



THE STATES assembled on Tuesday, 30th June, 1981 at 10.15 a.m. under the Presidency of the Bailiff, Sir Frank Ereaut.

All members were present with the exception of –

Senator Mrs. Gwyneth Clare Huelin – out of the Island.

Peter Gorton Baker, Connétable of St. Helier – out of the Island.

Alfred Durell Le Brocq, Deputy of St. John – out of the Island.

Edgar John Becquet, Deputy of Trinity – out of the Island.

Prayers.

H.M. The Queen – reply to loyal message of thanksgiving.

The Bailiff informed the Assembly that a reply had been received to the loyal message of thanksgiving recently sent to Her Majesty The Queen, in which Her Majesty conveyed to the States Her thanks for their kind message of concern and admiration for which Her Majesty was extremely grateful.

Agricultural Statistics 1980.

The Agriculture and Fisheries Committee by Act dated 22nd June, 1981 presented to the States the Agricultural Statistics for 1980.

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

States of Jersey Fire Service Report 1980.

The Defence Committee by Act dated 26th June, 1981 presented to the States a Report on the administration of the States of Jersey Fire Service for the year ended 31st December, 1980.

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

Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited. Report on water demands and resources.

The Public Works Committee by Act dated 29th June, 1981 presented to the States a Report of the Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited on water demands and resources.

Matters lodged.

The following subjects were lodged “au Greffe” –

1. Draft Main Roads (Classification) (No. 24) (Jersey) Act, 198 . P.77/81.
Presented by the Public Works Committee.
2. Draft Policing of Parks (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.78/81.
Presented by the Public Works Committee.
3. Development of site at Prairie Bungalows, Gorey Village. P.79/81.
Presented by Senator John Philip de Carteret.
4. Transfer of administration of land and property on the Weighbridge Island site. P.80/81.
Presented by the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee.
The States decided to take this subject into consideration on 28th July, 1981.
5. Report on water demands and resources and compulsory purchase of land in Queen’s Valley. P.81/81.
Presented by the Public Works Committee. The States decided to take this subject into consideration on 28th July, 1981.

Draft Fishing Vessels (Manning) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 .

THE STATES acceded to the request of the President of the Harbours and Airport Committee that consideration of the draft Fishing Vessels (Manning) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 (P.71/81 – lodged on 16th June, 1981) be deferred from the present Sitting to a later date.

New Abattoir at La Collette – transfer of administration of site.

THE STATES acceded to the request of the President of the Harbours and Airport Committee that the Proposition regarding the transfer of administration of the site of the new Abattoir at La Collette (P.46/81 – lodged on 5th May, 1981) be considered on 28th July, 1981.

Queen's Valley: compulsory purchase. P.24/81 – withdrawn.

THE STATES noted that the Public Works Committee had withdrawn the Proposition regarding the compulsory purchase of land in Queen's Valley (P.24/81 – lodged on 10th March, 1981) having lodged a revised Proposition at the present Sitting (P.81/81).

Development of Field 110, Gorey Village. Questions and answers.

Senator John Philip de Carteret asked Senator Pierre François Horsfall, President of the Island Development Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Will the President give the States a résumé of the events leading up to the recent granting of a development permit in respect of the development of Field 110, Gorey Village, the original application for planning permission having been received at the Planning Office on 1st July, 1970?
2. Having regard to the undertakings given to the applicant at a joint meeting held in August, 1979 and attended by the Presidents of the Island Development and Housing Committees, together with the Chief Officers concerned, will the President give the States a full account of the reasons which led to such an inordinate delay in bringing this matter to a conclusion?
3. Can the President confirm that the Building Bye-Laws notices, referred to in Condition 1 on the Development Permit as ‘accompanying notices’ were not in fact enclosed with the permit and, if not, why this was not done?

4. Can the President also confirm that the necessary copies of stamped and approved drawings were not returned at the same time as the permit and, if so, why was this also not done?

The President of the Island Development Committee replied as follows –

- “1. Since the inception of a village development scheme at Gorey and the rezoning of the land by the States in August, 1970, it has always been accepted that Field 110 would be developed residentially providing it formed part of a comprehensive scheme. Subsequent decisions determined that the dwellings constructed should be basic ‘States loan’. Three previous Island Development Committees have considered the complex physical problems which have delayed the village development but as this is all history I do not propose, unless the House expresses otherwise, to waste public money in officer time researching the nine years previous to my Committee being formed. The file is available to Senator de Carteret at the Planning Office if he would like to read it for himself.
2. I must emphasise that my reply to the second question is only a résumé. It does not cover for example, other than an occasional passing reference, any discussions or agreements reached by the applicant with other States Committees, the majority of which we were not party to.

When I took office in 1979 my Committee was presented with an application to construct one dwelling on Field 110. It was rejected because it would have impeded the development of the land which had been zoned for comprehensive residential development. Gorey Village Developments Limited, whose beneficial owner is Mr. A.L. Sargeant, had then indicated to the Housing Officer a willingness to sell the field to the States providing he retained a single plot for his daughter. The offer to Housing was withdrawn. In June, 1979 my Committee was asked by Housing to acquire the land by compulsory purchase. We did not support that request. What we did was to initiate a joint meeting between the parties concerned in an attempt to reach an amicable solution. There followed discussion by the Company with the Housing Committee over the type and sale price of

the proposed houses and agreement was not reached until December, 1979.

In order to achieve a basic States loan scheme it was necessary for Housing to ask the States to agree that the cost of filling the site and the cost of providing offsite drainage be borne at public expense. The House agreed this in May, 1980 at a cost of £35,000. In order that the Resources Recovery Board could lay the sewers before the Department of Public Building and Works filled the site, my Committee had agreed the principle of these preliminary works the month before. Two planning applications were submitted in June, 1980. One for the sewers and the other a layout design. The sewers plan was approved in July and following changes to the house types and amendments to the layout, a planning permit was issued on 5th September.

Discussions took place between officers and architectural agents on the whole layout of the village development. A development application was made on 18th December, 1980. It became apparent that although it was known that Timber Frameform construction was to be used, the choice of external walling proposed on some dwellings did not meet the Bye-Laws relating to fire resistance and my Committee was not prepared to accept such a potentially dangerous situation. Unfortunately, it was not possible to change the construction because of the loadings imposed on the foundation raft which was due in part to inadequately-filled ground. This latter problem was resolved between the applicant and the Housing Committee.

A revised plan was submitted on 20th March, 1981 but the problems of the Fire Bye-Laws had still not been resolved. The Committee instructed the officers to adjust the proposed layout to ensure that the Fire Precaution provisions were met. 13 of the 24 sites had to be altered and the agent, having redrawn his site plan, re-submitted that drawing on 20th May. Having assured ourselves that the plan was now acceptable, we issued a development permit on 11th June with conditions.

3.&4.

I would like to answer questions 3 and 4 together. I can confirm that the notices and the house plans to which the Senator refers were not issued with the permit.

The original working drawings for each house type did not relate to either the amended layout plan or to the revised construction necessary to meet the fire precaution provisions mentioned previously. Thus, these drawings could not be stamped and returned as approved.

The Committee is fully aware of the urgency of providing additional homes in order to 'get the show on the road', we issued a permit only on the layout drawing to allow work to commence. To have been 100% correct we should have insisted upon *ALL* the plans being correctly submitted and detailed before issuing the permit but this would have caused further delay.

I think we adopted the most reasonable approach. The detailed house plans have now been submitted to the Planning Office and if they are technically correct then they will be approved and stamped accordingly. The inspection notices will also be sent with the plans."

**Jersey Electricity Company Limited – States shareholding.
Question and answer.**

Senator John Philip de Carteret asked Senator Ralph Vibert, President of the Legislation Committee, the following question –

"Is the President satisfied with and will he clarify the position which, under the provisions of the Electricity (Jersey) Law, 1937, appears to be that although the States are the Government of the Island and hold 51% of the ordinary shares of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited in the public interest, they are unable to influence the policies adopted and implemented by this monopoly as the Directors cannot be instructed by the States to vote in favour of a particular policy if that runs counter to the Directors' personal judgment?"

The President of the Legislation Committee replied as follows –

“I will first do my best to give the clarification requested. In the first place, in the context of the question, a basic misunderstanding is implicit in the statement that ‘the States are the Government of the Island’.

Except in a very loose and general sense, the States, that is the States Assembly, is not the Government of the Island any more than the House of Commons is the Government of the United Kingdom. This Assembly is part of the legislature of Jersey, the other part being Her Majesty in Council, in the same way as the House of Commons is part of the legislature of the United Kingdom. And, in the same way as the Government of the United Kingdom consists of the Ministers responsible for the various departments of State, so in Jersey is government vested in the various Committees. The powers conferred by the Housing (Jersey) Law, 1949, for example, are conferred on the Housing Committee, and on no other body. The Housing Committee is the government of the Island so far as the housing is concerned, though the Housing Committee, like any other, is controlled by the Assembly financially, and in the same sense that it may be replaced.

However, no member of the States, thank Heaven, can effectively be instructed by the Assembly to vote contrary to his personal judgement, whether as Director of the Board of the Jersey Electricity Company, or as a member of a States Committee. In some instances a member might be persuaded by the logic of the majority; and in others he might accept the majority view. But in no case can he be ‘instructed’ how to vote, to take the Senator’s term, except when he so chooses. Indeed, in many instances, it would be absolutely wrong for Members, who have been appointed to exercise their judgement for a particular purpose, to come to a decision contrary to what they sincerely believe. They have a duty to exercise *their* judgement, not robot-like, that of others. What the Assembly can do, in these instances, is to replace these Members, if it so wishes, with others holding what is regarded by the majority as the correct view.

In this particular respect, and it is to this that the question seems to refer, I can see no significant difference between the Board and a Committee.

However, in other respects there are, of course, substantial differences, arising inevitably from the position that the undertaking in question is not wholly owned and run by the States, as is by contrast Telecommunications, and that the undertaking is structured as a registered company in which the States have a majority interest in shareholding and a controlling interest in voting rights. These differences result in the affairs of the undertaking coming before the Assembly much less frequently than those of a Committee.

The relationship between the Board and the States cannot therefore be the same as that which exists between a Committee and the States. The greatest difference of course is financial, in that Telecommunications obtains its capital from the States, and pays its profits into States Revenues, whereas the Company raises and disposes of its own finance, subject to the controls imposed by the Law of 1937. There are other differences, but it is this financial independence which above all, in my view, distinguishes the position of the Board from that of a Committee, and reduces the level of States control.

This broad distinction must continue, as it seems to me, for so long as the present framework remains, that is until the States choose to exercise the powers conferred by Article 25 of the Law of 1937, to purchase the undertaking from the Company.

In reply to the question, whether I am satisfied with the present position, I would say that what really matters, in my view, is not so much the number of State debates on electricity, but the quality of the service to the public. Handsome is, for me in this connexion, as handsome does. I am satisfied that, within the present framework, the undertaking has been run with great efficiency by Directors, Managers and Staff for many years, and to the great benefit of the people of this Island, and I see no reason to contemplate a change.”

Restriction of Island’s resident population. Question and answer.

Deputy Mrs. Helen Baker of St. Martin asked Deputy Sir Robert Marett of St. Brelade, President of the Policy Advisory Committee, the following question –

“Whereas the States by resolutions have made and repeated the commitment to limit the population and in view of the recent statement of the Board of Directors of the Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited implying that doubt had been felt in recent years as to the continued reliability of the present policy of the States for the restriction of the Island’s resident population, would the President affirm his Committee’s continuing observances of that policy in general terms?”

The President of the Policy Advisory Committee replied as follows –

“1. On 16th October, 1979, the States agreed that Committees of the States should pursue policies designed to limit the annual net rate of immigration to no more than 250 persons.

2. This is still the policy of the States. The Policy Advisory Committee, under my Presidency, has no intention at the present time of putting forward any new proposals to the House on this subject.

3. Deputy Mrs. Baker in her question refers to a recent report of the Board of Directors of the Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited, implying that doubt had been felt in recent years as to the continued reliability of the present policy of the States for the restriction of the Island’s resident population.

4. On page 4 of this report, dated May, 1981, the Directors have this to say on the subject of immigration restraint. I quote –

‘The forecasts of demand (for water) should not lend too much credence to the declared intention of the States to limit population to 80,000. Few would disagree at this time that to exceed this maximum is undesirable, but policies change, and may do so quite quickly. To put the population density into perspective the reader should remember that Manhattan Island has a population of 2½ million in an area the same size as Jersey.’

5. The comparison between the population problems of Manhattan Island and Jersey is laughable, and no doubt meant to shock. I would only remind the authors of this sentence that, according to my best information, the City of New York is

broke, while Jersey is still quite prosperous. Not a good advertisement for unlimited population growth!

6. However the suggestion that the immigration policy of the States 'may change, and change quite quickly', is to be disturbing.

7. I can only say, in reply to Deputy Mrs. Baker, that it is entirely up to the members of this House, and future elected assemblies of the States, to stand firm on immigration policy, and not allow the predictions of the Waterworks Company to come to pass."

**Alternative sources of fuel for generating electricity – report.
Question and answer.**

Senator John Philip de Carteret asked Senator Ralph Vibert, President of the Finance and Economics Committee, the following question –

“Will the President confirm that, notwithstanding the impression given in certain statements recently made on behalf of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited and having regard to the outcome of the debate on the electrical interconnection with France, the Finance and Economics Committee will appoint an independent firm of consulting engineers for the purpose of preparing the comprehensive report which the States require to be produced so that the report will be completely objective and impartial in its conclusions?”

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

“My Committee has not yet had the opportunity of considering how best to prepare the report required by the recent decision of the States. The employment of a consultant or consultants on one or several aspects of the matter will clearly be a possibility, but I would not wish to anticipate the deliberations of the Committee at this stage.

I can, however, say that it is hoped to arrange a meeting with Sir Derek Ezra, Chairman of the National Coal Board, as suggested during the debate, in the course of his forthcoming visit to the Island.”

Fort Regent – Cost of Gloucester Hall contract. Statement.

The President of the Fort Regent Development Committee made a statement in the following terms –

“This contract was let for commencement in February 1977 at a price of £1,175,000 and was due for completion in May 1978. The contract period was extended to July 1978 when a supplemental contract was entered into in November 1977 for the provision of squash courts at a cost of £124,000.

When the present Committee took office in December, 1978 the works were in effect some way short of completion and it soon transpired that a proposed handover in February 1979 would be unattainable.

The official opening had been performed by the Duke of Gloucester in September 1978 for which purpose it was necessary for the contractor to interrupt his programme of work and incur additional expense. Completion followed in stages, architect’s certificates of partial completion issuing in July and October 1979. The Architect’s final certificate of Practical Completion did not, however, issue until March 1980.

The increase in the original Contract Prize can be attributed to a number of factors –

- (a) many alterations, variations and modifications to the original design drawings became necessary in order to meet the practical requirements of, and to add essential facilities to achieve, a multi-purpose complex capable of being used both by small numbers at a time for various sports and, on other occasions, by large groups for exhibitions, conferences and concerts. Examples are the sprinkler system, maintained lighting and other fire precautions to meet requirements that followed in the wake of the Summerland Disaster enquiry, solid but removable arena walls, improved sound systems, sound separation between the Gloucester Hall and the Piazza, a more extensive heating system, a disabled persons lift etc. etc.

- (b) additional facilities were added to the main contract, e.g. the four new squash courts by the supplemental contract to which I have already referred;
- (c) inflation in the last four years which seems to have been particularly significant in the building sphere. For comparison, the price of a newly constructed house in the basic loans scheme has been allowed to rise from £16,000 to £35,000 – a remarkably similar percentage increase to the overall price of the Gloucester Hall and ancillary amounts. In a not dissimilar period the cost of the Harrogate Conference Centre, with a maximum seating capacity in its largest auditorium of 2,000 has risen from £7m to £25m and I understand is not finished yet;
- (d) an added factor has been the problem of adopting a 150 year old fortress and in the process using outside walls for inside use. In my own Committee's time a sum of not less than £50,000 has had to be spent on curing leaks from the old rampart walls;
- (e) in my opinion the R.I.B.A. Form of Contract leaves much to be desired. Under the existing Form – as used for every States' building contract – the employing Committee is bound to pay all increased costs whether arising from variations required by the employer, simple inflation or other increased costs during the contract period, or added inflation and increased costs arising during an unduly extended period. I understand that a new form of contract is under consideration but that the question of payment for increased costs on the overrun of a contract is a controversial one. It must be said that some delays on the Gloucester Hall contract were inevitable as I know from my earliest days as President in 1979 occurred with disruption caused by the bitterest winter since the Twenties and the bitterest industrial atmosphere on record in the United Kingdom. Consideration was given to the possibility of a counterclaim against the Contractor but any move in that direction had to be tempered with a sense of the practical difficulties and, in the final analysis, in close consultation with the Attorney General the Committee accepted that the overall settlement which was reached by negotiation was to be

preferred to prolonged and expensive arbitration. The final chapter of this contract and all its ramifications have all but been closed off.

Quite obviously this has not been an easy contract. However, my Committee is confident in the assertion that the Island now has a Centre of which it can be justly proud and which serves many purposes at a reasonable cost. Generous compliments are paid to the Committee and the Administration by the great majority of those who see and use Fort Regent whether for sports or otherwise. In particular, the Gloucester Hall has proved popular with the organisers of Exhibitions and their exhibitors, with top artistes who prove their acceptance of the Gloucester Hall by returning from year to year, and perhaps most important in terms of their potential contribution of many millions of pounds to our economy, with Conference Organisers such as the Soroptimists who last year brought 2,000 delegates and many other supporters to the Island and the National Union of Teachers, Royal Air Force Association, Royal Antediluvian Order of Buffaloes and several other Conference organisers who have committed their Conferences to Jersey because of the facilities that can be offered in the Gloucester Hall.”

Supplementary and Additional Votes of Credit.

THE STATES considered Acts of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 17th June, 1981 presenting Acts of the undermentioned Committees and, acceding to the requests contained therein, granted to the said Committees supplementary (S) and additional (A) votes of credit out of the General Reserve as follows –

(C) denotes Capital votes of credit.

	S	A
	£	£
<i>Finance and Economics Committee</i>		
Viscounts Department – 0337		
Désastres – investigation expenses	<u>10,000</u>	
Carried forward	10,000	

	S £	A £	
brought forward	10,000		
<i>Finance and Economics Committee</i>			
<i>[cont'd.] –</i>			
Miscellaneous –			
0602 Commonwealth Parlia- mentary Association.....	4,000		
0614 States' Members income supplement.....	10,300		
0618 Royal Wedding Cele- brations.....		20,000	
Establishment of H.E. the Lieutenant-Governor –			
0702A Premises	300		
0705 Administration	1,100		
C006 Capital – Construction of a Customs Examination Shed at No. 2 Berth, Albert Quay, Port of St. Helier	_____	<u>30,000</u>	(C)
Total Request £75,700	<u>25,700</u>	<u>50,000</u>	
<i>Public Works Committee</i>			
Dutch Elm Disease Campaign			
2043 Supplies and Services.....	50,000		
Public Buildings – 2082 Premises	<u>18,000</u>		
Total Request	<u>68,000</u>		
<i>Education Committee</i>			
General Education Services –			
3102 John Lobb Memorial Trust – Contribution.....		5,000	
3103 Advisory Training Council....		15,000	
The Youth Service –			
3188A Grants to voluntary clubs for capital works.....	50,000		
C0567 Capital – St. John's School Extensions	29,000	(C)	
C0594 Capital – Primary Schools Modernisation, St. Martin's, Trinity and St. Saviour Schools.....	110,000	(C)	
C0596 Capital – Le Rocquier School – caretaker's house.....	<u>4,500</u>	(C)	_____
Total Request £213,500	<u>193,500</u>	<u>20,000</u>	

	S £	A £
<i>Public Health Committee</i>		
Grants – 3251 Jersey Family Welfare Centre	<u>30,000</u>	
Total Request	<u>30,000</u>	
<i>Agriculture and Fisheries Committee</i>		
Subsidies and Grants –		
4138 Compensation – animal and plant health.....	10,300	
C0707 Capital – Provision of Slaughterhouse at La Collette	<u>74,500</u>	(C)
Total Request	<u>84,800</u>	
<i>Cottage Homes Committee</i>		
4902 Premises	<u>11,800</u>	
Total Request	<u>11,800</u>	
<i>Elizabeth House Committee</i>		
5302 Premises	<u>1,500</u>	
Total Request	<u>1,500</u>	
<i>Housing Committee</i>		
Administration – 5043 Supplies and Services	15,000	
Miscellaneous –		
5425 Maufant Vineries Offsite Drainage Costs and Accrued Interest.....		60,000
C1141 Capital – Landscaping at Clos des Sables	<u>17,000</u>	(C) _____
Total Request £92,000	<u>32,000</u>	<u>60,000</u>

	S	A
	£	£

Fort Regent Development Committee

C1204 Capital – General Development 1977 (£250,000 granted out of Contingencies Vote by Act of States dated 12th May, 1981).	<u>356,300</u>	(C)
Total Request	<u>356,300</u>	

Telecommunications Board

4500 Operating Expenses.....	<u>60,000</u>
Total Request	<u>60,000</u>

The total requests granted for the June Supply Day amounted to £993,600.

Agriculture and Fisheries Committee – oil subsidy for glasshouse growers. Deferred Supply.

THE STATES deferred consideration of the request of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee for an additional vote of credit in the sum of £210,000 for an oil subsidy to compensate, temporarily, glasshouse growers, until 28th July, 1981, when the subject would be debated together with a Proposition relative thereto (P.74/81 – lodged on 23rd June, 1981).

Le Geyt Centre Workshop. Deferred Supply.

THE STATES deferred consideration of the request of the Public Health Committee for a supplementary vote of credit in the sum of £11,200 for Le Geyt Centre Workshop (C.0651).

The Proposition relative thereto was lodged “au Greffe” by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Road Vehicles (Registration and Licensing) (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Order, 1981 – proposed amendment.

THE STATES rejected a Proposition of Deputy Terence John Le Main of St. Helier that the Road Vehicles (Registration and Licensing) (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Order, 1981, be annulled.

Rouge Bouillon School Building – transfer of administration.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Education Committee, approved the transfer to the Defence Committee from the Education Committee, with effect from 1st October, 1981, of the administration of the Rouge Bouillon School Building required to provide additional accommodation for the States of Jersey Police.

Agricultural Loans and Guarantees Advisory Board – appointment of member.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, approved the appointment of Mr. David John Le Marquand as a member of the Agricultural Loans and Guarantees Advisory Board.

Merchant Shipping (Deck Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 1981.

THE STATES, by virtue and in exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the Order in Council of the twenty-eighth day of March, 1771, made Regulations entitled the Merchant Shipping (Deck Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 1981.

Merchant Shipping (Marine Engineer Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 1981.

THE STATES, by virtue and in exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the Order in Council of the twenty-eighth day of March, 1771, made Regulations entitled the Merchant Shipping (Marine Engineer Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 1981.

Administrative Decisions (Review) (Jersey) Law, 1981.

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Administrative Decisions (Review) (Jersey) Law, 1981.

Suspension of Standing Order No. 18

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Housing Committee, suspended Standing Order No. 18 in order to allow the Proposition of that Committee regarding further development proposals for 1982 and the Maufant Vineries development off-site drainage costs to be considered at the present Sitting.

Housing Committee – further development proposals for 1982.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Housing Committee, approved in principle the Committee's further development proposals for the year 1982 as follows –

subject to the necessary finance being made available in the Budget, the development of the Balmain Nurseries site with approximately 20 States rental dwellings and 20 dwellings for sale under the States Loan Scheme, principally to existing States tenants OR in the event of the finance not being made available, the development of the site with approximately 40 dwellings for sale under the States Loan Scheme, principally to existing States tenants.

Maufant Vineries Development off-site drainage costs.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Housing Committee –

1. agreed that the public should reimburse Les Paturages Limited with the cost of the provision of off-site drainage in respect of the development of land to the south of Fields 105 and 106, Maufant, St. Saviour, together with accrued interest thereon, at a rate to be agreed by the Treasurer of the States;
2. agreed that the proportionate refunds should be made as and when the dwellings in each phase of the development are completed and sold within the Basic States' Loan limit;
3. authorised the Treasurer of the States to make the appropriate payments when they became due.

Deputy Brian Edward Troy of St. Saviour, having declared an interest in the matter, withdrew from the Chamber.

THE STATES rose at 3.20 p.m.

R.S. GRAY,

Deputy Greffier of the States.