

**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
13th February 2001 at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Philip Bailhache.**

**His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor,
Air Chief Marshal Sir John Cheshire, K.B.E., C.B.,
was present**

All members were present with the exception of -

Francis Herbert Amy, Connétable of Grouville - out of the Island
Stanley John Le Cornu, Connétable of St. Clement - ill
Derek Ryder Maltwood, Deputy of St. Mary - out of the Island
Paul Francis Routier, Deputy of St. Helier - out of the Island
Imogen Stephanie Nicholls, Deputy of Grouville - ill
Jacqueline Jeannette Huet, Deputy of St. Helier - out of the Island
Maurice François Dubras, Deputy of St. Lawrence - out of the Island
Judith Ann Martin, Deputy of St. Helier - out of the Island

Prayers

Liberation Day - extraordinary meeting of the States

The Bailiff informed the Assembly that there would be an extraordinary meeting of the States on 9th May 2001 on the occasion of the 56th anniversary of the Liberation.

Subordinate legislation tabled

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely -

Post Office (Foreign Post Provisions) (Amendment No. 26) (Jersey) Order 2001 - R & O 29/2001.

Post Office (General Provisions) (Amendment No. 47) (Jersey) Order 2001- R & O 30/2001.

Human Resources Committee - resignation of member

THE STATES noted the resignation of Maurice François Dubras, Deputy of St. Lawrence as a member of the Human Resources Committee.

Matters presented

The following matters were presented to the States -

Morier House, Halkett Place: assignment of rights and obligations of funding arrangement (P.4/2001): comments - P.4/2001 - Com.

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Site of the former Fine Gems and Craft Centre, La Route du Ouest, St. Ouen (P.12/2001): comments - P.12/2001 - Com.

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Jersey Law Commission - The Best Evidence Rule in Civil Proceedings.

Presented by the Legislation Committee.

The following matter was presented on 6th February 2001 -

Births, Marriages and Deaths in 2000: statement - R.C.9/2001.

Presented by the Etat Civil Committee.

THE STATES ordered that the said reports be printed and distributed.

Matters noted - land transactions

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 5th February 2001 recording the following decisions of the Treasurer of the States under delegated powers, in pursuance of Standing Orders relating to certain transactions in land -

- (i) as recommended by the Harbours and Airport Committee the termination of the lease to KLMuk of four units of first floor accommodation in the John Le Fondré Departures Hall, Jersey Airport, St. Peter (General Manager's Office, Outer Office, Administration Office and Crew Room) and of the ticket desk on the ground floor, with effect from the date on which the appropriate documentation would be completed (the Completion Date), and on the basis that the company would pay a termination fee of £10,000 in respect of the ticket desk on the ground floor; and
- (ii) as recommended by the Harbours and Airport Committee the lease to British Regional Airlines of the said four units of first floor accommodation in the John Le Fondré Departures Hall, Jersey Airport, St. Peter, with effect from the abovementioned Completion Date until 31st March 2006, at a total annual rent of £15,501.72, on the same terms and conditions as KLMuk, with rent reviews to take place on 1st April of each year of the lease period based on the Jersey Retail Price Index.

Matters noted - acceptance of tenders

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 5th February 2001, showing that, in pursuance of Rule 5 of the Public Finances (General) (Jersey) Rules 1967, as amended, the Committee had noted that -

- (a) the Housing Committee had, by Act dated 22nd January 2001, accepted the lowest fixed price tender received for Phases 5 and 6 of the refurbishment programme for Le Geyt Estate, St. Helier/St. Saviour, namely that submitted by A.C. Mauger and Son (Sunwin) Limited, in the sum of £2,859,051.00, in a contract period of 78 weeks;
- (b) the Education Committee had, by Act dated 31st January 2001, accepted the lowest tender for the fixed-price work received for the extension to Bel Royal School, St. Lawrence, namely that submitted by Stansell (QVC) Limited in the revised sum of £414,322.00 for a contract period of 26 weeks.

Matters lodged

The following matters were lodged "au Greffe" -

Draft Health Insurance (Medical Benefit) (Amendment No. 53) (Jersey) Regulations 200 P.20/2001.

Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee.

Draft Criminal Justice (International Co-operation) (Jersey) Law 200- P.21/2001.

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Sandybrook, St. Peter: Phase III redevelopment - approval of drawings - P.22/2001.

Presented by the Housing Committee.

Bequest of the late Mr. H.E. Le Seilleur: request for *ex gratia* payment - P.23/2001.

Presented by the Health and Social Services Committee.

Tourism administered cafés: transfer of administration - P.24/2001.

Presented by the Tourism Committee.

Review of the machinery of government: wording of response card - P.26/2001.

Presented by the Policy and Resources Committee.

Draft Public Holiday and Bank Holidays (Jersey) Act 200- P.27/2001.

Presented by the Legislation Committee.

Draft Harbours (Amendment No. 32) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.28/2001.

Presented by the Harbours and Airport Committee.

Cancellation of meeting

THE STATES decided not to meet on 27th February 2001, and accordingly agreed that their next meeting would be held on 13th March 2001.

Arrangement of public business for the meeting on 13th March 2001

THE STATES confirmed that the following matters lodged "au Greffe" would be considered at the next meeting on 13th March 2001 -

Referendums: Creation of a Legislative Framework - P.188/2000.

Lodged: 7th November 2000.

Deputy P.N. Troy of St. Brelade.

Morier House, Halkett Place: assignment of rights and obligations of funding arrangement - P.4/2001.

Lodged: 16th January 2001.

Planning and Environment Committee.

Morier House, Halkett Place: assignment of rights and obligations of funding arrangement (P.4/2001): comments - P.4/2001 Com.

Presented: 13th February 2001.

Finance and Economics Committee.

Site of the former Fine Gems and Craft Centre, La Route du Ouest, St. Ouen - P.12/2001.

Lodged: 30th January 2001.

Planning and Environment Committee.

Site of the former Fine Gems and Craft Centre, La Route du Ouest, St. Ouen (P.12/2001): comments - P.12/2001 Com.

Presented: 13th February 2001.

Finance and Economics Committee.

Draft Health Insurance (Medical Benefit) (Amendment No. 53) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.20/2001.

Lodged: 13th February 2001.

Employment and Social Security Committee.

Sandybrook, St. Peter: Phase III redevelopment - approval of drawings - P.22/2001.

Lodged: 13th February 2001.

Housing Committee.

Bequest of the late Mr. H.E. Le Seilleur: request for *ex gratia* payment - P.23/2001.

Lodged: 13th February 2001.

Health and Social Services Committee.

Tourism administered cafés: transfer of administration - P.24/2001.

Lodged: 13th February 2001.

Tourism Committee.

Draft Public Holiday and Bank Holidays (Jersey) Act 200- P.27/2001.

Lodged: 13th February 2001 and referred to the Finance and Economics Committee.
Legislation Committee.

Draft Harbours (Amendment No. 32) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.28/2001.
Lodged: 13th February 2001 and referred to the Finance and Economics Committee.
Harbours and Airport Committee.

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of Senator Stuart Syvret, decided not to consider on 13th March 2001 the 'Review of the machinery of government: wording of response card' (P.26/2001) lodged 'au Greffe' by the Policy and Resources Committee at the present meeting.

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (27)

Senators

Le Maistre, Stein, Bailhache, Syvret, Kinnard, Le Claire, Lakeman.

Connétables

St. Peter, St. Helier, St. Martin, St. Ouen, St. Saviour, St. Brelade, St. Lawrence, St. Mary, St. John.

Deputies

S. Baudains(H), Duhamel(S), Breckon(S), St. Martin, St. John, Vibert(B), St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C)
Troy(B), Le Hérisier(S), Bridge(H).

“Contre” (18)

Senators

Horsfall, Quérée, Norman, Walker, Le Sueur.

Connétable

Trinity.

Deputies

H. Baudains(C), Trinity, Layzell(B), Le Main(H), Crowcroft(H), St. Peter, Dorey(H), Voisin(L), Sco
Warren(S), Farnham(S), Ozouf(H), Fox(H).

An elected President of the States - P.19/2000

THE STATES noted that, in accordance with Standing Order 17(6), the proposition of Senator Stuart Syvret concerning an elected President of the States (P19/2000 lodged “au Greffe” on 8th February 2000) had been withdrawn.

Fireworks: restriction on sale - petition - P.25/2001

Deputy Jeremy Laurence Dorey of St. Helier presented to the States a petition on behalf of the residents of the Island of Jersey praying that all necessary steps should be taken to restrict the sale of fireworks to suitably qualified and accredited persons organising public fireworks displays.

The STATES referred the petition to the Home Affairs Committee and Deputy Dorey lodged 'au Greffe' a proposition to the effect that the prayer of the petition be granted.

The cost of an investigation into the conduct of honorary officers - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

Deputy Terence John Le Main of St. Helier, asked Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade, President of

the Home Affairs Committee, the following question -

“Would the President -

- (a) give members details of the costs of the investigation conducted by officers of the Wiltshire Constabulary into the conduct of the Connétable of St. Helier and his Chef de Police in the Roger Holland case?
- (b) indicate which vote of credit will be used to defray these costs?
- (c) indicate whether the Connétable and the Chef de Police, against whom it was decided not to institute criminal proceedings, will be compensated for their costs and out of pocket expenses?
- (d) advise members who instigated the complaint alleging criminal activities against the aforementioned persons?

The President of the Home Affairs Committee replied as follows -

- “(a) The investigation cost £30,300.
- (b) The costs were paid from the Operations budget of the States of Jersey Police.
- (c) No request for compensation has been received but I would not expect the Connétable and the Chef de Police to be treated differently from other citizens against whom an investigation is launched which fails to result in criminal charges, and who do not normally receive compensation.
- (d) The original complaint was made to the Attorney General and I am not personally aware of the identity of the complainant.”

Mont Orgueil Castle - questions and answers (Tape No. 636)

The Deputy of St. Martin asked Senator Nigel Lewis Quérée, President of the Planning and Environment Committee the following questions -

- “1. In reply to questions put by Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier on 16th January this year and supplementary questions, the President stated that no work had been undertaken at Mont Orgueil Castle without planning permission or had been subject to retrospective permission. He also stated that all work had been supervised. Please could the President now advise -
 - (a) given that channelling for plumbing and services in the room known as the “German Room” started in November 1998, which permit allowed for this work, and when was it issued?
 - (b) who supervised this work from an archaeological standpoint, and was that supervision continuous?
 - (c) what became of the material removed from the above excavations and whether it was assessed archaeologically?
- 2. Is the President aware that the spoil heap which accumulated following work in late 1999 and early 2000 on Peyton’s Ramparts contained medieval artefacts (including pottery, painted glass and coins) and could he identify the area from which this material originated?
- 3. In the President’s reply on 16th January, he stated that one of a number of conditions imposed in the ‘in principle’ Planning Permit was that ‘no works to the fabric of the castle were to be carried out without a survey and archaeological assessment of the affected areas having been first undertaken by Dr. Warwick Rodwell or other appropriately qualified archaeological expert agreed by the Committee’. Would the President state -

- (a) when the survey and assessment were completed and what the main conclusions were?
 - (b) whether the survey and assessment were taken into account before the appropriate permit was issued, as required under interim Policy HB13 and by the conditions attached to the “in principle” Planning Permission?
 - (c) if his answer to (b) is in the negative, would he give the reasons?
4. The Dixon/Kennedy report (para. 3.2) stated that Jersey was a signatory to certain international conventions for the protection of historic monuments. Can the President inform the Assembly which of these conventions are relevant to the development of Mont Orgueil Castle, and whether the Committee had regard to the terms of the conventions when considering planning applications for Mont Orgueil Castle?”

The President of the Planning and Environment Committee replied as follows -

- “1.(a) I was previously asked to outline the approvals for restoration granted to the Jersey Heritage Trust. My replies were given in that context. The work to the ‘German Room’ referred to by the Deputy involved the renewal of existing worn-out services, and was not considered to be work of restoration. Moreover, this work was carried out in November 1998 and therefore pre-dates the start of the major restoration project for Mont Orgueil, which was awarded States funding in July 1999. As a consequence, I did not refer to this work in my earlier answer. No formal application was requested for this work and no formal permit was given.
- (b) Work to the ‘German Room’ was assessed archaeologically by Dr Warwick Rodwell prior to commencement, and I understand that it was supervised on a day-to-day basis by the Jersey Heritage Trust’s Curator of Archaeology.
- (c) I understand that all archaeological material discovered as a result of this work was assessed both by the Archaeology Section of the Société Jersiaise and by the Curator of Archaeology at the Jersey Heritage Trust. This material is now held in the archaeological museum at La Hougue Bie.
2. I am advised that re-deposited archaeological artefacts were uncovered at Peyton’s Bastion (The Middle Ward, West Tower) during work supervised by Dr Warwick Rodwell (consultant archaeologist). These fragments, including glass and pottery, were not found in stratified archaeological layers but had been dumped at the rampart, mixed with earth and rubble, when the level of the rampart was raised at a point in the castle’s history. This ‘fill’ was thought to have been re-deposited either from another part or parts of the castle, or from outside the castle.
- 3.(a) A number of surveys and assessments of the various parts of Mont Orgueil that might be involved in the restoration project have been undertaken by Dr Warwick Rodwell since 1994. This body of work includes formalised reports on the condition and interpretation of certain areas of the castle, e.g. *‘Prynne’s Tower: a note on urgent remedial and conservation works’ August 1999*, as well as numerous assessments, with the project team, of specific areas of the building fabric prior to works of repair or restoration being carried out, as well as during their execution. The nature and conclusions of these various studies are inevitably specific to the areas of the castle to which they relate. They do not, therefore, lend themselves to a simple reduction of ‘main conclusions’ which the Deputy seeks. However, the Conservation Plan now being prepared by the Jersey Heritage Trust should helpfully draw together all the strands of previous research and analysis.
- (b) I can confirm that the results of the above surveys and assessments are taken into account by officers when assessing the various proposed works to the castle. For clarification, Interim Policy HB13 states that: *‘Applications for alterations to designated buildings must contain sufficient information to demonstrate the impact of the proposed works on the special interest of the building. In granting permission, the Planning Department will seek to ensure that the loss or damage of historic fabric is minimised’.*
4. The States of Jersey is signatory to two international conventions which have relevance to the Mont Orgueil project. I can confirm that the Committee had regard to the terms of these conventions in considering planning applications for Mont Orgueil.

Jersey became signatory to the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada 1985) on 13 November 1987. The Convention contains numerous articles, including the requirement of each party to:

“protect the architectural heritage” (Article 3);

“to prevent the disfigurement, dilapidation or demolition of protected properties” (Article 4);

“to provide financial support by the public authorities for maintaining and restoring the architectural heritage on its territory,.....and to encourage private initiatives for maintaining and restoring the architectural heritage” (Article 6);

“to foster the use of protected properties in the light of the needs of contemporary life and the adaptation when appropriate of old buildings for new uses” (Article 11).

The United Kingdom’s ratification of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised) Valetta 1992 was extended to Jersey as recently as 19th September 2000. This Convention recognises that the archaeological heritage is essential to a knowledge of the history of humanity and contains numerous articles which include the requirement of each party to protect the archaeological heritage and to ensure that excavations and other archaeological investigations are carried out only by qualified persons. These provisions were anticipated by Committee in granting its conditional Permit No.642/F on 4th May 2000.”

Mont Orgueil Castle - questions and answers (Tape No. 636)

The Deputy of St. Martin will asked Senator Frank Harrison Walker, President of the Finance and Economics Committee the following questions -

“Under the terms of ‘Elizabeth Castle and Mont Orgueil Castle: cession of usufruct’ (P.218/96) approved on 10th December 1996, two of the duties of the Jersey Heritage Trust are -

- (a) ‘3.01.4 [to] preserve the historical and archaeological integrity of the castles for future generations’; and
- (b) ‘3.06 The Trust shall consult with and obtain the agreement of the Finance and Economics [Committee] who may consult such other committees or other bodies as it thinks fit before the Trust undertakes any development relating to any part of the Castles.’

1. Building work was carried out in Mont Orgueil Castle in 1998. This work involved digging a trench across the open space known as the Tudor Great Hall, into the guard house and into the room known as the German Room, with wide channelling along and up the wall of that same room. Did The Heritage Trust consult and seek the Committee’s approval before the work commenced in accordance with paragraph 3.06 of P.218 of 1996?
2. In view of the fact that Mont Orgueil Castle is in need of repair, maintenance and consolidation will the President confirm that the necessary funds for such work may still be released from the vote of £3m approved in ‘Strategic Reserve: allocation of funds to Tourism Investment Fund’ (P.93 of 1999), and that any funds required for additional work required in connection with the proposed Tudor Great Hall reconstruction, will be withheld pending the results of the Conservation Plan commissioned by The Jersey Heritage Trust, as recommended by the Dixon/Kennedy Report?
3. As the States have imposed a legal obligation on The Jersey Heritage Trust ‘to preserve the historical and archaeological integrity of the site of the castles for future generations’, would the President agree that responsibility for ensuring that these and other legal requirements of the States are met rests with the Finance and Economics Committee?
4. If the answer to question 3 is in the affirmative, then how does the President reconcile this legal responsibility with the comments made in the Dixon/Kennedy report (Page 53, paragraph 8.5.5) that damage has been done to the archaeological integrity of Mont Orgueil Castle?

The President of the Finance and Economics Committee replied as follows -

“Before answering Deputy Hill’s questions in detail, I would like to make some general points. As President of the Finance and Economics Committee and a member of the States of Jersey, I have had a close association for many years with the Jersey Heritage Trust. In my opinion, the Trust’s record over the last decade has been remarkable. It has completed a series of successful projects, on time and on budget, which have won many awards and have been warmly welcomed by the people of this island. It provides an array of services to a high standard. It is properly governed by its board of trustees and well managed by its professional team. The heritage of Jersey has been enriched by the work of the Trust. It has the full confidence of my Committee.

Mont Orgueil was under the care of the States from 1908 to 1997. In retrospect - and it is always easier looking back - it is clear that the States’ record leaves much to be desired. The Dixon Kennedy Report, commissioned by the Trust and published in December 2000, refers to work over the years *‘being undertaken piecemeal with some sound repairs ... but much that was simply left or patched up.’* It also refers to the *‘depressingly dilapidated aspect of the central part of the castle ...’* and walls that are *‘quite dangerous through lack of maintenance’*. Work undertaken by the States in the 1970s, 80s and 90s was rarely archaeologically supervised, never properly recorded and often involved the use of inappropriate modern materials.

The States were right in December 1996 to agree to transfer responsibility for the castles to a specialist body with effect from January 1997. Some two years later, in 1999, the Trust brought proposals to this house to address the accumulated problems of nearly a century of States management, and falling visitor numbers. A grant of £3m from the Tourism Investment Fund was approved.

I now turn to Deputy Hill’s specific questions.

1. This work was undertaken to address the problem of an old electricity supply cable, which was loose, inadequate and dangerous. On archaeological advice, the route across the floor of the Tudor Great Hall was chosen because this area had previously been disturbed during work in the 1930s. Seeking to minimise the visual impact of the new cable in these historic spaces, it was decided to conceal the cable within the walls. Stones were carefully removed and the work was fully recorded. This is the same approach that was used at Hamptonne and in the recent restoration by the States at Fort Leicester.

The Trust did not consult with my Committee on this specific piece of detailed work - replacing an old cable with a new one - and nor would I have expected it to do so. The Trust has consulted fully with my Committee, and received its support, about the overall developments it wished to undertake. The Trust also made a detailed presentation on two occasions to States members before P.93/1999 - the allocation of the £3m grant - was debated.

2. In the report and proposition received and approved by the States in 1999, the Trust summarised the scheme as -
 - (a) improved reception facilities, shop and new toilets;
 - (b) restoration of the historic medieval heart of the castle, opening up a labyrinth of new staircases and rooms;
 - (c) new displays and recreated interior spaces;
 - (d) rebuilding the 16th century ruined Great Hall;
 - (e) recreated medieval garden;
 - (f) new car park at La Crete Quarry.

All these elements were endorsed in principle by the Planning and Environment Committee except the car park proposal. Since then, the Trust has developed the scheme in more detail. The work now planned does include repair, maintenance and consolidation of those parts of the castle that are in poor condition. As the Trust has made clear in its public statements, all its proposals were

subject to review in the Dixon Kennedy Report, which was published in December 2000. These proposals are being examined and tested in even more detail through the process of preparing the Conservation Plan and Development Strategy.

There can be no question of 'withholding' funds - the Tourism Investment Fund grant, approved by the States in July 1999, has been paid to the Trust; it is held in a restricted account and its expenditure is a matter for the Trust. The Chairman of the Trust - Jurat John de Veulle - was appointed by the States, and the trustees are all people of substance within the island. The Trust submits annual audited accounts to my Committee. The Trust will not commit funds unwisely or inappropriately, and has an unblemished record of financial management.

3. In respect of the Trust's usufruct of the castles, the responsibilities of the Finance and Economics Committee are set out in paragraph 3.6 (which refers to *consultation over proposed development*), and paragraphs 4.1 – 4.9 (*which refer to the use and administration of the Ancient Monuments Fund*). The usufruct agreement otherwise refers generally to "the States" and does not place upon the Finance and Economics or any other Committee the specific responsibility for ensuring that the Trust's legal obligations are met. Nevertheless, the Finance & Economics Committee is the Trust's rapporteur in the States and generally oversees its work in respect of its duties and obligations to the States.

It is also worthy of note that paragraph 7.1 of the usufruct says that *'The Trust, duly observing and performing its covenants and obligations hereunder, shall and may peacefully hold, manage and operate the Castles during the usufruct without any interruption or interference from the States.'*

4. Paragraph 8.5.5 of the Dixon Kennedy report does indeed express some concern at damage caused by the electricity cables - and this would refer not only to the work undertaken by the Trust in 1998 but also similar work carried out throughout the 20th century when the Castles were the direct responsibility of the States. In response to this, the Dixon Kennedy report makes a series of recommendations, which are set out in paragraphs 8.6.1 to 8.6.8. The Heritage Trust has formally and publicly committed to undertake all these recommendations before work on the scheme recommences. The Conservation Plan and new Development Strategy should be submitted to the Planning and Environment Committee in the next three months.

In conclusion, no-one doubts the importance of Mont Orgueil, nor the need to assure its future through the right scheme. In response to the concerns that have been raised by, it must be said, a very small minority, the Jersey Heritage Trust acted as any responsible body would and commissioned an external Review by eminent people - Dr. Philip Dixon and Ms. Jane Kennedy. This confirmed that what the Trust is proposing to do is appropriate to the Castle, is within acceptable national and international guidelines and would be approved of by mainland authorities. However, they recommended that certain processes and procedures are put in place. The Trust has fully accepted these recommendations and is implementing them. As I said earlier, the Trust aims to present the Conservation Plan and Development Strategy to the Planning and Environment Committee within three months. To quote from the Dixon Kennedy conclusions, the *'reasonable doubts expressed about the current programme can and should be assuaged'* through these documents.

Speaking in an interview to the Jersey Evening Post published on 12th January 2001, Dr. Dixon said: *'I've been impressed by the way that the Jersey Heritage Trust has acted. They have not done as many local authorities in the United Kingdom may have done and covered their ears and waited for people to go away. They have answered their critics and have been prepared to listen to them.'*

Given Deputy Hill's concern for Mont Orgueil, I am surprised that he has not attended any of the three special visits to the Castle set up by the Trust during the last few months, (the last one being on 8th February - only last week and after he had lodged these questions) - to inform members about the proposals in more detail. Given that fewer than ten members altogether have visited Mont Orgueil on these three arranged visits and no others, apart from the Planning and Environment Committee, have taken up their open invitation for a guided tour, it is reasonable for the Trust to assume that the great majority of this house remain supportive of this excellent scheme.

I will end by quoting the words of one member's contribution to the debate on the proposition to grant the £3m to Mont Orgueil in July 1999

'It's a wonderful boost ... a double win for tourism. I don't think this is very much a 'nice to do', it is very much 'a must do'. It is a gem and if you don't spend money on our gem – it's like anyone's house – it will eventually crumble. It amazes me really how strong Mont Orgueil is and how it has withstood those many years without real investments.'

Deputy Hill will recall that these were his very own words - and with these sentiments, I wholeheartedly agree."

The cost of notices in the Jersey Gazette - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire ask Senator Frank Harrison Walker, President of the Finance and Economics Committee the following question -

"Would the President supply members with the total cost of placing States' notices in the Jersey Gazette during the last 12 months?"

Senator F.H. Walker declared an interest in the subject matter or these questions, and requested Deputy Michael Edward Vibert of St. Brelade to respond as rapporteur on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Vibert replied as follows -

"The cost of placing States notices in the Gazette for the year 2000 was £89,314.45.

An advertising contract is currently being negotiated with the Jersey Evening Post in respect of advertisements placed in the Jersey Gazette and the classified section which should reduce costs."

Draft Legal Practitioners (Jersey) Law 2000 - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire asked Senator Wendy Kinnard, President of the Legislation Committee, the following question -

"Would the President inform members -

- (a) of the progress of the Draft Legal Practitioners (Jersey) Law 200-;
- (b) when the Draft Law is likely to be lodged;
- (c) the reason for the delay in lodging this Law;
- (d) of the proposed safeguards and provisions for the public who have complaints against legal practitioners and their firms;
- (e) what redresses are currently available to the public?"

The President of the Legislation Committee replied as follows -

- (a) The draft Legal Practitioners (Jersey) Law, 200-, and two related pieces of legislation, the Law Society of Jersey Law, 200-, and the Law Society of Jersey Bye-Laws, 200-, have been the subject of extensive consultation. That consultation with the legal profession was effectively concluded during the course of last year, and revised drafts of each of the three pieces of legislation were forwarded to the Attorney General at the beginning of this month for his consideration. The legislation is also to be circulated for public comment.
- (b) The Committee will lodge the final draft after receiving comments from the public and the

Attorney General.

- (c) The Law has not been lodged as it is not yet in final form, and it is not yet in final form because it has been the subject of consultation with the Law Society and other bodies such as the Association of English Solicitors in Jersey. (AESJ).
- (d) The proposed safeguards for the public who have complaints against Jersey lawyers will be contained in Part III of the Law Society Law. In summary, the Law Society will be required to establish a Disciplinary Panel of seven members who have been in practice for not less than ten years, while the Law itself establishes a Disciplinary Tribunal comprising two Jurats appointed by the Bailiff, two members of the Law Society appointed by it of at least ten years' standing, and two members of the public appointed by the President of the Legislation Committee.

A member of the public who has a complaint will be entitled to complain to the Law Society and the Law requires the President to take prompt action to refer the matter to a Disciplinary Committee unless he is satisfied that the complaint does not relate to professional misconduct, or that it is vexatious, frivolous or trivial, in which event he must inform the complainant.

The draft Law gives the Committee of the Law Society various powers for the purpose of investigating the complaint, and requires it to deal promptly with the complaint. After considering the complaint the Disciplinary Committee is obliged either to dismiss the complaint; if satisfied that the practitioner is guilty of professional misconduct, but that the matter can be properly dealt with by a private rebuke, to rebuke him in that way; or to refer the matter to the Disciplinary Tribunal without making a finding. The Disciplinary Committee is required to inform the complainant, the practitioner and the Secretary of the Law Society of the decision, and if the matter is referred to the Disciplinary Tribunal it must also notify the Attorney General.

If the Disciplinary Tribunal is satisfied that a practitioner is guilty of professional misconduct, it must deal with him in whichever of the following ways it considers appropriate -

- (i) by private rebuke;
- (ii) by public reprimand;
- (iii) by a fine not exceeding £20,000;
- (iv) by suspending him from practice for not more than six months; or
- (v) if it considers that none of these options is sufficient, by referring the matter to the Royal Court.

Article 26 empowers the Royal Court either to order that the name of the practitioner be removed from the Roll or to impose any penalty that the Tribunal could itself have awarded.

Practitioners are given rights of appeal against a decision of the Disciplinary Committee and the Tribunal.

- (e) A member of the public who has a complaint against an advocate may complain to the Batonnier, who will generally refer the matter to a Panel of Senior Practitioners who will report back to him. If it appears from the report that there has been misconduct meriting the sanction of the Royal Court, the matter is brought before the Royal Court which has an inherent power to censure, reprimand, suspend or strike off an advocate.

A complaint against a solicitor is dealt with under the provisions of the Advocates and Solicitors (Jersey) Law, 1997. That article provides for a Disciplinary Committee for Solicitors, one of the functions of which is to consider complaints from third parties concerning the conduct of solicitors in the course of practice. Where it appears to the Disciplinary Committee that the circumstances so justify, the Committee may -

- (a) reprimand a solicitor;

- (b) censure a solicitor, either informally or before a full meeting of the Committee; or
- (c) refer a matter to the Royal Court. The Royal Court has the same inherent powers in respect of solicitors as it has in respect of advocates.

Licence for the school bus service - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft, President of the Public Services Committee the following question -

“Would the President advise members -

- (a) whether the School Bus Service needs a licence to operate;
- (b) if the answer (a) is in the affirmative, would he confirm that the School Bus Service is currently licensed and when the licence was granted?”

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

“(a) No. his question was raised by a member of the public in November 2000 and referred to the Law Officers Department. Following a review of the relevant legislation, it was deemed that the operation of the School Bus service did not fit into any of the categories of road service covered by Article 22, read with Article 9(1), of the 1935 Law requiring the licensing of vehicles.”

Meetings of OECD matters - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire asked Senator Pierre François Horsfall, President of the Policy and Resources Committee the following question -

“Would the President advise members -

- (a) of the outcome of the recent meeting with the OECD and give details of that meeting including any agreements reached and any still under negotiation?
- (b) of the date and location of the next meeting and would he say what the purpose of that meeting will be?”

The President of the Policy and Resources Committee replied as follows -

“There was a meeting in Paris on 1st February, called by the OECD, to which Jersey was invited along with all those jurisdictions in the European region that the OECD has listed under what it terms its ‘tax haven’ criteria. This followed a similar regional multilateral meeting in the Caribbean and was ahead of one due to take place shortly in the Pacific region.

It was not in any sense a negotiating meeting. It was an opportunity for us to understand the OECD’s latest thinking, which has moved some way since its original report in 1988 on so-called ‘harmful’ tax competition. And it was an opportunity for us to make our views and concerns known, which we did, as did our partners from Guernsey, Gibraltar, the Isle of Man and others. To the best of my knowledge, no further such meetings are currently planned by the OECD, although this may change.

On behalf of Jersey, I repeated as strongly as I could the essential points of the Channel Islands’ position agreed with Guernsey and made public last November. These are as follows -

we believe firmly that Jersey is fully co-operative on all matters to do with international criminal activity concerning tax. We have excellent regulatory standards which indeed go further than those of many OECD member countries, and which have received praise in, for example, the Edwards Report, and through our top grading by the Financial Action Task Force in respect of our

money laundering controls;

we are very ready to participate in genuine, inclusive discussions about new international standards on such matters as exchange of so-called 'civil' tax information and the definition of 'harmful' tax competition. But we are not prepared to make unilateral and open-ended commitments to change our laws in areas so crucial to Jersey's prosperity where there is no agreement on definitions and where we do not have any true assurance that all the OECD countries are actively prepared to give effect to similar commitments. That would simply undermine Jersey's competitive position in international markets;

we have consulted extensively with the Island's finance industry on this position and gained its overwhelming endorsement for it;

together with Guernsey, we are continuing in dialogue with the OECD and we remain confident that a way can be found so that Jersey is not on the OECD's list of so-called 'unco-operative jurisdictions' that it has said it will publish next July. But any agreement we reach with the OECD must, as I have described, be within a satisfactory level playing field framework as between all OECD Member countries and non-Member countries. We shall continue to make this clear to the OECD on every possible occasion."

Cost of development of States internet sites - question and answer (Tape No. 636)

The Deputy of St. John asked Senator Pierre François Horsfall, President of the Policy and Resources Committee, the following question -

"Would the President inform members -

- (a) of the cost of developing the new official business internet portal?
- (b) how much money has been invested in the development of all internet sites set up by the States since 1997?
- (c) what instructions the Committee has issued to the designers of the States of Jersey Web-site given that these sites should also be easy to use by the disabled, and would he say when these instructions were issued?"

The President of the Policy and Resources Committee replied as follows -

- (a) the cost of developing the new business internet portal was about £60,000. About the same amount has been spent on related tasks such as, for example, writing a synopsis of Jersey's laws and preparing descriptions of Jersey's tax laws, making a total of £126,000;
- (b) excluding the new business portal, the Policy and Resources Department estimates that about £120,000 has been spent on developing 33 other States internet sites. This includes the Jersey Information Society Commission site, but excludes separate sites with specific budgets such as Jersey Tourism. It also excludes Jersey Post and Jersey Telecoms. Of the 33, five have been developed by the Computer Services Department, 15 in-house by the departments concerned, and 13 through outside contracts;
- (c) States web site development projects follow design, accessibility and security policies set out by the Computer Services Department within the Policy & Resources Department. Policy A03 is relevant in this case and comprises seven detailed pages, the document recommends compliance with guidelines for web content accessibility as issued by the W3C Organisation. A03 was last reviewed in August 2000 and will be reviewed again later this year. It can be found on the States Intranet site."

Health and Social Services Committee budget - questions and answers (Tape No. 636)

Deputy Philip Francis Cyril Ozouf of St. Helier asked Senator Stuart Syvret, President of the Health and Social Services Committee the following question -

“When the Budget 2001 was debated early in December 2000, the President warned that he would be seeking further increases in the Health and Social Services department’s budget. Would he explain to members -

- (a) the measures he uses to assess clinical performance versus cost of the Jersey Hospital, compared to near equivalents?
- (b) the measures he has taken to improve value for money within the Committee’s budget?”

The President of the Health and Social Services Committee replied as follows -

- “(a) The assessment of clinical performance versus cost is a highly complex subject that includes a number of different dimensions - for example, economic comparisons, cost-activity measures and evaluation of clinical outcomes. My Department currently attempts to carry out this type of analysis to a greater or lesser extent depending on the information that is available. However, most health services are struggling to develop meaningful ways of assessing clinical performance versus cost, and there is a considerable body of literature on the various methods and pitfalls of such analyses.

Crude comparisons are made with other countries at a ‘macro’ level, such as the total public expenditure on healthcare as a percentage of GDP, or health spending per head of population, and we find that Jersey falls near the European average. But I must add the reservation that these comparisons are fraught with difficulties. Other countries operate different health systems and include a very different range of services within their public sector provision. There are no ‘near equivalents’ with which Jersey’s health service can be reliably compared. Other countries and, indeed, other Islands’ health services are so different that any comparisons can only be broad indicators, they can be very misleading and often give rise to more questions than answers.

An independent analysis of performance was carried out by *PricewaterhouseCoopers* in 1999 as part of the very extensive service review commissioned by the Policy and Resources Committee. The consultants benchmarked the performance of the General Hospital in respect of inpatient admissions, waiting times for out-patient appointments, Accident and Emergency attendances, nursing activities, consultant staffing ratios, workload trends, average length of stay, number of operations carried out, occupied beds, day-surgery cases and outpatient attendances, broken down into several clinical specialities. Notwithstanding the difficulties mentioned earlier, this data was compared with broadly equivalent information from England and Wales, Spain, Holland and New Zealand.

The service review concluded that, whilst the performance measures for Jersey were broadly similar to those for England and Wales, they also indicated (and I quote from the service review report) ‘a higher level of efficiency in the provision of inpatient services when compared to England and Wales and to some other countries (including Holland, Spain and New Zealand, where measures from these countries are available)’. The report went on to specify that there was a high inpatient workload and number of operations per medical consultant in a number of specialities; a low or comparable average length of stay in all surgical specialities; a low or comparable proportion of emergency to elective admissions, and an efficient use of surgical inpatient beds. In addition, the waiting lists for inpatient elective surgery compared very favourably with England and Wales.

In summary, the service review demonstrated that Health and Social Services achieved a high level of clinical performance; however, the costs were also relatively high due to specific Island factors which were outside the control of the Committee - namely, the diseconomies of operating a small health service, staff salaries associated with the relatively high cost of living in Jersey, high travel costs for patients and the comparatively high cost of locally available supplies and services.

The Service Review was a ‘one-off’ exercise; however my Department *routinely* monitors over 140 clinical activity indicators, based on the National Health Service Minimum Data Set, and

financial data which are reported to the Committee each quarter. The financial performance reporting for Health and Social Services has been commended by the States Audit Commission, who have commented in their review of overtime working: 'We were most impressed by the financial reporting in the Health and Social Services Department'.

Crude clinical indicators, for example perinatal mortality, inpatient mortality, hospital acquired infection and length of stay, all suggest that we perform well. However, like health services in many other countries, we could be described as 'data rich and information poor'. It is difficult to extract detailed performance measures and unit costs because of our limited development of clinical coding, which is needed to classify the types of surgical procedures being carried out, and the absence of adequate information systems. May I remind members that a Health and Social Services Information Systems Strategy was approved in 1997 which recommended a key programme for updating the Health and Social Services information systems during 1997-2000. This strategy has been consistently under-funded by the States and has now fallen seriously behind schedule. Following a progress review, the Department has developed a recovery plan, the *Information and Communications Strategy for 2001-2005*, which will require significant investment of £4.7 million over the next five years if it is to provide the quality of information required to support good clinical care and effectively manage a modern health service.

In the longer term, we are moving towards assessing clinical outcomes and quality of life as a true measure of clinical performance; that is, whether the treatment works and whether it makes people feel better, rather than simply counting how many treatments are provided. We shall also identify accurate programme costs for the different types of treatments available and will then be able to properly assess clinical performance versus costs.

In the meantime, the Department has to wait for better information systems and make do with proxy activity measures which can only give an indication of how busy the Department is and how much it costs to run the services, whilst failing to capture important information about the clinical effectiveness and quality of care being provided.

The PwC Service Review summary has already been presented to States members and further copies are available.

- (b) The Public Health Committee was the first States Department to establish an independent Audit Committee in 1991. Since then, the Audit Committee has completed a series of reviews across a wide range of services; for example, the Catering Service's central production kitchen, the Central Laundry, Estates Management, pharmacy, nursing services, operating theatres, ambulance and transport services, private patient services, overtime working and pathology services. All of the reviews resulted in a better understanding of the services in question, improved operational efficiency and in some cases cash releasing efficiency savings. The Audit Committee's current programme includes a pilot study in Services for the Elderly Mentally Ill, a broad review of Services to Older People, a review of clinical governance and a value for money review of hospital prescribing.

The Health and Social Services Committee has been particularly impressed by the efficiency savings which have been achieved to enable existing services to be maintained, new modern services to be introduced and increased demand to be met from a budget which has included only one per cent real growth per annum on average over the course of the last eight years. That speaks volumes for the efforts of those who work in the health service and who demonstrate a commitment every day of the week which money just cannot buy.

My Committee has approved initiatives to formalise service level agreements for treatment that cannot be provided locally, and which is obtained in the United Kingdom under the Reciprocal Health Agreement. The total value of health care provided in the United Kingdom for Jersey residents is in the order of £4 million. Through commissioning arrangements introduced in 2000 with specific NHS Trusts, it has been possible to achieve a high quality of care and best prices, resulting in a saving for the Jersey tax-payer of several hundred thousand pounds every year. However, it is certain that increasing clinical specialisation and public expectations will lead to greater numbers of patients being referred to the United Kingdom, and consequently a higher level of expenditure on United Kingdom health services in the future.

My Committee has recently endorsed a comprehensive quality improvement agenda, which clinical staff are keen to pursue. It includes the implementation of clinical audit and evidence-based practice, using for example the 'best value' guidance from the United Kingdom National Institute for Clinical Excellence, as an approach to evaluating and improving clinical performance and ensuring the cost-effective use of resources. Recent developments with the Employment and Social Security Committee, general practitioners and other primary care providers will help ensure services are well integrated, of high quality and delivered in a way most appreciated by the public.

In summary, the efforts to ensure value for money and the most cost-effective provision of health care have been considerable. Health and Social Services is a very complex organisation and has some extremely difficult challenges to face in the years ahead. However, I am convinced that the staff who are working in the health service are efficient and there is little more that can be achieved without additional funding. The independent reviews that have been carried out endorse this view."

Control of private sector construction - questions and answers (Tape No. 636)

Deputy Michael Edward Vibert of St. Brelade asked Deputy Robin Charles Hacquoil, Vice-President of the Industries Committee the following question -

"1. On 13th September 2001 the States adopted a proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee as follows -

"agreed that the overall level of construction activity in Jersey, excluding small projects and civil engineering works, should be limited to approximately £120 million a year (at December 1999 prices) initially for the years 2001-2003 and accordingly during those three years -

- (i) the States capital construction programme should be limited to £60 million a year; and
- (ii) the Industries Committee should be requested to apply Part III of the Regulation of Undertakings and Development Law 1973, as amended, to limit private sector construction to approximately the same amount."

Would the Vice-President advise members of the Committee's progress in implementing the above?

- 2. If the answer to (1) indicates concerns that to limit the private sector construction programme under Part III of the Regulation of Undertakings and Development (Jersey) Law 1973, as amended, may be ultra vires, would the President explain what steps are being taken to ensure the States' decision can be legally implemented, including proposing amendments to the Law, if necessary, to achieve this?"

The Vice-President of the Industries Committee replied as follows -

- "1. The Committee expects to agree a draft policy statement at its meeting on 21st February, following which the statement will be issued for public consultation.
- 2. The Committee will consider each application on its merits having careful regard to States objectives. The Committee is confident that its revised policy statement will clarify matters for everyone and will get the support of the construction industry and the business community by encouraging a steady flow of major construction work thus avoiding peaks and troughs.

It is not anticipated that any amendments to the Law will be required."

Agricultural Loans - statement

Senator Jean Amy Le Maistre, President of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, made a statement in the following terms -

“I welcome the opportunity to update members of the House on the actions, which have been taken as a result of the Audit of Loans report published in December 2000.

A considerable number of actions have been taken, but before detailing them I would like to put them in context by reminding members briefly of the background which led to these actions.

When I took office as President of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee in December 1999, I acted immediately to address a problem of financial administration which I, Committee members and many others perceived to exist. Members will recall that a senior accountant in the Treasury was seconded to the Department in January 2000 for six months to clarify and address the various issues. The secondment was, however, unsuccessful with the result that, in June last year the new Chief Officer inherited a range of issues concerning financial administration. He quickly became aware of issues concerning the administration of loans and, having taken advice from the Treasury, requested an audit of loans - the report of which was issued in December 2000.

During the second half of last year discussions took place with the Human Resources Department and the Treasury about the fundamental need to strengthen the Department's capabilities - by providing the expertise of a qualified accountant. It is regrettable that it took rather a long time to gain acceptance that this was necessary.

Following the publication of the Audit Report and with the full support and advice from Human Resources and the Treasury, for which we are grateful, a number of actions have been taken, which I will now summarise.

First, in January of this year an accountant was appointed on a temporary basis to assist the Department until a full-time accountant is recruited. He is actively involved in general financial administration and in addressing the issues arising from the loans audit. His input is already extremely valuable.

Second, a recruiting exercise is well advanced, using the expertise of the agency Hays Personnel, and I understand that there have been more than 30 applicants. It is planned to make an appointment in March, with the intention that he or she will begin work as soon as possible.

Third, specifically with regard to agricultural loans, a consultant, who was formerly a Director of a local bank with first-hand experience of loans administration, has been engaged to review all the current agricultural loans and to advise as to the actions that may be necessary in each case. He has already reviewed many of the problem cases. I must emphasise at this point that whilst it is recognised that there are a number of problem cases - as the audit report showed - the majority of loans are not problematical.

Fourth, based on the consultant's findings and the accountant's advice, improved guidelines for financial administration are being developed to improve administration at all levels. Some aspects of these guidelines are already being acted upon.

Fifth, a general policy has been developed, guided by the consultant and accountant, to address the problem cases. In developing this policy the main considerations are -

The financial interests of the States must be safeguarded.

The prevailing financial difficulties for the industry and for individual businesses must be taken into account in deciding the way forward.

A mutually acceptable way forward must be sought for each of the problem cases.

The approach adopted in relation to individual cases must be consistent and even-handed.

The Committee will be considering this policy on Thursday of this week and, if it is adopted, it will be implemented immediately. This will involve actions for each individual problem case arising from the Agricultural Loans Scheme, the Small Business Scheme and from the so-called discretionary loans.

Sixth, in order to ensure that each and every recommendation from the loans audit is addressed, we are monitoring progress against an implementation plan with the objective that all the recommendations will have been addressed by April.

I would like to mention that we have discussed the actions and the policy I have described, with Senator Lakeman, who has taken a particular interest in this subject. We are grateful for his constructive comments and I think it fair to say that he was satisfied, as indeed I am, that the actions in hand are appropriate and will, in due course, resolve the problem cases. We have to accept, however, that a small number of cases have problems of long-standing and they will not be easily or quickly resolved.

Finally, whilst I believe the approach now being taken is both thorough and highly professional, it needs to be recognised that it is costly. Whatever savings may have been achieved in the past by not providing accountancy expertise in the Department will now appear to some people to have been a false economy.”

Projet de Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de la Trinité - P.7/2001

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de la Trinité.

Projet de Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de St. Jean - P.8/2001

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de St. Jean.

Projet de Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de St. Laurent - P.9/2001

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de St. Laurent.

Projet de Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de Ste. Marie - P.10/2001

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Loi (200-) concernant la Police Honorifique de Ste. Marie.

Machinery of Government: responsibility for implement-ation procedures - P.19/2001

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of Senator Stuart Syvret, agreed -

- (a) that no procedure for the implementation of changes to the machinery of Government should be put in place until such time as the States had decided whether, and to what extent, the recommendations of the Review Panel on the Machinery of Government should be accepted;
- (b) that prior States approval should be given to the implementation procedure of any changes to the machinery of Government and, in particular -
 - (i) the membership and terms of reference of any implementation group; and
 - (ii) the wording and timing of any form of opinion poll, ballot or referendum of the public.

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (38)

Senators

Horsfall, Le Maistre, Stein, Quérée, Bailhache, Syvret, Walker, Kinnard, Le Sueur, Le Claire.

Connétables

St. Peter, St. Helier, St. Martin, St. Ouen, Trinity, St. Saviour, St. Brelade, St. Lawrence, St. Mary, St. John.

Deputies

H. Baudains(C), S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Duhamel(S), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), St. Martin, St. John, L Main(H), Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Troy(B), Scott Warren(S), Le Hérissie (S), Fox(H), Bridge(H).

“Contre” (3)

Deputies

St. Peter, Dorey(H), Ozouf(H).

1 abstention.

Channel Islands Lottery: future format and allocation of profits - P.11/2001 - comments - P.11/2001

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Gambling Control Committee -

- (a) agreed in principle that the Channel Islands Lottery should have a varied format including -
 - (i) a combination of instant prize and numbers draw;
 - (ii) instant prizes only;
 - (iii) a numbers draw only;

and charged the Gambling Control Committee to bring forward for approval by the States the necessary legislation to give effect to the proposals;

- (b) agreed that the Jersey proportion of the profits of the Channel Islands Lottery during 2001 should be paid to the Association of Jersey Charities for the benefit of the community and the charitable needs of the Island.

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (9)

Senators

Horsfall, Stein, Quérée, Bailhache, Syvret, Norman, Kinnard, Le Sueur, Le Claire.

Connétables

St. Peter, St. Helier, St. Martin, St. Ouen, Trinity, St. Saviour, St. Brelade, St. Lawrence, St. Mary, St. John.

Deputies

H. Baudains(C), S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Duhamel(S), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), St. Martin, St. John, L Main(H), Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), St. Peter, St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Troy(B), Voisin(L), Scc Warren(S), Farnham(S), Le Hérissier(S), Fox(H), Bridge(H).

“Contre” (1)

Deputy

Dorey(H).

Draft Road Traffic (No. 51) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.13/2001

THE STATES, in pursuance of the powers conferred on them by the Order in Council of the twenty-sixth day of December 1851 and Article 49 of the Road Traffic (Jersey) Law 1956, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Road Traffic (No. 51) (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

Draft Terms of Employment (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.14/2001

THE STATES, by virtue and in exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the Order in Council of the fourteenth day of April 1884, made Regulations entitled the Terms of Employment (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

Commission Amicale: membership - P.15/2001

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of Senator Pierre François Horsfall agreed that the following members would be appointed to the Jersey delegation to the Commission Amicale -

Connétable Henry George Coutanche of St. Lawrence
(Education Committee);

Deputy Robin Charles Hacquoil of St. Peter
(Industries Committee).

Summerland site, Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier: use by States of Jersey Police- approval of drawing - P.16/2001

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Home Affairs Committee -

- (a) approved drawing No. 1596PL1 (revision B) showing the proposed internal alterations to the former Summerland premises, Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier, for occupation by the States of Jersey Police;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the said drawing on behalf of the States.

THE STATES rose at 15.52 p.m.

M.N. DE LA HAYE

Deputy Greffier of the States.