

STATES OF JERSEY



COMPOSITION OF THE STATES: REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF DEPUTIES (P.2/2011) – SECOND AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 11th January 2011
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade**

STATES GREFFE

COMPOSITION OF THE STATES: REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF DEPUTIES
(P.2/2011) – SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (b) –

After the words “as set out in the Appendix 1” insert the words –

“, except that for Saint Helier there shall be returned 10 Deputies, and for Trinity, Saint John, Saint Mary, Saint Ouen and Saint Lawrence there shall be returned 1 Deputy”.

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

REPORT

In his proposition, Deputy Noel proposes reducing the number of Deputies from 29 to 21 and creating 5 ‘super constituencies’ in which the 21 Deputies should be distributed proportionately according to the population. I will not comment here on the desirability or otherwise of either proposal, however the point of this amendment is to address what I believe has been an oversight on the part of the Deputy, and if this proposal is to be adopted, I believe that this amendment will make it fairer.

Whilst trying to achieve proportionality in the representation of each super-constituency, Deputy Noel has ignored the fact that in addition to the allocated Deputies which each area is to have, they will also have a number of other political representatives in the form of the Parish Connétables. The exact number of political representatives will therefore vary greatly depending on how many parishes are contained within each Super-Constituency.

What Deputy Noel is proposing –

Constituency	% of population	No. of Deputies	No. of Connétables	Total no. of Representatives	<i>Ideal no. of Representatives*</i>
1 St. Helier	32.47	7	1	8	10.72
2 St. Saviour St. Martin	18.48	4	2	6	6.10
3 Grouville St. Clement	14.79	3	2	5	4.88
4 Trinity St. John, St. Mary St. Ouen St. Lawrence	17.70	4	5	9	5.8
5 St. Brelade St. Peter	16.55	3	2	5	5.46

* Ideal no of representatives is calculated by multiplying the percentage of population by the total no. of representatives (i.e. 21 Deputies and 12 Connétables = 33 representatives), so to get the ideal for St. Helier: $0.3247 \times 33 = 10.7151$.

As you will see from the above table, Deputy Noel is on the money when it comes to allocating Deputies to constituencies 2, 3 and 5, however, when the effect of the Connétables is taken into account – i.e. only one for Constituency No. 1, but 5 for No. 4, then his model starts to break down.

What I am proposing below corrects this and makes representation mathematically as near as possible to proportionate.

Constituencies	Number of Deputies to be returned	Total number of representatives, including Connétables	Mathematically ideal number of Representatives
St. Helier	10	11	10.72
St. Saviour St. Martin	4 (unchanged)	6	6.10
Grouville St. Clement	3 (unchanged)	5	4.88
Trinity St. John St. Mary St. Ouen St. Lawrence	1	6	5.8
St. Brelade St. Peter	3 (unchanged)	5	5.46

Essentially, what this amendment does is to show the disproportionate and perverse effect that Deputy Noel's proposition, if unamended, would have on political representation in rural and urban areas.

I will spare you another table, but it should be noted that, if left unamended, **St. Helier residents** would be left with **one representative per 3,539 inhabitants**, whereas those in the **rural super-constituency** would have **one representative per 1,715**, effectively double. This is clearly not democratic.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no additional financial or manpower implications arising from this amendment.