

# **STATES OF JERSEY**



## **MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: COMPOSITION AND ELECTION OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY**

---

**Presented to the States on 8th June 2004  
by the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## **REPORT**

### **MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: FUTURE COMPOSITION AND ELECTION OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY**

#### **Foreword**

As those who attended the public meetings of the Special Committee will know, it has been difficult to find common ground on how to move ahead on the matter of reform of the composition of the States.

In particular discussion and debate has focussed on the following issues –

1. Should the all-Island mandate be retained?
2. Should the Connétables remain in the States by virtue of their office?
3. Should representation in the States be based on the parish as the constituency or a variation thereof?
4. Is it possible to structure a system which is a combination of all-Island and parish based representation?

The Committee was also aware that, in attempting to resolve these issues, it had to keep in the forefront of its mind the fundamental issues that have driven reform, namely –

1. The perception that the system is no longer fully representative or, some argue, legitimate, as reflected in declining turnout figures;
2. Gross disparities between the representation afforded to different parish constituencies;
3. The changing rôle of States members, with a much greater focus on strategic and all-Island issues;
4. An inability to bring about a change of government;
5. Confusion as to how members derive their political mandates;
6. Voters' confusion as to the division of rôles between municipal and States' functions.

The challenge that faced the Clothier Panel, and subsequent Special Committees, was that of devising a system which purported to deal with all, or most, of these major issues.

It has been strongly represented to the Special Committee that it should simply have put forward the Clothier proposals without amendment. The Committee was reluctant to do that. Firstly there were serious doubts as to the proposed size of constituencies as proposed by Clothier. Secondly it was important that the Committee, and indeed the public, should work through the issues so that there was ownership of them and it was not seen as an imposed report.

**Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier of St. Saviour  
President**

## **Chronology and proposed way forward**

Since the publication of the Clothier Report in January 2001 there has been on-going discussion and consultation about the future composition of the States Assembly. The matter was initially considered by the Policy and Resources Committee and, since March 2002, has been considered by the Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly under 3 different Presidents as explained in Section 1 below.

The present Committee, under the presidency of Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier, took office on 18th February 2004 and, having reviewed progress to date, decided that this matter should be brought to a conclusion if possible. The Committee is aware that there is unlikely to be any general consensus on the issues but believes that, by setting out the various options available, members and the public will be able to make choices and decide on the most appropriate way forward. This report is the first stage of that process and the Committee is hopeful that, after a period of consultation, a report and proposition can be lodged to enable initial decisions to be taken before the end of 2004. The Committee is particularly concerned to ensure that appropriate transitional arrangements should be put in place for the 2005 elections to ensure that changes can be finally implemented for 2008. This report sets out areas where the Committee feels it appropriate to make definite recommendations and also draws attention to other issues where the Committee believes that there are various options and where members are not unanimous in their recommendations.

The Privileges and Procedures Committee, which has the same membership as the Special Committee, will be lodging the draft States of Jersey Law 200- 'au Greffe' in the near future so that it can be considered by the States and approved in time to ensure that ministerial government begins on schedule in December 2005. That draft Law currently includes the composition of the States in its present form and it would, of course, be necessary for amendments to be made in due course if a proposition to amend the composition of the Assembly is approved later this year.

The Committee welcomes comments on this report from members of the States and in order to progress this matter in a timely way would be grateful to receive those comments by the **end of June 2004**.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Special Committee on the Composition and Election of the States Assembly was established by the States on 26th March 2002 on a proposition of the Policy and Resources Committee (P.26/2002) following that Committee's decision to withdraw its own recommendations for change to the composition and election of the States Assembly (P.179/2001).
- 1.2 The terms of reference for the Special Committee are to consider –
- (a) whether there should be changes to the existing composition of the States Assembly;
  - (b) whether the constituencies of elected members should be amended and, if so, how;
  - (c) whether the term of office of elected members should be amended and, if so, how;
  - (d) how and when members should be elected to the States;
  - (e) whether there should be a maximum level of election expenses for candidates standing for the States;
  - (f) whether all candidates standing for election to the States should be required to produce a policy statement and, if so, how this should be defined and controlled;
  - (g) whether a Chief Electoral Officer should be appointed by the States and, if so, what the duties of such an Officer should be;
  - (h) whether there should be a central register of voters and, if so, how this should be defined and managed.
- 1.3 The Special Committee, as originally constituted under the Presidency of Senator M.E. Vibert, undertook a process of public hearings and consultation in an attempt to get a broad, balanced view of public opinion on changing the composition and election of the States Assembly. It subsequently prepared a report in which it made the comment: *'there is clearly a wide range of strong views held by the public and elected members of the States which are often opposing and rarely consistent'*. Its report contained recommendations for limited change in the current number of States members and the timing of elections but the Committee favoured preserving the current positions of Senators, Deputies and Connétables as members of the States.
- 1.4 The Special Committee lodged its report and proposition (P.186/2002) 'au Greffe' on 8th October 2002, together with a minority report prepared by Senator L. Norman, who called for more radical change based on the recommendations of the Clothier Panel for one class of States member. The proposition was never debated and was subsequently withdrawn.
- 1.5 Following the elections in 2002, the States re-appointed the Special Committee under the Presidency of Senator C.G.P. Lakeman and since that time the Special Committee, under its 2 Presidents, has had the same membership as the Privileges and Procedures Committee.
- 1.6 The initial view of the Special Committee under Senator Lakeman's presidency was that the recommendations proposed by the previous Committee had missed an opportunity to make significant changes to the current composition and election of the States Assembly. The Committee considered that the first Committee had failed to respond to the momentum for change initiated by the Clothier review and taken up in the various decisions already made by the States in moving towards reform of the machinery of government. Following a review of submissions made to the original Committee, the Special Committee confirmed that it wished to put forward alternative recommendations on the reform to the composition and election of the Assembly. It believed that the issues involved were closely linked to

the effectiveness of the new ministerial/scrutiny system of government in Jersey and that it was important for the reform of the Assembly to proceed alongside the reforms to the machinery of government. Unfortunately the Committee under Senator Lakeman's presidency was not able to finalise its proposals before the Committee fell on his resignation.

- 1.7 The Special Committee, reconstituted in February under Deputy Le Hérissier's presidency, has decided that options for change, building on the work of the former Committee, should now be brought forward for discussion and subsequent debate.
- 1.8 The Committee has concluded that the conclusion reached by the original Committee referred to above, namely that *'there is clearly a wide range of strong views held by the public and elected members of the States which are often opposing and rarely consistent'* is undoubtedly accurate. The Committee itself has found it impossible at this stage to reach a unanimous view on the way forward and has therefore decided to set out a range of options in this report. The Committee nevertheless believes that the matter of the composition of the States cannot be left in abeyance indefinitely and it will only be by stimulating a wide-ranging discussion in the Island that the issue can finally be resolved by the States, having taken account of the views of the public in a referendum as explained below.

## 2. Why should the present structure be changed?

- 2.1 The Committee shares many of the conclusions of the Clothier Panel on the need for change. At a very simple level it is, for example, clear that the present discrepancies in the sizes of the Deputies' constituencies lead to an imbalance which the Committee believes is unsustainable. As a example the Parishes of Grouville and St. Lawrence both had, by coincidence, an identical population in the 2001 census (4,702 inhabitants), yet the former is represented by only one Deputy whereas St. Lawrence has 2 Deputies. The Deputy of St. Mary represents a Parish with a population of 1,591 in the 2001 census, just over a third of the population represented by the Deputy of Grouville. The full breakdown of the present electoral districts for Deputy is as follows –

Table 2.1

	<b>Population 2001 Census</b>	<b>Electors March 2004</b>	<b>Current Deputies</b>	<b>Residents per Deputy</b>	<b>Electors per Deputy</b>
St. Helier	28,310	13,750	10	2,831	1,375
St. Lawrence	4,702	3,001	2	2,351	1,501
St. Peter	4,293	2,538	1	4,293	2,538
St. Brelade	10,134	6,268	3	3,378	2,089
St. Ouen	3,803	2,261	1	3,803	2,261
St. Mary	1,591	1,096	1	1,591	1,096
St. John	2,618	1,664	1	2,618	1,664
Trinity	2,718	1,733	1	2,718	1,733
St. Martin	3,628	2,348	1	3,628	2,348
Grouville	4,702	2,933	1	4,702	2,933
St. Saviour	12,491	6,548	5	2,498	1,310
St. Clement	8,196	4,621	2	4,098	2,311
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>48,761</b>	<b>29</b>		
<b>Average</b>				<b>3,006</b>	<b>1,681</b>

- 2.2 Although it might be possible to rectify such discrepancies to a certain extent by redefining constituency

boundaries, the Committee believes that more radical change is required to reinvigorate the electoral process in the Island and to put in place an Assembly that will be more appropriate for the new system of government. In addition the Committee believes that steps must be taken to address the current electoral apathy which it believes is partly due to the current complex election process with elections occurring at different times for the 3 different categories of members.

2.3 The issues that have inevitably dominated the work of the 3 Special Committees are –

- Should there be a ‘general election’ for all members of the States on one day?
- Should the present 3 year term of office be changed?
- Should Connétables remain as members of the States by virtue of their office?<sup>[1]</sup>
- Should the Island-wide mandate be retained?
- Should the position of Deputy remain in its present form?

It has become clear throughout the Committee’s deliberations that it is necessary to consider the relative priority of proposals in relation to the above matters and to consider the feasibility of combinations of those proposals in one overall package. Any proposals will inevitably lead to a trade-off of advantages and disadvantages and the Committee hopes that this report will set out the options to enable members to consider whether there is a pragmatic solution.

2.4 The Committee has concluded that certain proposals, however attractive in isolation, are simply not feasible if combined. As an example the Committee does not believe it would be practical or desirable on a long-term basis to retain the positions of Senator and Deputy in their present form alongside the introduction of a common election day and identical term of office for both positions. In the Committee’s view this would devalue the position of Senator, would lead to confusion with the electors, and would detract from the parochial and district campaigns being conducted by prospective Deputies as media and public attention would almost certainly be dominated by the senatorial hustings ‘roadshow’. In addition it is not clear whether the position of Senator would continue to be attractive to sitting Deputies as a ‘progression’ to a more ‘senior’ position if the advantage of a longer term of office was lost.

### **3. A single general election day**

3.1 The Committee believes that the Island would best be served if all members of the Assembly were elected at a single general election. The Committee notes that this recommendation, which was made by the Clothier Panel, has received widespread support in the various consultation processes undertaken since the publication of that report although there have been concerns about practical implementation.

3.2 In the Committee’s view the current system of election, where 3 different categories of elected members are elected at different times, and, in the case of the Senators, for a different term of office, is unwieldy, leading to voter apathy and, in addition, frustration for the public who face a prolonged period every 3 years during which States members’ attention is divided between electioneering and maintaining the normal business of the States.

3.3 The Committee believes that the electorate should be able to make an effective change in the composition of the Assembly should it wish to do so. The present ‘general elections’ that take place every 3 years do not involve over one third of the members of the Assembly (6 Senators and 12 Connétables) and the electorate are therefore entitled to believe that it is difficult to make any significant change by taking the trouble to vote. This problem is, of course, compounded with individual Connétable’s elections that are held at various times throughout the electoral cycle. The Committee is convinced that the ability to renew the entire membership of the Assembly on one day would enhance the significance of the occasion and stimulate renewed interest in the electoral process. At present it would take many elections (2 senatoria

elections, 12 Connétables' elections and the Deputies' elections) to renew the entire membership of the Assembly over a 6-year period.

- 3.4 A further advantage of having a single election date is that it would overcome the difficulties that occur in the present system with Connétables joining the States at different times when Committee membership and, in the future ministerial and scrutiny panel membership positions, have been decided. In addition the Committee believes it would be desirable to ensure that the States did not meet during the election campaign period and this would be more easily achievable with a single election date in the spring than in the present system when the election period runs from September until late November.

**The Committee recommends that all members of the States should be elected on a single general election day.**

#### **4. Spring Elections**

- 4.1 The Special Committee supports the recommendation to move current autumn elections to the spring when there are longer hours of daylight and the weather is generally more favourable than in October and November. It is mindful that this period, with moveable dates for Easter, a number of Bank Holidays and the potential impact on the budgetary timetable, is not without its difficulties in selecting a suitable date.
- 4.2 Easter Sunday can fall on any date between 22nd March and 25th April and it will therefore be necessary to fix an election date that does not conflict with that date whilst avoiding the school half-term holiday at the end of May. The Committee's view is that a date in the middle of May in every 4th year would be suitable but accepts that further research needs to be undertaken to ensure that no unforeseen problems would be caused by the choice of this date. A schedule of possible election dates from 2008 to 2060 showing the interaction with Easter (on the assumption that elections continue to be held on a Wednesday), is given in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 It will not be possible for the necessary legislative changes to be in place in time for a spring election in 2005 and the Committee therefore recommends that the spring election should be introduced from 2008.

**The Committee recommends that the general election should be held in the spring in every 4th year.**

#### **5. Term of Office**

- 5.1 The Clothier Panel recommended that the term of office for all elected members of the States should be between 4 and 5 years, which is the practice in most other jurisdictions. The Committee agrees that the present 3-year term is not long enough to allow proper development of long-term policy within the electoral cycle.
- 5.2 The Committee accepts that a 5-year term of office would give members a significant period of certainty but has concluded that this must be weighed against the need to allow the public to express their views through the ballot box at regular intervals. The Committee has noted that although MPs are elected to the House of Commons for a 5-year term it is almost inevitably the practice of the U.K. Prime Minister to seek a dissolution before that full term and the actual term served is usually therefore between 4 and 5 years. The Committee has therefore concluded that a fixed 4-year term of office for all members would be appropriate for Jersey.

**The Committee recommends a fixed 4-year term for States members.**

#### **6. The abolition of the present positions of Senator and Deputy**

- 6.1 The Special Committee has concluded that the positions of Senator and Deputy in their present form should be abolished and replaced with a new category of States member as described in Section 8 below.

#### **The position of Senator**

- 6.2 The Committee accepts that in the various consultation processes that have taken place since the publication of the Clothier report, which recommended the abolition of the position of Senator, strong views have been expressed by some members of the States and members of the public in favour of retaining the Island-wide mandate.
- 6.3 Although the Policy and Resources Committee recommended that the position of Senator should be abolished this recommendation was, of course, withdrawn following a series of public meetings held in early 2002 which produced nearly unanimous votes in favour of the retention of Senators.
- 6.4 Some of those against retaining the position of Senator have tried to claim that these public meetings were not representative of public opinion as a whole but it has become clear to the Committee during its work that it is very difficult to know with any certainty what the general view of the electorate is on these issues. The Clothier Panel itself commissioned a MORI poll which was conducted in a scientific manner from a sample of 1,000 residents by that polling organisation. The results from that poll on options for removing or reducing States members were –

*Q21 If it were decided to reduce the number of States members, would you prefer to remove or reduce:*

Deputies	37% Reduce	5% Remove	44%
Constables	13% Reduce	17% Remove	31%
Senators	16% Reduce	3% Remove	20%

On the issue of whether the overall numbers of members should be reduced the results were as follows –

*Q20. There are 53 States members. Do you think that this is too many, too few, or about right?*

Too many	46%
Too few	3%
About right	44%
Other/don't know	8%

The issue of a general election gained considerable support in the MORI poll –

*Q22. States members are elected for varying terms of office. Do you think there should be:*

Single general election for all members	62%
Separate elections as at present	33%
Other/don't know	8%

The island-wide mandate was considered in a question about constituencies –

*Q23. At present some members are elected by the whole island, while others are elected on a local basis. Do you think that:*

All members should be elected on an <i>Island-wide</i> basis	46%
The present arrangements should continue	32%
All members should be elected on a <i>local</i> basis	19%
Other/don't know	3%

- 6.5 An alternative, albeit unscientific, attempt to judge public opinion was conducted by the Jersey Evening Post who published the results of a telephone poll on 21st February 2001. The relevant results of that poll,

which received 1,629 responses, were as follows–

Should ...	YES	NO
The size of the States be reduced from 53 Members to 42-44?	89%	11%
The Constables be removed from the States?	68%	32%
The distinction between Senators and Deputies be removed, with all elections on a parish or constituency basis and none on an Island-wide basis?	67%	32%
The titles of Senator and Deputy be scrapped and replaced by that of Member of the States of Jersey?	60%	39%
One general election be held on the same day, both for all States Members and the parish Constables?	76%	23%
General elections be held at intervals of 4-5 years, instead of the present three?	78%	22%

- 6.6 The Special Committee’s conclusion is that there is no accurate way to state what the electorate really think on these issues at the present time and it should not attempt to second-guess public opinion. The Committee believes that the appropriate way to proceed is for proposals which have been debated ‘in principle’ by the States to be put to the public in a referendum where, after a campaign in which all viewpoints can be expressed, all electors will be entitled to express their views on the proposals before the final decisions are taken by the States. The Committee believes that this will be the only way to assess the public’s views in a systematic and accurate way.
- 6.7 A common argument used in favour of retaining the island-wide mandate is that electors appreciate the ability to influence the election of a significant number of members of the Assembly but the Committee does not believe that this feature of the present system is sufficient in itself to retain the position of Senator. Furthermore, while electors speak of their ability to vote for a large number of candidates, they also increasingly speak of their inability to influence the policy these candidates will pursue and their inability (in the absence of a general election) to fundamentally change the composition and therefore, by extension, the policies of the States. In addition, as shown by the recent J.E.P. analysis of the views expressed by senatorial candidates in 2002 on sales tax, there is no guarantee that statements made by candidates on the election platform are carried forward into policy development.
- 6.8 It has been stated that the electors in a small Parish such as St. Mary would be disadvantaged if they lost the ability to vote for several members of the States. The Committee believes that this view must be considered alongside the fact that, in an island-wide election, the total votes from a small Parish have very little, if any, influence on the overall result which is largely dependent on the results from larger Parishes although each single vote cast does, of course, have the same value in the overall total. The analysis of the results of all senatorial ‘general’ elections since the present 6-year term was introduced in 1966 given in Appendix 2 shows this very clearly. The figures in that Appendix show that no single result of a senatorial ‘general election’ has been affected since 1966 by the total votes in St. Mary although the final order of the 6 successful candidates has been influenced on many occasions by the St. Helier total with the actual result of the 6th placed candidate being affected in 1993.
- 6.9 In the Clothier report it was stated that the Senators no longer occupy the most senior positions in the States. The Committee’s research has shown that this was in fact an incorrect assertion although the years 1987, 1990 and 1993 show a low number of Senators in senior Presidencies. Appendix 3 lists the Presidents elected to the 12 most senior presidencies (in the order they were appointed by the States) after each general election since 1966. The Appendix shows that Senators have been appointed to the ‘top 2’

Presidencies on every single occasion since 1966 and the breakdown between the 3 categories of members for the top 12 presidencies is as follows –

Table 6.9

	Senators	Deputies	Connétables
2002	8	4	0
1999	7	5	0
1996	7	4	1
1993	4	6	2
1990	4	6	2
1987	5	6	1
1984	6	5	1
1981	8	4	0
1978	9	3	0
1975	10	2	0
1972	7	5	0
1969	6	6	0
1966	7	5	0
Total	88	61	7
%	56.4	39.1	4.5

6.10 The conclusion to be drawn from the figures is clearly that Senators have been viewed as more ‘senior’ when appointments have been made to presidencies. The Committee believes that it would nevertheless be incorrect to imply that this seniority comes solely from their island-wide mandate. The 12 Senators have, on average, always had considerably longer periods of office in the States than Deputies and it is not therefore surprising that those members with more years’ service are appointed to senior positions by their colleagues. A snapshot at 10-year intervals of the average length of service of all Senators and Deputies in the States on the given date shows the following results –

Table 6.10

<b>DATE</b>	<b>Senators</b>	<b>Deputies</b>
January 1974	16.6 years	5.7 years
January 1984	14.6 years	5.3 years
January 1994	12.8 years	4.4 years
January 2004	10.9 years	5.3 years

6.11 The Committee believes that length of service, and consequential seniority, goes some considerable way towards explaining why a higher proportion of Senators have risen to positions of responsibility. It has always been accepted that Presidents are appointed by the States on the basis of a judgment about the suitability of a member for the position and there are many examples of Senators being appointed to presidencies they had already held as Deputies, for example –

- Deputy Jeune – Education in 1969 – retained as Senator in 1972;
- Deputy Morvan – Harbours and Airport in 1972 – retained as Senator in 1975;
- Deputy Le Sueur – (Employment and) Social Security in 1993 and 1996 – retained as Senator in 1999

and, conversely, well known examples of Deputies regaining presidencies they had held before defeat in a senatorial election –

Senator Dupré – Tourism in 1966, 1969, 1972, 1975 – retained as Deputy in 1978;  
Senator Farley – Sewerage Board (RRB) 1966, 1969, 1972 – retained as Deputy in 1975

- 6.12 The Committee's research has shown very clearly that, although Senators have held a higher percentage of Presidencies, there is no direct correlation between success in a senatorial election and appointment as a senior President. Appendix 4 shows the presidencies gained by senatorial candidates immediately after each senatorial 'general election' since 1966. The figures show that of the 13 'poll toppers' in this period only one has ever been appointed to the most senior presidency immediately after his success (Senator Horsfall in 1996) whilst 5 did not receive a single presidency and 2 others gained minor presidencies that do not even figure in the 12 most senior presidencies list shown in Appendix 3. A further difficulty that distances the appointment of Presidents from the election process is that many Senators are appointed or re-appointed as Presidents at the halfway point in their term of office when their 'mandate' from the electorate is already over 3 years old.
- 6.13 Having studied the evidence from the senatorial election results, the Committee has concluded that there is no valid reason to suggest that the island-wide mandate must be retained because it gives a greater 'democratic' mandate to senior Presidents. If this were the case the logical conclusion would be that no Deputy or Connétable should be eligible for a senior position.
- 6.14 The Committee recognises that there are some members who consider that new procedures should be put in place to make a link between electoral success and the appointment to ministerial office in the new system. The Committee does not share this view and does not believe it would be acceptable to a majority of members of the public as the tradition in the States has always been that Presidents are appointed and, if necessary, dismissed on the basis of their experience, ability and conduct. The Committee considers that this should continue in relation to the appointment of the Chief Minister and Ministers in the new system. There have been situations where Senators have clearly won on the basis of popular policies but this does not necessarily guarantee that they possess the executive skills to occupy a ministerial position.
- 6.15 The Committee has heard and considered views from members of the States, and from some members of the public who have attended its meetings on a regular basis, that the island-wide mandate should be retained and that all members of the States should be elected on that basis. This would undoubtedly give Islanders the ability to influence the election of members in a very direct way and it would be clear both in Jersey and outside that members had a mandate from the whole electorate. The Committee can see merits in these arguments but has not been convinced that there is any practical way to run elections in an orderly fashion with the number of candidates that would stand in such an election. As a result the Committee has rejected this option although it believes that its suggested 'super constituency' model could go some considerable way towards ensuring that all members have a wide popular mandate. Under the 'super constituency' model, the mandates of the new members will be considerably larger than those held by the 29 Deputies at present even though the island-wide mandate of 12 members will be lost.
- 6.16 The Committee has concluded that the advantages of holding a general election with one new category of member to replace the present positions of Senators and Deputies outweigh any advantages of retaining the Island-wide mandate.

### **The position of Deputy**

- 6.17 As mentioned in paragraph 2.1 above the Committee has serious concerns about the discrepancies that exist between the current Deputies' constituencies and believes that the present system is unsustainable if the Island electoral system is to be truly fair and representative. In addition the Committee believes that the present system, that allows some electors to choose up to 4 Deputies, whereas others only choose one is illogical and unfair. The present system inevitably means that there are considerable differences between the number of votes received by candidates because of the differences in the size of the electoral districts. This has the undesirable result that many unsuccessful candidates in large districts receive

considerably more votes than successful candidates in smaller areas as shown from the 2002 results below –

Table 6.17

<b>andidate</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>% of voters voting</b>	<b>% of registered electors</b>	
on	St. Helier No. 3	1,359	62.1	20.8	Elected
t	St. Helier No. 3	1,289	58.9	19.8	Elected
	St. Helier No. 3	1,233	56.4	18.9	Elected
Maye	St. Helier No. 3	1,191	54.4	18.3	Elected
lor	St. Clement	1,024	63.1	22.0	Elected
/	St. Brelade No. 2	961	61.2	22.7	Elected
sin	St. Lawrence	877	70.9	30.3	Elected
dains	St. Clement	811	50.0	17.4	Elected
ol	St. Helier No. 3	793	36.3	12.2	
ge	St. Helier No. 2	785	68.7	22.3	Elected
ey	Grouville	774	65.9	27.1	Elected
ras	St. Lawrence	743	60.1	25.7	Elected
	St. Martin	725	57.1	32.3	Elected
olls	St. Helier No. 3	724	33.1	11.1	
n	St. Helier No. 1	720	69.9	20.7	Elected
5	St. Peter	711	67.5	28.5	Elected
tin	St. Helier No. 1	660	64.1	18.9	Elected
Main	St. Helier No. 2	658	57.6	18.7	Elected
stein	St. Brelade No. 2	640	40.8	15.1	Elected
hern	St. Helier No. 2	609	53.3	17.3	Elected
eham	St. Brelade No. 2	599	38.2	14.1	
l	St. Ouen	598	42.9	23.0	Elected
Firbhisigh	St. Helier No. 2	577	50.5	16.4	
te	St. Clement	561	34.6	12.1	
bourian	St. Lawrence	550	44.5	19.0	
ckstone	St. Martin	539	42.4	24.0	
t Warren	St. Saviour No. 1	531	57.3	22.5	Elected
amel	St. Saviour No. 1	519	56.0	22.0	Elected
Iérisier	St. Saviour No. 3	500	82.8	27.4	Elected
uson	St. Brelade No. 1	489	51.4	24.8	Elected
ey	St. Helier No. 1	488	47.4	14.0	Elected
ings	St. Helier No. 3	486	22.2	7.5	
zell	St. Brelade No. 1	455	47.8	23.1	
uet	St. Clement	425	26.2	9.1	
t	Grouville	397	33.8	13.9	
tanche	St. Brelade No. 2	397	25.3	9.4	
is	St. Saviour No. 1	374	40.3	15.9	
ce	St. Helier No. 1	352	34.2	10.1	
Maistre	St. Ouen	340	28.1	15.1	
t	St. Ouen	340	28.1	15.1	
ny	St. Peter	338	32.1	13.6	

ne	St. Mary	300	50.3	28.8	Elected
ichan	St. Mary	296	49.6	28.5	
tworth	St. Helier No. 1	252	24.5	7.2	
on	St. Saviour No. 1	240	25.9	10.2	
gh	St. Brelade No. 2	193	12.3	4.6	
n	St. Clement	163	10.0	3.5	
ens	St. Saviour No. 3	104	17.2	5.7	
ridge	St. Brelade No. 2	92	5.9	2.1	
rral	St. Lawrence	66	5.3	2.3	
ikon	St. Saviour No. 2	Unopposed			Elected
ipel	Trinity	Unopposed			Elected
ham	St. Saviour No. 2	Unopposed			Elected
del	St. John	Unopposed			Elected

- 6.18 The Committee has serious concerns, particularly with the move to the ministerial system, that the mandates of some Deputies are very small. It is well known that in by elections in urban areas Deputies can be elected with very few votes and as can be seen above 3 candidates were elected with 500 votes or less in 2002 and, perhaps of greater concern, 4, through no fault of their own, were elected unopposed although that figure was significantly less than the 9 Deputies elected unopposed in 1999, one of whom had never previously been elected to the Assembly).
- 6.19 The Committee has considered the suggestion made by the Clothier report and put forward by others (including Senator Norman in his minority report to the proposition of the first Special Committee) that the position of Deputy should be retained as the sole class of States member with a reallocation of the number of candidates to correct some of the present anomalies referred to in paragraph 2.1. The Committee does not accept that this system would be adequate if the Island-wide mandate is abolished. In an Island with a population of some 88,000 people and 48,761 registered electors it would be difficult to claim that a person with less than 500 votes could be said to represent the overall interests of the Island when conducting dealings on the international stage. The Committee believes that a sitting Deputy with strong parish connections who was in a senior position in the new system could be re-elected on a regular basis because of those local connections even if his or her policies were unpopular across the Island and this could enable members to 'hide' from the electorate in small districts.
- 6.20 Another argument against the introduction of an 'all Deputies system' on a parish constituency basis is that the discrepancies identified in the table above draw attention to the fact that districts should not be different sizes and the only alternative, to divide the Island into a large number of single member constituencies, (with perhaps 10 to 12 electoral districts in St. Helier) would be extremely confusing.
- 6.21 If the position of Senator is to be abolished as recommended above, the Committee believes that the position of Deputy in its present form should also be abolished, with the creation of a new category of member to replace both positions as described below.

**The Committee recommends that the present positions of Senator and Deputy should be abolished.**

## **7. Number of members**

- 7.1 The Committee has been conscious throughout its deliberations that the view has been frequently expressed that the number of members should be reduced as an Assembly of 53 members is too large for an island the size of Jersey. The Clothier Report recommended an Assembly of between 42 and 44 members.
- 7.2 The Committee considered whether it would be preferable to allow the ministerial system to begin before suggesting any reduction but concluded that the overall changes being proposed represented a 'one-off'

opportunity to make significant changes and, if the number was not reduced at this stage, it would be more difficult to make changes later.

7.3 Following the adoption of an amendment of Deputy Troy to the initial machinery of government proposals there will have to be a ‘gap’, equivalent to 10% of the total number of members, between the number of members in the Executive and those not involved in the Executive. The ‘rounding’ of the 10% figure to the nearest figure in accordance with the formula agreed by the States shows that the balance between the Executive and the non-Executive members is affected by the overall figure with, somewhat curiously, the actual gap sometimes being larger with a smaller number of members as shown below –

Table 7.3

TOTAL MEMBERS	‘10% rule’ (rounded as required)	Maximum in the Executive	Balance (members not in the Executive)	Actual ‘gap’
40	4	18	22	4
41	5	18	23	5
42	5	18	24	6
43	5	19	24	5
44	5	19	25	6
45	5	20	25	5
46	5	20	26	6
47	5	21	26	5
48	5	21	27	6
49	5	22	27	5
50	5	22	28	6
51	6	22	29	7
52	6	23	29	6
53	6	23	30	7

7.4 In accordance with existing decisions of the States the minimum number of non-Executive members required to fill the positions already agreed is 22, made up as follows –

4 Scrutiny Panels (x 5 each) = 20  
 Chairman PAC = 1  
 President PPC = 1

With 10 Ministers, Assistant Ministers could be appointed up to the maximum number of the Executive allowed in the table above.

7.5 The Committee believes that an appropriate reduction at this stage might be from 53 to 48 and has used this number as the basis for its proposals on the future composition of the Assembly. An Assembly of 48, as shown above, gives a non-Executive majority of at least 27 members, 6 more than the maximum of 21 allowed in the Executive. This would allow the appointment of up to 11 Assistant Ministers and the Committee believes this would be adequate.

7.6 The Committee accepts that there are arguments in favour of a greater reduction in numbers and the final number chosen may depend on decisions on other issues such as the number of constituencies.

**8. A new category of member elected in new large electoral districts**

8.1 Having concluded that all members should be elected on one day, and having decided that the island-wide mandate should not be retained, the Committee has given careful consideration to the manner in which

States members should be elected in future.

8.2 The Committee recognises that many electors value the ability to vote for a number of candidates and believes that there would be considerable merit in retaining this facility in some way if possible. In addition the Committee recognises that candidates will obtain a greater democratic mandate if elected in a larger constituency.

8.3 Having taken these 2 matters into account the Committee has concluded that the appropriate way forward is the division of the Island into a small number of electoral districts or ‘super-constituencies’. These would, as far as possible, have a similar population and would each elect a similar number of members to the States. The Committee has concluded that it is preferable to base its calculations principally on population figures and not on the number of registered electors as there are significant discrepancies across the Island on the percentage of residents registered and the Committee is hopeful that steps can be taken, as part of overall reform, to address these discrepancies. The following table gives an illustration of the discrepancies (albeit based on total population and not just those eligible to register) –

Table 8.3

	<b>Population</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>% of population</b>
	<b>2001 Census</b>	<b>March 2004</b>	<b>registered</b>
Grouville	4,702	2,933	62.38
St. Brelade	10,134	6,268	61.85
St. Clement	8,196	4,621	56.38
St. Helier	28,310	13,750	48.57
St. John	2,618	1,664	63.56
St. Lawrence	4,702	3,001	63.82
St. Martin	3,628	2,348	64.72
St. Mary	1,591	1,096	68.89
St. Ouen	3,803	2,261	59.45
St. Peter	4,293	2,538	59.12
St. Saviour	12,491	6,548	52.42
Trinity	2,718	1,733	63.76
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>48,761</b>	
<b>Average</b>			55.93

8.4 Figures calculated by the Statistics Unit of the Policy and Resources Department prior to the 2002 elections show the low level of electoral registration in the Island when compared to an estimation of the number of potential electors (over 18 with at least 2 years’ residence) on the basis of the 2001 census figures –

Table 8.4

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Estimated Electoral Roll</b>	<b>Total pop</b>	<b>% of pop</b>	<b>Rounded figures</b>
Grouville	3,659	4,702	78	3,700
St. Brelade	7,923	10,134	78	7,900
St. Clement	6,150	8,196	75	6,200
St. Helier	22,650	28,310	80	22,700
St. John	1,981	2,618	76	2,000

St. Lawrence	3,749	4,702	80	3,700
St. Martin	2,779	3,628	77	2,800
St. Mary	1,212	1,591	76	1,200
St. Ouen	2,882	3,803	76	2,900
St. Peter	3,366	4,293	78	3,400
St. Saviour	9,455	12,491	76	9,500
Trinity	2,114	2,718	78	2,100
<b>All Island</b>	<b>67,920</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>67,900</b>

- 8.5 There are obviously different ways to divide the Island into the proposed new electoral districts and some members of the Committee favour the division of the Island into electoral 3 districts, with up to 12 members in each, in the following way (although it is accepted that the names of the districts given below may need to be amended to reflect the geography of the Island more accurately) –

Table 8.5

	<b>2001 Population</b>	<b>2004 Electors</b>	<b>No of residents per member (12)</b>	<b>No of electors per member (12)</b>
<b>East</b>				
St. Clement	8,196	4,621		
Grouville	4,702	2,933		
St. Martin	3,628	2,348		
St. Saviour	12,491	6,548		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>29,017</b>	<b>16,450</b>	<b>2,418</b>	<b>1,371</b>
<b>St. Helier</b>	<b>28,310</b>	<b>13,750</b>	<b>2,359</b>	<b>1,146</b>

<b>West and Centre</b>				
St. Brelade	10,134	6,268		
St. John	2,618	1,664		
St. Lawrence	4,702	3,001		
St. Mary	1,591	1,096		
St. Ouen	3,803	2,261		
St. Peter	4,293	2,538		
Trinity	2,718	1,733		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>29,859</b>	<b>18,561</b>	<b>2,488</b>	<b>1,547</b>
<b>Island Totals</b>	<b>87,186</b>	<b>48,761</b>		
<b>Island average</b>			<b>2,422</b>	<b>1,354</b>

- 8.6 Those members of the Committee who favour this model believe that it would offer voters a broad choice of candidates and would hopefully focus elections on island-wide issues thereby creating a viable alternative to the current position of Senator. It would be very unlikely for uncontested elections to take place under these proposals meaning that the public would have a full opportunity to hear the views of all potential members of the States and influence their election through the ballot box. As the work of States members becomes increasingly complex the Committee believes it is important that all members view their role as one representing the Island as a whole and not simply local areas issues and the multi-Parish constituencies would also encourage more cross Parish strategic vision for members.
- 8.7 The Committee believes that members elected in a ‘super constituency’ would be sufficiently representative of Island interests as a whole. An analysis of the senatorial elections shows that results between Parishes in an island-wide election are remarkably similar and it is probably fair to say that most of those elected in one ‘super constituency’ would have received a similar level of support in other areas of the Island although there will always, of course, be particular Parish and local influences that can affect results and potentially significant differences between urban and rural constituencies. There would, of course, also be potential for candidates in different parts of the Island to join forces to promote issues across the various constituencies.
- 8.8 Once elected, all members elected on this basis would have an equal status in the Assembly and there would, therefore, be no public expectation, as is possibly the case at present with Senators, that certain members should automatically achieve senior positions within the Assembly. In addition, whilst some will argue that the public is losing 12 members with island-wide mandates, the senatorial results since 1966 show that a Senator can be elected with as few as 6,684 votes and the Committee hopes that with a general election and re-invigoration of the electoral process the number of votes cast for successful candidates in a new electoral district could be quite substantial in one new constituency alone.
- 8.9 The Committee accepts that some will see the loss of the direct link between Parishes and their Deputy or Deputies as a disadvantage of the new system. The Committee believes that it is likely that informal relationships will develop between members and different parts of their constituency to replace the current formal link between Deputy and the parish especially in the early years of the new system. Members of the public would nevertheless have a number of elected representatives from their constituency to contact and would, of course, retain the ability to contact members from other parts of the Island if they were unable to receive a satisfactory response from any of their constituency representatives. The Committee is also conscious that, at present, any elector living in a single member Deputy constituency who does not wish to contact that Deputy for whatever reason has no other ‘area’ representative to contact except the Connétable.

- 8.10 The Committee totally refutes the suggestion made by some that its recommendations would ‘destroy’ the parish system. The proposals would, if adopted, simply change the method of election of members to the States and the Committee would point out that the parish system in the Island is about far more than the election of Deputies. The role of the Connétable, Procureurs du Bien Public, Parish and Ecclesiastical Assemblies, the honorary police, Roads Inspectors and Committees, the rating and welfare system, refuse collections, the branchage and ‘Visites Royales’, as well as parish social groups, magazines, twinings with France and all other parish activities would be totally unchanged by the proposals and it is likely that some of the members elected in the new electoral districts would continue to be closely involved in local parish affairs in one or more of the parishes in their area. It would be necessary to consider how the new members could participate in Parish Assemblies to ensure the retention of the present provisions on such participation. The Committee would point out that 11 of the current 29 Deputies, well over a third, do not live in the parish or district they represent and there is no evidence that these members are unable to relate to their electors in a direct and effective way.
  
- 8.11 The Committee wishes to stress that it considers that the role of being a member of the States is not only about parish or district interests and with the move to ministerial government the need for all members to deal with all Island and international issues will become increasingly important.
  
- 8.12 The Committee is aware that there is clearly one potential difficulty with the 3 constituency model namely that the election process will be difficult to handle although this could be mitigated if the number of members was reduced beyond the reduction to 48 suggested earlier. The Committee was concerned to learn that there were some 3% of spoilt papers in the 2000 election for People’s Deputies in St. Peter Por in 2000 when the electors were required to vote for 12 candidates. It is possible that there could be some 20 or more candidates for the 12 seats in each district and it would be necessary for new and innovative approaches to be taken towards the campaign process. The Committee believes that the potential problems could be overcome to some extent by the publication at public expense of a comprehensive election booklet in each district in which each candidate would be able to publish his or her manifesto and which would also contain practical information about how and where to vote. In addition it would be necessary to reinvigorate the hustings and consider new ways of allowing the public to know the views of the candidates.
  
- 8.13 Because of the potential logistical problems with the large number of candidates in 3 districts, some members of the Committee are attracted to a division of the Island into 6 or 7 districts. This would have the advantage of making elections considerably more manageable with a much smaller number of candidates for each district and less risk of confusion. This must, of course, be balanced against the smaller electoral mandate if the districts are smaller and the reduction in the number of members that each elector can vote for.
  
- 8.14 Because the Committee believes that it will be essential to base any new districts on a combination of existing Parishes it is not easy to make a fair division of the Island into 6 or 7 constituencies if the number of members is to be the same in each district. Nevertheless a workable model for 6 constituencies is as follows (bearing in mind that it may be necessary to base the division of St. Helier on Vingtain boundaries and not on the 50-50 split shown here) –

Table 8.14

	<b>Population</b>	<b>No. of members</b>	<b>Residents per member</b>
<b>District 1</b>			
St. Helier W	<b>14,155</b>	6	2,359
<b>District 2</b>			

St. Helier E	<b>14,155</b>	6	2,359
<b>District 3</b>			
St. Clement	8,196		
Grouville	4,702		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,898</b>	5	2,580
<b>District 4</b>			
St. Saviour	12,491		
St. Martin	3,628		
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,119</b>	7	2,303
<b>District 5</b>			
St. Brelade	10,134		
St. Peter	4,293		
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,427</b>	6	2,405

<b>District 6</b>			
St. Lawrence	4,702		
St. John	2,618		
St. Mary	1,591		
Trinity	2,718		
St. Ouen	3,803		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,432</b>	6	2,572

8.15 A possible model for 7 constituencies is as follows –

Table 8.15

	<b>Population</b>	<b>No. of members</b>	<b>Residents per member</b>
<b>District 1</b>			
St. Helier W	<b>14,155</b>	6	2,359
<b>District 2</b>			
St. Helier E	<b>14,155</b>	6	2,359
<b>District 3</b>			
St. Clement	8,196		
Grouville	4,702		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,898</b>	5	2,580
<b>District 4</b>			
St. Saviour	<b>12,491</b>	5	2,498
<b>District 5</b>			
St. Brelade	<b>10,134</b>	4	2,534
<b>District 6</b>			
St. Lawrence	4,702		
St. Ouen	3,803		
St. Peter	4,293		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,798</b>	5	2,560
<b>District 7</b>			
St. Mary	1,591		
St. John	2,618		
Trinity	2,718		
St. Martin	3,628		
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,555</b>	4	2,639

8.16 The models for 6 or 7 districts would clearly be more manageable than 3 constituencies although it could be seen as a disadvantage that the constituencies are not of equal size. The Committee is conscious that

the 3 constituency model would work better if there were fewer States members and thus potentially fewer names to consider on a ballot paper.

8.17 Appendix 5 shows the impact of splitting the 2002 senatorial result across the proposed 3, 6 and 7 constituency model. As can be seen there is considerable similarity of results across the Island with the main difference coming in St. Helier.

8.18 The Committee has considered what this new category of member should be called. The Committee recognises that the Clothier recommendation that members should be called 'MSJs' has not met with an enthusiastic response. There may be some merit in retaining the title 'Deputy' or even 'Senator' for historic reasons although this could lead to an expectation that the position was similar to those that have been abolished. The Committee would welcome views on this matter.

**The Committee recommends a new category of States members should be created and that these members should be elected in a small number of new 'super constituencies' across the Island**

## **9. Connétables**

9.1 The Special Committee is aware of the high regard in which the Connétables are held in the Island. Traditionally, Connétables have represented the particular interests of their parishioners on any topic coming before the States. The suggestion by the Clothier Panel that they should cease to be members of the States by virtue of their office was one of the most controversial of its recommendations and the attempt by the Policy and Resources Committee to push forward this reform as part of its report and proposition (P.179/2001) was considered at the Parish meetings throughout the Island referred to above with a strong movement of support for retaining the right of Connétables to sit in the Assembly.

9.2 The original Special Committee recommended that the Connétables should remain in the States to represent the views of their Parish and to reinforce the current Parish system. It felt that *'it was premature at this stage to remove them from the States on the unproven assumption that it was impossible to combine the two roles of States member and head of the Parish'*.

9.3 The Committee recognises that Connétables have a significant workload in their Parishes that may impact on their ability to participate fully in the new system in their *ex-officio* capacity as members of the States. Recent experience in relation to the membership of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels has shown that some Connétables have difficulty combining parish duties with active participation in committee work for the States. Table 6.9 above shows how few major Presidencies have been held by Connétables since 1966. It can nevertheless be argued that the Connétables play an important role in the States and provide a direct link between the Assembly and the Parishes that should not be lost. If they are to remain in the States in an *ex-officio* capacity the Committee considers that they must be prepared to justify their membership of the Assembly by participating fully in the Executive or in the scrutiny function in the new system of government. If they do not, the new system will not operate correctly and with due accountability especially if there is a reduced overall membership in the States.

9.4 If a decision was taken to abolish the direct link between Deputies and Parishes in some parts of the Island the Connétables could continue to provide that direct link. The Committee believes that this would, in fact, enhance the position of the Connétables as it would clarify the distinction between the Connétable as the person with direct responsibility for the Parish and other members of the States. The Committee believes that some confusion exists in the minds of electors about this distinction at the present time insofar as Parish Deputies are often approached about municipal matters although the Committee accepts that this has traditionally been one part of a Deputy's rôle. In addition the moves to enhance the role of the parishes arising from the decision of the States on 25th May 2004 to adopt the recommendations of the Working Party on the Relationship between the Executive and the Parishes strengthens the argument to keep the Connétables in the States so that they can have input into decisions that affect the parishes and be accountable to the States.

9.5 The Committee considers that it would be vital for all the Connétables be elected on the same general

election day as the other members of the States if they remain as *ex officio* members. The current election dates of the 12 Connétables are given in Appendix 6 for information. As stated earlier the ability of electors to influence the entire composition of the States on one day every 4 years is believed to be essential and holding a separate election for Connétables, even if all 12 were elected on the same day, would detract from this objective. The Committee is aware that some Connétables have queried the practicality of holding the elections all on one day but the Committee cannot believe that the practical problems are insurmountable. If necessary it would be possible for the Jurats, who act as Returning Officers for elections, to enlist help from public sector workers in addition to the Parish staff, honorary police officers and others who traditionally assist on election days. The Committee is aware that in U.K. elections it is common practice for local government employees to be seconded to assist on Election Day. Furthermore it is not unusual for voters in other jurisdictions to vote on the same day in different elections through aids such as colour-coded ballot papers. Nevertheless this matter would have to be thoroughly thought through as it could involve voters going to ‘super constituency’ polls who would then need to be issued with papers for the Connétable election in their own Parish. The Committee nevertheless believes that these issues are manageable.

- 9.6 The Committee has been almost equally split on the issue of whether Connétables should remain in the States in their present *ex officio* capacity. Several members of the Committee believe that the Connétables should no longer be members of the States by virtue of their office so that there would only be one class of member elected in the new electoral districts. Under this proposal Connétables would, of course, be free to stand alongside other candidates if they wished to sit in the States as a member in one of the new electoral districts.
- 9.7 The arguments used to justify the retention of the Connétables do, of course, contradict some of those used to justify other changes being suggested by the Committee. Connétables in small parishes will inevitably be elected by a small number of electors, sometimes without a contest, and there is, of course, no theoretical reason why the Connétable of a small Parish could not be appointed as Chief Minister or as a Minister and it is possible that one or more Connétables will be appointed as Assistant Ministers.
- 9.8 As mentioned in paragraph 9.3 above, the Committee is concerned that because of the heavy workload of Connétables in their parishes they will not be able to participate fully in the new system of government. This could severely undermine the effectiveness of the future scrutiny system and has influenced some members of the Committee to believe that the Connétables should not sit as *ex officio* members.
- 9.9 In addition it is possible that there are members of the community who would like to stand for the office of Connétable but who have no desire to sit in the States. The removal of the Connétables would give candidates for Connétable the option to decide for themselves whether to seek election as a States member. If the Connétables were removed there would be no necessity to hold the Connétables elections on the same general election day as other members and this would simplify the electoral process even though it would nevertheless be desirable to hold all 12 Connétables elections on one day to increase awareness and interest.
- 9.10 The retention of the Connétables in the new ‘super constituency’ model would cause a significant imbalance in representation across the 3 districts. This imbalance would, of course, be mitigated in a 6 or 7 constituency model. If the Connétables are added to the totals given in paragraph 8.5 for the 3 constituency model the imbalance would be as follows—

	<b>2001 Population</b>	<b>2004 Electors</b>	<b>No. of residents per member</b>	<b>No. of electors per member</b>
<b>East</b>	29,017	16,450	1,814	1,028
(16 members)				
<b>St. Helier</b>	28,310	13,750	2,178	1,058

(13 members)				
<b>West and Centre</b>	29,859	18,561	1,572	977
(19 members)				
<b>Island Totals</b>	87,186	48,761		
<b>Average</b>			<b>1,816</b>	<b>1,016</b>

9.11 It can be seen that there are strong arguments both for and against the retention of the Connétables in the proposed new system and the Committee accepts that this issue will not be simple to resolve.

## 10. Referendum

10.1 The Committee believes that once firm proposals for reform of the Assembly have been lodged for debate it would be appropriate for members to consider them to test the direction States members are prepared to take. Although it is important for the States to take a lead on the issues involved, and it would not be worthwhile putting forward proposals to the electorate if the proposals had no support from members, it is nevertheless accepted that members have considerable self interest in these issues and it will be necessary for members to set aside personal considerations to allow these issues to go forward to the public.

10.2 The Committee believes that, once the States have deliberated on the broad principles of reforming the Assembly, the public should be given the opportunity to express their opinion in the shape of a referendum on whatever recommendations may be agreed by the States. Although the States Assembly itself should take the final decision on reforms it will undoubtedly wish to take due account of the views of the electorate as shown in results of the referendum. It will, of course, be vital to ensure that the wording of the referendum is clear and unambiguous.

**The Committee recommends that a referendum should be held before the States take a final decision on reforms to the Assembly.**

## 11. Implementing the changes

11.1 Although the Committee was very keen to progress the reforms in time for a first 'general election' in autumn 2005 it accepts that it is unrealistic to achieve that aim as, in practical terms, it is virtually impossible. The Committee believes there would have been considerable merit in achieving a complete renewal of the Assembly before the onset of ministerial government but such a decision would have required the following extremely ambitious timetable to be met –

States debate on proposition	July 2004
States agree detail of referendum	September 2004
Referendum campaign	September/October 2004
Referendum	October 2004
Law changes drafted	October to December 2004
States debate legislation	January 2005
Privy Council sanction	April/May 2005
General election	November 2005

11.2 The Committee accepts that this timetable would not have allowed time for slippage at any stage. Many

matters could have held up the timetable, not least of which is the extremely far-reaching nature of the proposals which means that any attempt to rush them through would have been quite properly resisted by many members. The Committee has also been conscious of the position of members whose current term of office runs beyond 2005 and it would have possibly been unreasonable to suggest that they should co-operate on a voluntary basis to allow these terms of office to be curtailed to achieve the 2005 deadline.

11.3 The Committee believes it would be appropriate to take steps to introduce legislation to allow appropriate transitional arrangements to be made from 2005 onwards. This legislation could, for example, provide that Senators and Deputies elected in autumn 2005 would only serve until a first general election in spring 2008 and would also set out a schedule to arrange the terms of office of all Connétables so that their terms of office terminated on the day of the 2008 election.

## **12 Other issues**

12.1 This report covers items (a) to (d) of the Committee's terms of reference as set out in paragraph 1.2 above. The Privileges and Procedures Committee has now set up a joint Working Party with the Legislation Committee, which currently has general responsibility for election matters, to address items (e) to (h) of its terms of reference. The Committee believes that changes to the electoral system such as improvements to the postal voting system and the introduction of some form of preferential voting, should be investigated as part of an overall move to enhance the effectiveness of elections in the Island. In addition the Committee is sympathetic to suggestions that candidates should be able to indicate group affiliations, alliances or political party membership on ballot papers.

## **13. Conclusion**

13.1 The Committee has realised through its work that there is little consensus on issues relating to the composition and election of the Assembly and many of the suggestions put forward in this report will undoubtedly be contentious.

13.2 The Committee urges members, before jumping to conclusions as to whether or not some, or all, of the proposals are, for example, deleterious to the Parishes or whether they overstate the importance of the island-wide mandate, to consider the background to the impetus for reform. Many electors believe that the States has lost touch with the electorate and many believe that the Assembly is ineffective in crucial areas such as maintaining accountability, attracting high-calibre candidates and focussing on key policy areas. The role of the States has changed enormously in the post-war period and the Assembly faces much greater challenges. No-one pretends there are easy or quick solutions. The Committee is nevertheless convinced that its proposals would help to address the serious issues and questions that the States faces with regard to its own efficacy.

## POSSIBLE SPRING ELECTION DATES 2008 – 2060

Year	Easter Sunday <a href="#">[2]</a>	Election Date (3rd Wednesday of May)	Spring Bank Holiday (Last Monday of May)
2008	23rd March	21st May	26th May
2012	8th April	16th May	28th May
2016	27th March	18th May	30th May
2020	12th April	20th May	25th May
2024	31st March	15th May	27th May
2028	16th April	17th May	29th May
2032	28th March	19th May	31st May
2036	13th April	21st May	26th May
2040	1st April	16th May	28th May
2044	17th April	18th May	30th May
2048	5th April	20th May	25th May
2052	21st April	15th May	27th May
2056	2nd April	17th May	29th May
2060	18th April	19th May	31st May

## SENATORIAL ELECTION RESULTS 1966 – 2002

<b>2002</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Ozouf P.	14,442	362	3,230	14,080	11,212
Kinnard W.	12,230	344	2,714	11,886	9,516
Routier P.	11,687	294	2,610	11,393	9,077
Vibert M.	10,624	266	2,046	10,358	8,578
Norman L.	10,192	300	1,839	9,892	8,353
Walker F.	9,377	271	1,699	9,106	7,678
de Faye G.	7,576	213	1,659	7,363	5,917
McDonald T.	7,488	162	1,833	7,326	5,655
<b>1999</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Syvret S.	15,212	348	3,591	14,864	11,621
Lakeman C.	12,806	315	2,556	12,491	10,250
Le Sueur T.	10,471	261	2,182	10,210	8,289
Le Claire P.	8,287	176	2,309	8,111	5,978
Le Maistre J.	7,796	233	1,415	7,563	6,381
Bailhache A.	7,295	172	1,648	7,123	5,647
Dorey J.	6,529	120	1,744	6,409	4,785
Le Hérisssier R.	5,206	128	972	5,078	4,234
<b>1996</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Horsfall P.	14,681	395	2,622	14,286	12,059
Stein C.	11,213	269	2,381	10,944	8,832
Norman L.	11,017	275	2,018	10,742	8,999
Kinnard W.	10,520	259	2,325	10,261	8,195
Walker F.	10,305	293	1,933	10,012	8,372
Querée N.	9,761	246	2,009	9,515	7,752
Le Main T.	9,578	217	2,085	9,361	7,493
Vibert M.	8,709	220	1,701	8,489	7,008

<b>1993</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Tomes V.	16,392	395	3,728	15,997	12,664
Syvret S.	14,388	331	3,441	14,057	10,947
Rothwell J.	9,586	288	1,938	9,298	7,648
Bailhache A.	9,020	250	1,989	8,770	7,031
Le Maistre J.	8,934	277	1,815	8,657	7,119
Shenton R.	8,755	179	2,150	8,576	6,605
Carter D.	8,453	218	1,797	8,235	6,656
Baudains S.	7,142	138	1,853	7,004	5,289
<b>1990</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Stein C.	12,643	290	2,801	12,353	9,842
Horsfall P.	11,741	304	2,259	11,437	9,482
Jeune R.	10,457	261	2,057	10,196	8,400
Le Main T.	10,124	218	2,538	9,906	7,586
Querée N.	9,784	262	2,125	9,522	7,659
Chinn A.	9,058	216	1,771	8,842	7,287
Wavell M.	8,675	193	2,018	8,482	6,657
Crespel D.	5,694	155	1,160	5,539	4,534
<b>1987</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Shenton R.	12,838	296	3,317	12,542	9,521
Baal A.	9,292	248	2,262	9,044	7,030
Binnington B.	9,025	256	1,941	8,769	7,084
Le Maistre J.	8,271	260	1,815	8,011	6,456
Carter D.	8,020	172	2,124	7,848	5,896
Rothwell J.	7,510	194	1,660	7,316	5,850
Vandervliet H.	6,742	181	1,614	6,561	5,128
(only 7)					
<b>1984</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Le Main T.	14,022	351	3,393	13,671	10,629
Jeune R.	12,585	332	2,641	12,253	9,944
Horsfall P.	11,808	315	2,408	11,493	9,400
Sandeman J.	11,485	319	2,708	11,166	8,777
Manton P.	10,717	291	2,425	10,426	8,292
Ellis J.	10,296	258	2,190	10,038	8,106
Filleul D.	8,484	228	1,835	8,256	6,649
Buesnel	3,859	90	1,088	3,769	2,771

<b>1981</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Shenton R.	17,256	362	4,917	16,894	12,339
Vibert R.	14,206	334	3,584	13,872	10,622
Baal A.	12,395	273	3,499	12,122	8,896
Le Marquand J.	12,039	281	3,120	11,758	8,919
Binnington B.	11,343	265	2,818	11,078	8,525
Rothwell J.	11,165	237	3,323	10,928	7,842
Le Main T.	10,709	211	3,186	10,498	7,523
Buesnel M.	3,989	99	1,210	3,890	2,779
<b>1978</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
De Carteret J.	16,312	416	4,412	15,896	11,900
Sandeman J.	14,235	258	4,382	13,977	9,853
Le Marquand C.	12,621	326	3,320	12,295	9,301
Morvan W.	11,514	292	3,083	11,222	8,431
Averty J.	10,443	264	2,751	10,179	7,692
Jeune R.	10,032	242	2,584	9,790	7,448
Dupré C.	8,741	209	2,257	8,532	6,484
Thomas M.	8,242	160	2,280	8,082	5,962

<b>1975</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Shenton R.	17,221	320	5,022	16,901	12,199
Vibert R.	14,574	346	3,781	14,228	10,793
Binnington B.	12,818	307	3,199	12,511	9,619
Le Marquand J.	12,035	278	3,247	11,757	8,788
Huelin G.	11,897	258	3,064	11,639	8,833
Riley J.	9,937	218	2,599	9,719	7,338
Farley C.	9,904	210	2,732	9,694	7,172
Sandeman J.	9,040	154	3,063	8,886	5,977
<b>1972</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Averty J.	12,645	279	3,653	12,366	8,992
Le Marquand J.J.	11,824	286	3,298	11,538	8,526
Le Marquand C.	10,562	252	2,882	10,310	7,680
Jeune R.	8,576	199	2,333	8,377	6,243
Dupré C.	7,868	174	2,105	7,694	5,763
Scriven A.	6,832	148	1,914	6,684	4,918
Romeril P.	6,375	142	1,613	6,233	4,762
White L.	4,209	86	1,086	4,123	3,123

<b>1969</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Shenton R.	13,220	230	4,121	12,990	9,099
Vibert R.	11,587	179	3,396	11,408	8,191
Huelin G.	11,574	168	3,333	11,406	8,241
Le Marquand J.	10,635	178	3,137	10,457	7,498
Krichefski W.	10,553	156	3,234	10,397	7,319
Farley C.	9,342	146	2,804	9,196	6,538
Venables S.	6,973	88	2,513	6,885	4,460
Liron R.	3,432	22	1,482	3,410	1,950
<b>1966</b>	<b>TOTAL VOTES</b>	<b>St. Mary votes</b>	<b>St. Helier votes</b>	<b>11 without St. Mary</b>	<b>11 without St. Helier</b>
Le Marquand J.J.	9,321	235	2,594	9,086	6,727
Le Marquand C.	7,824	139	2,239	7,685	5,585
Vibert R. (3 yrs)	6,698	114	1,917	6,584	4,781
Huelin G. (3 yrs)	6,598	112	1,753	6,486	4,845
Gaudin J.	4,843	97	1,214	4,746	3,629

## MOST SENIOR PRESIDENCIES AFTER EACH ELECTION

2002

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Policy and Resources	Senator F. Walker	6th in election
Privileges and Procedures	Senator C. Lakeman	2nd in 1999 election
Finance and Economics	Senator T. Le Sueur	3rd in 1999 election
Environment and Public Services	Deputy M. Dubras	
Economic Development	Deputy G. Voisin	
Health and Social Services	Senator S. Syvret	1st in 1999 election
Education, Sport and Culture	Senator M. Vibert	4th in election
Home Affairs	Senator W. Kinnard	2nd in election
Employment and Social Security	Senator P. Routier	3rd in election
Housing	Deputy T. Le Main	
Harbours and Airport	Senator L. Norman	5th in election
Postal Administration	Deputy P. Ryan	

1999

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Policy and Resources	Senator P. Horsfall	1st in 1996 election
Finance and Economics	Senator F. Walker	5th in 1996 election
Human Resources	Deputy D. Crespel	
Planning and Environment	Senator N. Querée	6th in 1996 election
Industries	Deputy M. Dubras	
Health and Social Services	Senator S. Syvret	1st in election
Education	Senator L. Norman	3rd in 1996 election
Public Services	Deputy S. Crowcroft	
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator J. Le Maistre	5th in election
Tourism	Deputy I. Nicholls	
Home Affairs	Deputy A. Layzell	
Employment and Social Security	Senator T. Le Sueur	3rd in election

**1996**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Policy and Resources	Senator P. Horsfall	1st in election
Finance and Economics	Senator F. Walker	5th in election
Establishment	Deputy D. Crespel	
Planning and Environment	Senator N. Querée	6th in election
Health and Social Services	Connétable J. Roche	
Education	Senator L. Norman	3rd in election
Public Services	Senator V. Tomes	1st in 1993 election
Agriculture and Fisheries	Deputy J. Dorey	
Tourism	Senator J. Rothwell	3rd in 1993 election
Defence	Deputy M. Wavell	
Employment and Social Security	Deputy T. Le Sueur	
Housing	Senator C. Stein	2nd in election

**1993**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Policy and Resources	Senator R. Jeune	3rd in 1990 election
Finance and Economics	Senator P. Horsfall	2nd in 1990 election
Defence	Deputy M. Wavell	
Harbours and Airport	Deputy J. Le Fondré	
Public Services	Deputy D. Carter	
Education	Connétable I. Le Feuvre	
Public Health	Connétable J. Roche	
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator J. Rothwell	3rd in election
Tourism	Senator R. Shenton	6th in election
Social Security	Deputy T. Le Sueur	
Island Development	Deputy C. Hinault	
Housing	Deputy L. Norman	

**1990**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Policy and Resources	Senator R. Jeune	3rd in election
Finance and Economics	Senator P. Horsfall	2nd in election
Defence	Deputy M. Wavell	
Harbours and Airport	Deputy J. Le Fondré	
Public Services	Deputy D. Carter	
Education	Connétable I. Le Feuvre	
Public Health	Connétable J. Roche	
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator J. Rothwell	6th in 1987 election
Tourism	Senator R. Shenton	1st in 1987 election
Social Security	Deputy T. Le Sueur	
Housing	Deputy L. Norman	
Telecommunications	Deputy R. Rumboll	

**1987**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator R. Jeune	2nd in 1984 election
Defence	Senator R. Shenton	1st in election
Harbours and Airport	Senator B. Binnington	3rd in election
Public Works	Deputy J. Le Gallais	
Education	Deputy R. Rumboll	
Public Health	Deputy J. Roche	
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator P. Horsfall	3rd in 1984 election
Tourism	Senator J. Rothwell	6th in election
Social Security	Deputy L. Norman	
Island Development	Connétable J. Le Sueur	
Housing	Deputy H. Vandervliet	
Resources Recovery	Deputy D. de la Haye	

**1984**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator R. Jeune	2nd in election
Defence	Senator J. Ellis	6th in election
Harbours and Airport	Senator B. Binnington	5th in 1981 election
Public Works	Deputy D. Filleul	
Education	Deputy P. Mourant	
Public Health	Senator J. Le Marquand	4th in 1981 election
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator P. Horsfall	3rd in election
Tourism	Senator J. Rothwell	6th in 1981 election
Social Security	Deputy F. Morel	
Island Development	Connétable J. Le Sueur	
Housing	Deputy H. Vandervliet	
Resources Recovery	Deputy J. Le Gallais	

**1981**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator R. Vibert	2nd in election
Defence	Senator J. Ellis	By election – June 1981
Harbours and Airport	Senator B. Binnington	5th in election
Public Works	Deputy D. Filleul	
Education	Senator R. Jeune	6th in 1978 election
Public Health	Senator J. Le Marquand	4th in election
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator R. Shenton	1st in election
Tourism	Senator J. Rothwell	6th in election
Social Security	Deputy F. Morel	
Island Development	Deputy N. Le Brocq	
Housing	Senator J. Sandeman	2nd in 1978 election
Resources Recovery	Deputy J. Le Gallais	

**1978**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator C. Le Marquand	3rd in election
Defence	Senator J. Riley	6th in 1975 election
Harbours and Airport	Senator W. Morvan	4th in election
Public Health	Senator G. Huelin	5th in 1975 election
Agriculture and Fisheries	Senator B. Binnington	3rd in 1975 election
Education	Senator R. Jeune	6th in election
Public Works	Senator J. Averty	5th in election
Social Security	Deputy F. Morel	
Tourism	Deputy C. Dupré	
Housing	Senator J. Le Marquand	4th in 1975 election
Island Development	Deputy P. Horsfall	
Resources Recovery	Senator R. Shenton	1st in 1975 election

**1975**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator C. Le Marquand	3rd in 1972 election
Defence	Senator J. Riley	6th in election
Harbours and Airport	Senator W. Morvan	By election – Sep 1975
Public Health	Senator G. Huelin	5th in election
Agriculture	Senator B. Binnington	3rd in election
Education	Senator R. Jeune	4th in 1972 election
Public Works	Senator J. Le Marquand	4th in election
Social Security	Deputy M. Thomas	
Tourism	Senator C. Dupré	5th in 1972 election
Housing	Senator J. Averty	1st in 1972 election
Island Development	Senator R. Shenton	1st in election
Resources Recovery	Deputy C. Farley	

**1972**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator C. Le Marquand	3rd in election
Defence	Deputy J. Riley	
Harbours and Airport	Deputy W. Morvan	
Public Health	Senator G. Huelin	3rd in 1969 election
Agriculture	Deputy B. Binnington	
Education	Senator R. Jeune	4th in election
Public Works	Senator J. Le Marquand	4th in 1969 election
Social Security	Deputy M. Thomas	
Tourism	Senator C. Dupré	5th in election
Housing	Senator J. Averty	1st in election
Island Development	Deputy P. de Veulle	
Resources Recovery	Senator C. Farley	6th in 1969 election

**1969**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance and Economics	Senator C. Le Marquand	2nd in 1966 election
Defence	Senator W. Krichefski	5th in election
Harbours and Airport	Deputy J. Ellis	
Public Health	Senator G. Huelin	3rd in election
Agriculture	Deputy J. Riley	
Education	Deputy R. Jeune	
Public Works	Senator L. White	By election
Social Security	Deputy M. Thomas	
Tourism	Senator C. Dupré	1st in 1963 election
Housing	Deputy A. Querée	
Island Development	Deputy P. de Veulle	
Sewerage Board	Senator C. Farley	6th in election

**1966**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>President</b>	<b>Election result for Senators</b>
Finance	Senator C. Le Marquand	2nd in election
Defence	Senator R. Vibert	3rd in election
Harbours and Airport	Senator W. Krichefski	3rd in 1960 election
Public Health	Senator G. Huelin	4th in election
Agriculture	Deputy V. Tomes	
Education	Senator J. Le Marquand	1st in 1960 election
Public Works	Deputy R. Jeune	
Social Security	Deputy A. Clarke	
Tourism	Senator C. Dupré	1st in 1963 election
Housing	Deputy J. Gaudin	
Island Development	Deputy M. Letto	
Sewerage Board	Senator C. Farley	4th in 1960 election

## SENATORS ELECTED AND PRESIDENCIES HELD IMMEDIATELY AFTER EACH ELECTION

2002

Senators elected	Votes received	Presidencies after election
Ozouf P.	14,442	None
Kinnard W.	12,230	Home Affairs
Routier P.	11,687	Employment and Social Security and Telecoms
Vibert M.	10,624	Education Sport and Culture
Norman L.	10,192	Harbours and Airport
Walker F.	9,377	Policy and Resources

1999

Senators elected	Votes received	Presidencies after election
Syvret S.	15,212	Health and Social Services
Lakeman C.	12,806	None
Le Sueur T.	10,471	Employment and Social Security
Le Claire P.	8,287	None
Le Maistre J.	7,796	Agriculture and Fisheries
Bailhache A.	7,295	None

1996

Senators elected	Votes received	Presidencies after election
Horsfall P.	14,681	Policy and Resources
Stein C.	11,213	Housing
Norman L.	11,017	Education
Kinnard W.	10,520	None
Walker F.	10,305	Finance and Economics and Postal
Querée N.	9,761	Planning and Environment and Telecoms

1993

Senators elected	Votes received	Presidencies after election
Tomes V.	16,392	None
Syvret S.	14,388	None
Rothwell J.	9,586	Agriculture and Fisheries
Bailhache A.	9,020	Overseas Aid
Le Maistre J.	8,934	Sport Leisure and Recreation
Shenton R.	8,755	Tourism

**1990**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Stein C.	12,643	Postal
Horsfall P.	11,741	Finance and Economics
Jeune R.	10,457	Policy and Resources
Le Main T.	10,124	Fort Regent
Querée N.	9,784	None
Chinn A.	9,058	None

**1987**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Shenton R.	12,838	Defence
Baal A.	9,292	Elizabeth House
Binnington B.	9,025	Harbours and Airport
Le Maistre J.	8,271	Overseas Aid
Carter D.	8,020	Fort Regent
Rothwell J.	7,510	Tourism

**1984**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Le Main T.	14,022	Gambling Control
Jeune R.	12,585	Finance and Economics
Horsfall P.	11,808	Agriculture and Fisheries
Sandeman J.	11,485	None
Manton P.	10,717	None
Ellis J.	10,296	Defence

**1981**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Shenton R.	17,256	Agriculture and Fisheries
Vibert R.	14,206	Finance and Economics Committee
Baal A.	12,395	Elizabeth House Committee
Le Marquand J.	12,039	Public Health Committee
Binnington B.	11,343	Harbours and Airport
Rothwell J.	11,165	Tourism

**1978**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
De Carteret	16,312	None
Sandeman J.	14,235	Industrial Relations
Le Marquand C.	12,621	Finance and Economics Committee
Morvan W.	11,514	Harbours and Airport
Averty J.	10,443	Public Works and Broadcasting
Jeune R.	10,032	Education

**1975**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Shenton R.	17,221	IDC and Broadcasting
Vibert R.	14,574	Legislation, Establishment and Constitution
Binnington B.	12,818	Agriculture
Le Marquand J.	12,035	Public Works
Huelin Mrs. G.	11,897	Public Health and Elizabeth House
Riley J.	9,937	Defence and Prison Board

**1972**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Averty J.	12,645	Housing
Le Marquand J.J.	11,824	None
Le Marquand C.	10,562	Finance and Economics
Jeune R.	8,576	Education
Dupré C.	7,868	Tourism
Scriven A.	6,832	None

**1969**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Shenton R.	13,220	None
Vibert R.	11,587	Legislation and Constitution
Huelin Mrs. G.	11,574	Public Health and Elizabeth House
Le Marquand J.	10,635	Industrial Relations
Krichefski W.	10,553	Defence and Postal
Farley C.	9,342	Sewerage Board and Overseas Aid

**1966 (4 Senators elected in transition from 9 to 6 year term)**

<b>Senators elected</b>	<b>Votes received</b>	<b>Presidencies after election</b>
Marquand J.J.	9,321	None
Marquand C.	7,824	Finance and Establishment
Robert R. (3 yrs)	6,698	Defence and Legislation
William Mrs. G. (3 yrs)	6,598	Public Health and Elizabeth House

## 2002 Senatorial results split into new constituency model

## 2002 Results

Ozouf	14,442
Kinnard	12,230
Routier	11,687
Vibert M.	10,624
Norman	10,192
Walker	9,377
de Faye	7,576
McDonald	7,488

## 3 super constituencies

East (St. C., G., St. Mn., St. S.)		St. Helier		West and Centre (St. B., St. J., St. L., St. My., St. O., St. P., T.)	
5,271	Ozouf	3,230	Ozouf	5,941	Ozouf
4,348	Kinnard	2,714	Kinnard	5,168	Kinnard
4,300	Routier	2,610	Routier	4,941	Vibert M.
3,921	Norman	2,046	Vibert M.	4,777	Routier
3,637	Vibert M.	1,839	Norman	4,432	Norman
3,471	Walker	1,833	McDonald	4,207	Walker
2,711	de Faye	1,699	Walker	3,206	de Faye
2,689	McDonald	1,659	de Faye	2,966	McDonald

## 6 super constituencies (Districts 1 and 2 as per St. Helier above)

District 3 (St. C., G.)		District 4 (St. S., St. Mn.)		District 5 (St. B., St. P.)		District 6 (St. L., St. J., St. My., T., St. O.)	
2497	Ozouf	2774	Ozouf	2797	Ozouf	3144	Ozouf
2093	Routier	2294	Kinnard	2449	Vibert M.	2744	Kinnard
2054	Kinnard	2207	Routier	2424	Kinnard	2637	Routier
2050	Norman	1895	Vibert M.	2140	Routier	2492	Vibert M.
1742	Vibert M.	1871	Norman	1970	Norman	2462	Norman
1692	Walker	1779	Walker	1849	Walker	2358	Walker
1299	de Faye	1435	McDonald	1507	de Faye	1699	de Faye
1254	McDonald	1412	de Faye	1443	McDonald	1523	McDonald

7 super constituencies (Districts 1 and 2 as per St. Helier above)

3 G.)	District 4 (St. S.)		District 5 (St. B.)		District 6 (St. L., St. O., St. P.)		District 7 (St. My., St. J., T., St. Mn.)	
uf	1,989	Ozouf	2,146	Ozouf	2,279	Ozouf	2,301	Ozouf
tier	1,640	Kinnard	1,855	Vibert M.	2,154	Kinnard	1,971	Kinnard
ard	1,577	Routier	1,697	Kinnard	1,979	Routier	1,903	Routier
man	1,345	Vibert M.	1,525	Routier	1,954	Vibert M.	1,826	Norman
ert M.	1,281	Norman	1,460	Norman	1,736	Norman	1,815	Walker
ker	1,142	Walker	1,325	Walker	1,704	Walker	1,682	Vibert M.
aye	1,062	McDonald	1,068	de Faye	1,315	de Faye	1,211	de Faye
Donald	1,024	de Faye	1,030	McDonald	1,245	McDonald	1,064	McDonald

## Connétables – date sworn

Parish	Connétable	Date Sworn
St. Peter	Thomas John du Feu	29.06.01
St. Saviour	Philip Francis Ozouf	10.08.01
St. Clement	Derek Frederick Gray	14.12.01
St. Helier	Alan Simon Crowcroft	14.12.01
Trinity	John Le Sueur Gallichan	01.11.02
St. Brelade	Maxwell Robert de la Haye	08.11.02
St. Lawrence	Geoffrey William Fisher	31.01.03
St. Martin	John Baudains Germain	13.06.03
St. Mary	Kenneth Alan Le Brun	15.08.03
St. Ouen	Kenneth Priaulx Vibert	25.08.03
Grouville	Daniel Joseph Murphy	19.09.03 <sup>[3]</sup>
St. John	Richard Edward Norwood Dupré	05.12.03

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Any person who is eligible is, of course, free to stand for election to the States and it is accepted that if Connétables lost their automatic right to sit in the States by virtue of their office they would be free to stand for election separately as suggested in the Clothier Report.

<sup>[2]</sup> Never earlier than 22nd March and never later than 25th April.

<sup>[3]</sup> Until 20th July 2004 only.