

STATES OF JERSEY



STANDING ORDERS: ADDITIONAL SIGNATORIES ON PROPOSITIONS (P.174/2010) – AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 26th November 2010
by the Deputy of St. John

STATES GREFFE

STANDING ORDERS: ADDITIONAL SIGNATORIES ON PROPOSITIONS
(P.174/2010) – AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 –

For the number “7” substitute the number “2”.

DEPUTY OF ST. JOHN

REPORT

I must say there may be merit in increasing the number of signatures on a proposition, but the system proposed by Senator Routier and others is farcical and is designed to prevent a member from doing what they believe is right for the people they represent. In parishes with only 2 elected members, it may be more difficult than the Senator thinks to look at bringing members from outside the parish to support an issue.

We have at present 12 members with an Island mandate and this is soon to be reduced to 8. Aside from Senator Le Main attending a meeting in St. John for Field 605, I do not recall seeing any Senator attending a Parish Meeting or Assembly in the last 10 years, other than at election hustings and polling days when they want your vote; but I would stand corrected if individual members could furnish me with the relevant dates they did attend such meetings.

A member may wish to do any number of things within his/her Parish or district to benefit those they represent – for instance to put a reduced speed limit in the parish, as I did successfully in the late 1990s. Such matters may be of no interest to other elected members, so they would disqualify themselves from signing the proposition.

I must ask why do these 8 members wish to stifle backbencher debate with this proposition? Would these members not be better off looking at government reform in the round, bringing forward a time limit on speeches or considering standing down at the next election if the work in the Chamber is not to their liking?

Finally, I have reduced the number of signatures needed to 3 as currently a proposition needs a proposer and a seconder, and by adding a third member it shows that the member has taken the trouble to discuss the matter with a third party, but in truth I'm happy with the status quo.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this proposition.