

STATES OF JERSEY



SALARIES OVER £100,000: NOTIFICATION TO STATES ASSEMBLY (P.30/2011) – SECOND AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 22nd March 2011
by Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Clement**

STATES GREFFE

SALARIES OVER £100,000: NOTIFICATION TO STATES ASSEMBLY
(P.30/2011) – SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 –

After the words “States Employment Board,” insert the words “within 2 weeks of the publication of the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on senior salaries, to lodge for approval by the States proposals for a new mechanism to control and monitor senior salaries and to further request the Board to give consideration to the feasibility of introducing a notification procedure as part of the new procedures so that” and for the words “to present a report” substitute the words “a report would be presented”.

DEPUTY I.J. GORST OF ST. CLEMENT

REPORT

Whilst I would wish to disassociate myself from much of the report accompanying the original proposition, I do believe that senior salaries have not been appropriately controlled and monitored in the recent past. As other jurisdictions have allowed senior remuneration levels to escalate, we appear to have followed suit without appropriate question. Clearly, for some of our posts that are mainly recruited from the U.K. it could be argued that we had little choice if we wished to recruit the highest calibre individuals.

However, as every department is expected to make savings over the next 3 years and beyond, it is only right that previously accepted practices are challenged and changed. It is not, in my view, acceptable to look to make savings at all levels and across all services, but to exclude senior pay. It is for this reason that I present my amendment which strengthens the original proposition.

It appears to me to be implicit in the proposition that the mover would like to see remuneration controlled. However it is not explicit. The proposition proposes a monitoring mechanism which it is hoped will, in practice, control. My amendment makes it clear that what is required is a control mechanism which is appropriately monitored and reported upon. I am also of the opinion that it would be far more sensible to agree what that mechanism should be once the Comptroller and Auditor General has produced his report and findings. I am of the view that the States, as a whole, should be accountable for this mechanism, and therefore propose that it should, in due course, be presented to the States for debate and approval.

Financial and manpower implications

There will inevitably be administrative costs involved with this amendment; however the States Employment Board is already undertaking a review, and it should be possible to consider an appropriate control and monitoring mechanism with that work at little extra cost and within existing resources. Ultimately it would be expected that either costs stabilise or reduce over time.