

STATES OF JERSEY



PUBLIC IMPACT OF PROPOSITIONS: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS (P.96/2018) – SECOND AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 22nd August 2018
by Senator S.C. Ferguson

STATES GREFFE

PUBLIC IMPACT OF PROPOSITIONS: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
STANDING ORDERS (P.96/2018) – SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (a) –

After paragraph (a) insert new paragraph (b) as follows –

“(b) that every proposition should also be accompanied, where appropriate, by an estimate of the cost and practicality of policing or enforcing the substance of the proposition;”

and re-letter the subsequent paragraph accordingly.

SENATOR S.C. FERGUSON

Note: After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

- (a) that in addition to the existing requirements under Standing Order 21(2), every proposition should also be accompanied by a statement estimating the impact of its implementation on the public of Jersey in both time and money, along with an explanation as to how the proposer has calculated his or her estimate;
- (b) that every proposition should also be accompanied, where appropriate, by an estimate of the cost and practicality of policing or enforcing the substance of the proposition;
- (c) to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee to bring forward amendments to the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey to give effect to this change.

REPORT

Frequently, propositions are brought to the States Assembly which make fair estimates of the cost of propositions. What is usually missing is the actual feasibility of policing or enforcing the proposal.

The example given in the main proposition is that all vehicles should carry a Breakdown Kit. The question is whether this would only be enforced in the case of an actual breakdown, or whether all road checks would include checking for this kit. If this only adds 30 seconds to each examination, then for 70 cars this would add 35 minutes.

The question most politicians are asked by officials, such as the Honorary Police, when propositions are considered is: "how will we enforce this?". For example, the proposal that the owners of dogs fouling public places should be fined. Either the dog must be caught in the act, or else samples must be taken and an expensive series of DNA testing undertaken.

This amendment is intended to bring some practicality into proposals by members.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from the adoption of this amendment.