

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: PROPOSED REFORMS (P.122/2001) - THIRD AMENDMENTS

**Lodged au Greffe on 11th September 2001
by Deputy P.N. Troy of St. Brelade**

STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

180

2001

P.122 Amd.(3)

Price code: A

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: PROPOSED REFORMS (P.122/2001) - THIRD AMENDMENTS

In paragraph (a) -

in sub-paragraph (vii) after the words those who are insert the words -

by a margin equivalent to at least ten per cent of the total membership of the States, with any resulting fraction of one being regarded as one

DEPUTY P.N. TROY OF ST. BRELADE

Report

If part (a) of P.122/2001 is adopted and a ministerial system introduced we are requested to approve section (vii), which states -

“the revised structure will be designed to ensure that the number of members of the States who are not involved in the Executive will be greater than those who are;”.

I agree that there should be a differential in numbers between the Executive function and the remainder who will perform a scrutinising function, and am of the opinion that the States should decide what that differential should be. I would not wish to see it delegated to the proposed Procedure Committee described in P.122/2001, paragraph (a)(iv) or any other newly formed committee.

It is an important principle that the Scrutiny membership should exceed the size of the Executive and I am of the opinion that that the differential should be determined at this stage of debate and included in section (vii).

I have specifically used a percentage of the total membership of the States so that in the event of the Assembly reducing in number if the electoral process were amended, the differential could immediately be adjusted.

The ten per cent margin that I suggest, if creating a fraction, would be regarded as one. The words used regarding a fraction mirror existing words used in the States of Jersey Law 1966 concerning the quorum of a committee. Consequently, with a States membership at 53, the ten per cent differential equals 5.3; which is then rounded up to six, and as a result the number not involved in the Executive must exceed the Executive by at least six.

This proposition has no implications for the financial and manpower resources of the States.