

STATES OF JERSEY



STATES MEMBERS' REMUNERATION: RECONSIDERATION OF 2011 INCREASE AND REPEAL OF ARTICLE 44 OF THE STATES OF JERSEY LAW 2005 (P.127/2010) – AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 7th October 2010
by Deputy J.A. Martin of St. Helier**

STATES GREFFE

STATES MEMBERS' REMUNERATION: RECONSIDERATION OF 2011
INCREASE AND REPEAL OF ARTICLE 44 OF THE STATES OF JERSEY
LAW 2005 (P.127/2010) – AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (b) –

For the words “taking account of factors such as the positions of official responsibility held by elected members” substitute the words “including the reintroduction of a means-tested system of remuneration which takes account of the total income of each individual States member.”.

DEPUTY J.A. MARTIN OF ST. HELIER

REPORT

I have put this the amendment to the States of Jersey as I keep hearing many different views from 'we are paid too much' to 'we do not pay enough to encourage good, experienced people into the States'.

I will not stop the Review Body looking at any other options, but I have had concerns since the means-testing was stopped at the end of 2003 and we were told in many speeches (if my memory is correct) that most States members who did not need it would not take the money. Not accounting for inflation, the wage bill for States members went from £1,492,620 in 2003 to £2,014,279 at the end of 2004, an increase of just over half a million pounds with the same politicians.

The last full year recorded is 2009 and that total was then £2,435,321, so since means-testing stopped in 2003, the wage bill has risen by just under £1 million (£942,701), which I would suggest is well above the allowed increase in pay for public sector workers on a percentage basis. We must also remember our wages were frozen this year, but the total for the last 10 years to date is £19,934,195.

We did not have Hansard in 2003, but it was felt in P.145/2003 that means-testing should come to an end and if people needed paying they would apply.

We do not know who claims part or all of the wage and the expenses, but if all 53 members claimed the maximum of both, the total wage bill would be £2,450,647, and the actual spend was £2,433,321 – just £17,326 difference, which I will leave for members to contemplate.

If we really want to do something about the overall problem with our overspend we must start with ourselves. We have introduced an income support system where working people are able to keep 22.5p in the £ over the maximum and then monies are taken away from them.

We have also asked public sector workers to take a pay freeze, have frozen some benefits or reduced them, like the Christmas Bonus, so if we really want to do something about reducing the States members' pay bill, the only way is to means-test or reduce our numbers by approximately 10.

Financial and manpower implications

This amendment does not change the wording in the main proposition that any revised scheme must operate within the existing budget, and there are therefore no additional financial or manpower implications arising.