643	POSTAL
HORSFALL P.	11,741	FINANCE AND ECONOMICS
JEUNE R.	10,457	POLICY AND RESOURCES
LE MAIN T.	10,124	FORT REGENT
QUEREE N.	9,784	NONE
CHINN A.	9,058	NONE

1987

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
SHENTON R.	12,838	DEFENCE
BAAL A.	9,292	ELIZABETH HOUSE
BINNINGTON B.	9,025	HARBOURS AND AIRPORT
LE MAISTRE J.	8,271	OVERSEAS AID
CARTER D.	8,020	FORT REGENT
ROTHWELL J.	7,510	TOURISM

1984

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
LE MAIN T.	14,022	GAMBLING CONTROL
JEUNE R.	12,585	FINANCE AND ECONOMICS
HORSFALL P.	11,808	AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES
SANDEMAN J.	11,485	NONE
MANTON P.	10,717	NONE
ELLIS J.	10,296	DEFENCE

1981

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
SHENTON R.	17,256	AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES
VIBERT R.	14,206	FINANCE AND ECONOMICS COMMITTEE
BAAL A.	12,395	ELIZABETH HOUSE COMMITTEE
LE MARQUAND J.	12,039	PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE
BINNINGTON B.	11,343	HARBOURS AND AIRPORT
ROTHWELL J.	11,165	TOURISM

1978

---

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>DE CARTERET J.</b>	<b>16,312</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>SANDEMAN J.</b>	<b>14,235</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND C.</b>	<b>12,621</b>	<b>FINANCE AND ECONOMICS COMMITTEE</b>
<b>MORVAN W.</b>	<b>11,514</b>	<b>HARBOURS AND AIRPORT</b>
<b>AVERTY J.</b>	<b>10,443</b>	<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND BROADCASTING</b>
<b>JEUNE R.</b>	<b>10,032</b>	<b>EDUCATION</b>

1975

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>SHENTON R.</b>	<b>17,221</b>	<b>IDC AND BROADCASTING</b>
<b>VIBERT R.</b>	<b>14,574</b>	<b>LEGISLATION, ESTABLISHMENT AND CONSTITUTION</b>
<b>BINNINGTON B.</b>	<b>12,818</b>	<b>AGRICULTURE</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND J.</b>	<b>12,035</b>	<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>
<b>HUELIN MRS. G.</b>	<b>11,897</b>	<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND ELIZABETH HOUSE</b>
<b>RILEY J.</b>	<b>9,937</b>	<b>DEFENCE AND PRISON BOARD</b>

1972

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>AVERTY J.</b>	<b>12,645</b>	<b>HOUSING</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND J.J.</b>	<b>11,824</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND C.</b>	<b>10,562</b>	<b>FINANCE AND ECONOMICS</b>
<b>JEUNE R.</b>	<b>8,576</b>	<b>EDUCATION</b>
<b>DUPRE C.</b>	<b>7,868</b>	<b>TOURISM</b>
<b>SCRIVEN A.</b>	<b>6,832</b>	<b>NONE</b>

1969

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>SHENTON R.</b>	<b>13,220</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>VIBERT R.</b>	<b>11,587</b>	<b>LEGISLATION AND CONSTITUTION</b>
<b>HUELIN MRS. G.</b>	<b>11,574</b>	<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND ELIZABETH HOUSE</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND J.</b>	<b>10,635</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</b>
<b>KRICHEFSKI W.</b>	<b>10,553</b>	<b>DEFENCE AND POSTAL</b>
<b>FARLEY C.</b>	<b>9,342</b>	<b>SEWERAGE BOARD AND OVERSEAS</b>

**1966 (4 Senators elected in transition from 9 to 6 year term)**

SENATORS ELECTED	VOTES RECEIVED	PRESIDENCIES AFTER ELECTION
<b>LE MARQUAND J.J.</b>	<b>9,321</b>	<b>NONE</b>
<b>LE MARQUAND C.</b>	<b>7,824</b>	<b>FINANCE AND ESTABLISHMENT</b>
<b>VIBERT R. (3 YRS)</b>	<b>6,698</b>	<b>DEFENCE AND LEGISLATION</b>
<b>HUELIN MRS. G. (3 YRS)</b>	<b>6,598</b>	<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND ELIZABETH HOUSE</b>

---

[1] *Any person who is eligible is, of course, free to stand for election to the States and it is accepted that if Connétables lost their automatic right to sit in the States by virtue of their office they would be free to stand for election separately as suggested in the Clothier Report.*

[2] *Never earlier than 22nd March and never later than 25th April.*