

**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,  
27th March 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 -

Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire - ill  
Malcolm Cedric Pollard, Connétable of St. Peter - ill  
Stanley John Le Cornu, Connétable of St. Clement - ill  
Celia Joyce Scott Warren, Deputy of St. Saviour - ill.

Prayers

#### **Liberation Day - extraordinary meeting of the States**

The Bailiff re-affirmed that an extraordinary meeting of the States would take place on 9th May 2001 on the occasion of the 56th anniversary of the Liberation, when Senator P.F. Horsfall, O.B.E. would give an address, and members would then proceed to Liberation Square to participate in a Service of Thanksgiving.

#### **Subordinate legislation tabled**

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely -

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 4) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 44/2001.**

**Education (Registration of Non-provided Schools - Fee) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 45/2001.**

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 5) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 46/2001.**

**Rabies (Importation of Dogs, Cats and Other Mammals) (Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 47/2001.**

**Pet Travel Scheme (Pilot Arrangements) (Amendment No. 2) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 48/2001.**

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 6) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 49/2001.**

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 7) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 50/2001.**

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 8) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 51/2001.**

**Diseases of Animals (Foot and Mouth - Restrictions No. 9) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 52/2001.**

**Airport Dues (Tariff) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 53/2001.**

## **Gambling Control Committee - appointment of President**

THE STATES appointed Deputy Lyndon John Farnham of St. Saviour as President of the Gambling Control Committee.

### **Matter presented**

The following matter was presented to the States -

#### **Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000 - 2020 - P.51/2001.**

Presented by the Planning and Environment Committee.

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of Senator P.F. Horsfall, O.B.E., referred the Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000-2020 to the Public Services Committee for a report.

Senator Nigel Lewis Quérée, having declared an interest in the matter, withdrew from the Chamber prior to the voting on this matter.

Members present voted as follows -

**“Pour” (28)**

#### **Senators**

Horsfall, Le Maistre, Stein, Syvret, Walker, Le Sueur.

#### **Connétables**

St. Helier, St. Ouen, St. Brelade.

#### **Deputies**

H. Baudains(C), St. Mary, Trinity, Duhamel(S), Routier(H), Grouville, Huet(H), St. Martin, St. John Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), St. Peter, St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Dorey(H), Troy(B), Le Hérisier(S), Ozon(H), Martin(H).

**“Contre” (20)**

#### **Senators**

Bailhache, Norman, Kinnard, Lakeman.

#### **Connétables**

Grouville, St. Martin, Trinity, St. Saviour, St. Lawrence, St. Mary, St. John.

#### **Deputies**

S. Baudains(H), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), Le Main(H), Dubras(L), Voisin(L), Farnham(S), Fox(H), Bridge(H).

### **Matters lodged**

The following matters were lodged “au Greffe” -

**Financial assistance for the cost of ophthalmic and dental care for persons aged over 65: proposed**

**scheme - P.49/2001.**

Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee.

**Draft Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 200- P.50/2001.**

Presented by the Planning and Environment Committee.

The following matters were lodged on 20th March 2001 -

**Aircraft noise zones: revision - P.45/2001.**

Presented by the Planning and Environment Committee.

**Tenants and Lodgers: return of deposits - P.46/2001.**

Presented by Senator C. Stein.

**Draft Milk (Sale to Special Classes) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.47/2001.**

Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee.

**Draft Airport Dues (Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Law 200 P.48/2001.**

Presented by the Harbours and Airport Committee.

**Arrangement of public business for the next meeting on 3rd April 2001 - deferral**

THE STATES decided that there was insufficient public business requested for 3rd April 2001, and accordingly decided not to meet on that day, and agreed that the following matters should be considered at the next meeting on 24th April 2001 -

Draft Companies (Amendment No. 6) (Jersey) Law 200- P.29/2001.

Lodged: 20th February 2001.

*Finance and Economics Committee.*

Draft Financial Services Commission (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Law 200 (P.39/2001).

Lodged: 13th March 2001 - P.39/2001.

*Finance and Economics Committee.*

Draft Financial Services Commission (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Law 200 (P.39/2001): amendment - P.39/2001 Amd.

Lodged: 13th March 2001.

*Deputy J.L. Dorey of St. Helier.*

Aircraft noise zones: revision - P.45/2001.

Lodged: 20th March 2001.

*Planning and Environment Committee.*

Draft Milk (Sale to Special Classes) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.47/2001.

Lodged: 20th March 2001.

*Employment and Social Security Committee.*

Draft Airport Dues (Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Law 200 P.48/2001.

Lodged: 20th March 2001.

*Harbours and Airport Committee.*

Financial assistance for the cost of ophthalmic and dental care for persons aged over 65: proposed scheme - P.49/2001.

Lodged: 27th March 2001.

*Employment and Social Security Committee.*

Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000 - 2020 - P.51/2001.  
Lodged: 27th March 2001.  
*Planning and Environment Committee.*

THE STATES acceded to the request of Deputy A.J. Layzell of St. Brelade, Vice-President of the Planning and Environment Committee, that the proposition regarding Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000 - 2020 (P.51/2001 lodged "au Greffe" on 27th March 2001) be considered as the first item of matters lodged "au Greffe" listed under Public Business on 24th April 2001. The President of the Public Services Committee undertook to make available the report of that Committee prior to that date.

### **Services and allowances for the over 60's - questions and answers (Tape No. 640)**

Senator Corrie Stein asked Senator Terence Augustine Le Sueur President of the Employment and Social Security Committee, the following questions -

- “1. Would the President explain to members why the £680,000, specifically budgeted to provide services to the over 65's, has not yet been committed bearing in mind that £530,000 came from the promised television licences and £150,000 has already been allocated to the Committee's Budget in 2001?
2. Would the President advise members -
  - (a) how this capital sum will be allocated to each of the various services, like chiropody, dental care and optical care?
  - (b) at what level the income ceiling will be placed?
  - (c) whether he can assure members that the total amount of £680,000 will be used this year in the way it was intended?
3. Does the Committee have any concerns that a dangerous precedent could be set by allocating £680,000 towards eye, chiropody and dental care for the elderly to a non-governmental, non-professional body which may not be perceived to be independent?
4. Could the President confirm that the States' Auditors would be content with such an arrangement?
5. In the United Kingdom senior citizens receive a £200 winter allowance for heating, free health care, and those over 75 years of age qualify for a free television licence. Would the President advise members whether the Committee is prepared to introduce these or similar benefits for the Island's senior citizens so that they will not be disadvantaged in comparison with their United Kingdom peer group?”

The President of the Employment and Social Security Committee replied as follows -

- “1. Up until last November when the States decided not to pay for TV licences for the over 65's, the Health and Social Services and Employment and Social Security Committees had developed some ideas for use of a sum of £150,000 that had been promised for healthcare. These ideas were shared with the Senior Citizens' Association. Following the Budget debate last December when the sum of £680,000 was finally approved for health care purposes, discussions took place with representatives of the Senior Citizens' Association when different suggestions were made for targeting this money. Both Committees worked quickly together after Christmas to consider the alternatives and then discuss issues with the Association and the Comité des Connétables. Whilst all these discussions were going on, work on the method of administration was being undertaken. In essence, all this has been achieved and agreement reached between all the parties, a report and proposition and Service Level Agreement drafted in just over two months. It has to be recognised that this money is not large

in relation to the pensioner population so decisions have been difficult, trying to target the right groups in the best way but not spread the money too thinly nor to end up with a complicated scheme to administer.

The report is about to be lodged through the Finance and Economics Committee, with their comments to follow so that a debate can take place on 24th April, 2001.

- 2.(a) The proposal, which of course will be subject to States approval, is that the money will initially be targeted to a group of people over the age of 65 years, resident in Jersey for five years -

giving financial assistance of up to £15 for an eye test and £45 for spectacles every two years, and

up to £22 for a dental check and £150 for dental treatment each year.

- (b) The proposals are that the scheme will be available to those -

with income above the Health Insurance Exemption level (the Welfare System will cover those up to and including HIE level)

but below the tax threshold.

In very broad terms, this means single pensioners with incomes of approximately between £7,000 and £12,000 a year and between £12,000 - £19,250 for a couple.

It is also proposed that pensioners with assets (other than their own home) and capital above £30,000 for a married couple and £15,000 for a single pensioner will not be eligible for a subsidy.

- (c) It is impossible to predict the rate of take-up of any benefit. The proposals are based on an estimated take-up of around 3,200 pensioners from a potential 5,500 who are likely to be in this category.

It is also difficult to predict whether everyone who claims will use up their full entitlement. The rate at which dentists and opticians can absorb extra work is also outside our control. Furthermore, the scheme is essentially one that spans a two year period. However, members can be assured that the money will be ring fenced and only used for this purpose.

3. Both I and the President of the Health and Social Services Committee have had a number of meetings with representatives of Age Concern and have prepared a Service Level Agreement to ensure that the scheme is run professionally in accordance with good practice. Three of the main conditions of any agreement would be that -

it is administered efficiently and effectively in line with the parameters agreed by the States;

the administering organisation is perceived to be objective and performs its role in a professional, timely and confidential manner;

there is a high take up of subsidies amongst the target group.

I would add that it will be for the States to decide on this matter and, if the outsourcing of the administration to Age Concern were to be approved, it would only be on a pilot basis, initially for one year. The other options are described in the report which the States' members now have but basically the scheme could be outsourced off Island or possibly administered by the Department but the latter would have staffing implications.

4. The Service Level Agreement is based on a format which has already been through the States' Auditors and we have sent a copy of the current draft to them for comment. I am happy to provide any States' Member with a copy of the current draft which has been seen by both my Committee and

the Health and Social Services Committee .

5. As recently as November of last year the States agreed not to provide free, or subsidise the cost of, television licences for senior citizens. At the same time the States agreed to make funds available to assist with the health care needs of senior citizens, and an aggregate sum of £680,000 was made available in the 2001 budget for this purpose. Proposals for the use and dissemination of these funds have been lodged by my Committee, for debate once they have been considered by the Finance and Economics Committee.

As regards a winter fuel allowance, this is already available to our most vulnerable pensioners in receipt of Welfare Grants. Parishes provide help towards the extra cost of heating during periods of very cold weather. I am advised that the Parishes use a formula based on winter temperatures and wind speeds. Using last winter's temperatures and wind speeds as an example, the fuel allowance paid would have totalled £124 for 1999/2000 and £137 for 2000/2001. At the present time my Committee has no plans to bring forward proposals for a winter fuel allowance for other groups of pensioners.

The introduction of such an allowance, or any such additional benefit, should be viewed against a background of a much lower rate of Old Age Pension in the United Kingdom, a rate which is only adjusted in line with the retail price index, whereas that in Jersey is now uprated in line with the percentage increase in average earnings. The effect is that in Jersey the standard rate of pension for a married couple is currently £198.38 per week or £10,316 a year, compared with £115.90 per week or £6,027 a year in the United Kingdom. I would stress that this UK rate applies from this April. Our pensioners will get a further increase this October. In addition, Jersey pensioners receive Christmas bonuses of £65.00 a year whereas the UK one has been pegged at £10.00 for many years now.

The current policy of the Employment and Social Security Committee, which is derived from the last review of the Social Security System, is to maintain the real value of pensions rather than allow them to be devalued and then top them up with additional allowances. This only serves to increase administration costs and reduce the amount of money available for redistribution.

With regard to Health Care, the current health insurance scheme covers, on average, 60 per cent of the cost of visits to the doctor and any prescriptions. The HIE scheme ensures that these services and prescriptions are free for our most needy citizens. The Parish Welfare system covers dental, optical and chiropody costs for those up to HIE level and we are proposing to give some support for dental and optical costs to pensioners above HIE level but below the tax threshold with the £680,000 already voted by the States. Of course, the hospital services are largely free.

The Senator, and members, should also appreciate that other sectors of our community may also be disadvantaged. My Committee, and indeed the States, owe a duty of care to all those groups, as well as to senior citizens. From my Committee's perspective, it is in the area of health care that we believe priority should be given for any additional funding in future. The £680,000 already voted for this year will provide some support for dental and optical costs for around 3,200 pensioners but we believe that additional funding will be needed to expand such a scheme across other lower income groups and improve access to health care generally.

Equally important will be the issue of sustainability of the whole health and residential care system over the demographic bulge of pensioners. We have been working with the Health and Social Services Committees in recent years to improve services and address sustainability issues.

Discussions are currently underway with the Finance and Economics Committee on the terms of reference for a review of the funding of health care in the Island. In the meantime we are continuing to work with others on a Low Income Support system which will attempt to ensure that pensioners, as well as others, receive a minimum income which relates to their needs.

Overall, there are many differences between Jersey and the UK which makes comparison difficult.

For example, tax thresholds here are much higher than those in the UK.

In our view, as evidenced by these figures, Jersey's senior citizens are **not** disadvantaged in comparison with their UK peer group in respect of pensions and allowances. Taking into account any Christmas bonus, winter fuel **and** TV licence support, a couple, over 75, can get a maximum of £10,381 a year in Jersey compared with £6,341 in the UK, around 61 per cent more. For completeness, a single pensioner over 75 could get £6,278 as opposed to £4,084 in the UK from April, some 65 per cent more."

**Purchase of health care services from France and hospital waiting lists - questions and answers** (Tape No. 640)

Senator Corrie Stein asked Senator Stuart Syvret, President of the Health and Social Services Committee, the following questions -

- “1. In answer to my question on 18th July 2000, the President advised that an approach would be made to France to investigate the purchase of some of that country's health care services. In view of the fact that the OECD announced last year that France has the best health care in the world, would the President -
  - (a) advise members of the progress the Committee has made in making enquiries of the French health service about buying some of its health care services?
  - (b) if enquiries have been made, when did he or his officers first make contact?
  - (c) advise members of the regions in France or elsewhere with which contact has been made?
2. On 18th July 2000, I asked the following questions of the President of the Health and Social Services Committee -

“Would the President advise members -

- (a) of the number of patients on the waiting list and the length of time they have been waiting to see the following consultants or service?
  - (i) orthopaedics;
  - (ii) gynaecology;
  - (iii) urology;
  - (iv) ophthalmology;
  - (v) physiotherapy;

and would he also give the number of patients on those same specialities who are waiting for operations following their first visit and how long do they have to wait.”

Would the President -

- (a) give updated figures, calculated in the same way as for the answers to my questions on 18th July, and with the July figures shown in brackets so that direct comparison can be made?
- (b) advise what action has been taken since July to bring these figures down?

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

- “1. For ease of reference, I quote my previous answer to Senator Stein’s question of 18th July 2000 in regard to French health care facilities.

‘The OECD findings to which the Senator refers are, I understand, contentious and have been disputed by health care professionals. However, as I explained in response to the first question, my Committee is currently preparing its strategic plan for the period 2001 - 2005 and it is our intention to consider whether a closer relationship with France has merit. Notwithstanding the close proximity of France, Jersey has long established relationships with the UK National Health Service and the Reciprocal Health Agreement is of great importance in making comprehensive health care available for the people of Jersey, particularly the supra-specialist services which a small Island such as ours could not provide for itself. Any additional service which might be secured from France will require a separate funding source’.

- (a) Initial investigations into the French health care facilities, which are reasonably accessible to Jersey, began in November 2000. An exploratory report considers the types of facilities, the services they provide, their location and transport links;
- (b) no contact has been made with French health care providers, as we are not yet in a position to contract services from them should we wish to do so. The earliest that that could possibly happen would be April 2003 and before that much thought must be given to the logistics of moving any of our established supra-specialist support from the UK;
- (c) the intelligence that has been gathered relates to the Paris, Normandy and Brittany regions of France. That is, those areas with whom we have, or might secure, reasonable transport links.

- 2.(a) In my reply to the question, each of the figures is given for March 2001, followed as requested by a comparison with the corresponding figure for July 2000.

**(i) The waiting times in respect of orthopaedic surgery are as follows -**

There are currently 524 patients listed for surgery (compared to 526 in July 2000); 299 patients have been waiting less than three months (compared to 272), 156 for more than three months but less than six months (compared to 149), 36 less than nine months (compared to 63) and 33 have waited over nine months (compared to 42).

There are 503 people awaiting an outpatient consultation (compared to 417 in July 2000) and the waiting times vary between one and two weeks for urgent referrals, whilst other patients for non-urgent consultation can wait up to 22-24 weeks (compared to 20-21 weeks)

**(ii) The waiting times in respect of gynaecological surgery are as follows -**

There are currently 125 patients listed for surgery (compared to 131 in July 2000); 102 patients have been waiting less than three months (compared to 108), 18 for more than three months but less than six months (compared to 15), five more than six months but less than nine months (compared to six) and no patients waiting over nine months (compared to two).

There are 246 people awaiting an outpatient consultation (compared to 207) and the waiting times varies between one - two weeks for urgent referrals, whilst other patients for non-urgent consultation can wait up to 11-14 weeks (compared to five - six).



**(iii) The waiting times in respect of urological surgery are as follows -**

There are currently 50 patients listed for surgery (compared to 33 in July 2000); 48 patients have been waiting less than three months (compared to 29), two for more than three months but less than six months (compared to three) and there are no patients currently waiting over six months (compared to one).

There are 181 people awaiting an outpatient consultation (compared to 158) and the waiting times varies between one - two weeks for urgent referrals, whilst other patients for non-urgent consultation can wait up to 24 weeks (compared to 21 weeks).

**(iv) The waiting times in respect of ophthalmic surgery are as follows -**

There are currently 191 patients listed for surgery (compared to 132 in July 2000); 111 patients have been waiting less than three months (compared to 50), 74 for more than three months but less than six months (compared to 36), six patients waiting more than six months but less than nine months (compared to 40) and there are no patients currently waiting over nine months (compared to six).

There are 373 people awaiting an outpatient consultation (compared to 232) and the waiting times varies between one - two weeks for urgent referrals, whilst other patients for non-urgent consultation can wait up to 27 weeks (compared to nine - 19 weeks).

**(v) The waiting times in respect of physiotherapy are as follows -**

Four categories of service are provided. Accident and Emergency patients are seen immediately or within 36 hours of referral. Patients newly out of plaster are seen on the same day. The orthopaedic fast track service currently has 16 patients (compared to 24 in July 2000) who will be treated within three - four weeks (which compares with three - four weeks also in July 2000). There are currently 15 non-urgent physiotherapy patients (compared to 19) who will be seen within a one - two week period (compared to one - three weeks in July 2000);

- (b) a number of initiatives have been pursued, since July 2000, to improve waiting times wherever possible. In addition to the specific measures, which I will outline later, I can confirm that action has been taken to make more effective use of beds within the service. This has involved improved co-ordination of admission and discharge arrangements, as well as contracting some convalescent beds, over the winter period, from the private sector.

In consequence, we have succeeded in significantly reducing the number of medical patients who would otherwise have spilled-over into surgical beds and have come through the period of winter pressures without cancelling elective surgical procedures because of a lack of beds.

A medical manpower strategy has been completed and I can confirm that, in order to continue to achieve acceptable waiting times, all the specialities which have been identified by the Senator will require additional manpower. My Committee is due to consider this Medical Manpower strategy at an all-day meeting in May and there is no doubt that significant additional resources will need to be sought. I hope that my Committee will be able to rely on this Assembly to support these developments when it considers the Health and Social Services strategy for 2001-2005.

The position, in relation to the individual specialties identified is as follows -

**Orthopaedics**

A comparison of the current figures with the figures in July 2000 represents an approximate improvement of 35 per cent in the number of people waiting over six months for non-urgent

surgery.

The waiting time for non-urgent out-patient appointments has increased by 20 per cent however, this is because the number of outpatient consultations has been increasing throughout the year, and January 2001 showed a 15 per cent rise in the number of out-patient attendances compared with the same period last year.

### **Gynaecology**

A comparison of the current figures with the figures in July 2000 represents a five per cent reduction in the number of patients waiting for non-urgent surgery and an overall improvement in waiting list times.

The 19 per cent increase in the number of out-patients waiting is due to an overall increase in number of out-patient referrals.

### **Urology**

A comparison of the current numbers with the figures in July 2000 indicates a 51 per cent increase to 50 patients currently on the waiting list for non-urgent surgery, but only two of these are waiting over three months.

There is also a 15 per cent rise in the number of people awaiting out-patient consultations and an increase in the length of time they wait for an appointment. In order to reduce these waiting times, we are currently re-allocating general surgery referrals between both consultants in this Department. The Out-Patients Department is also in the early stages of developing a new impotence service which will alleviate some pressure from this service.

### **Ophthalmology**

A comparison of the current figures with those of July 2000 shows a 45 per cent increase in the number of patients waiting for surgery, but the number of people waiting six months or over has been improved by 87 per cent to only six patients.

There is also a 61 per cent increase in the number of people awaiting out-patient appointments and an increase in the length of time they have to wait. In response to this significant rise in workload, my Committee has recently approved the appointment of a locum ophthalmic doctor, pending the creation of a substantive post, to support the Ophthalmic Service particularly in the outpatient setting.

### **Physiotherapy**

Whilst there is no significant difference in this service, the waiting times for the fast-track service will fluctuate depending upon the level of referrals. A back exercise group is being piloted to improve the efficiency and throughput of this significant group of patients.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the medical, nursing and other clinical staff for continuing to work harder to achieve even higher levels of activity. Over the last year, total out-patients attendances have increased by six per cent, and seven per cent more in-patients were admitted to the General Hospital. But the number of patients referred for treatment continues to rise and although we have been able to contain, and in many areas reduce waiting times for now, the only solution in the long-term is further significant investment in the health service.”

The Deputy of St. John asked Deputy Philip Francis Cyril Ozouf of St. Helier, President of the Etat Civil Committee, the following question -

- “(a) Would the President confirm that all households had received a census form by Sunday 11th March in view of the fact that the Committee emphasized that the form had to be completed that day?
- (b) if the answer to (a) is in the negative, would the President explain why?
- (c) given that many forms were returned prior to census day, would the President advise whether the Committee is satisfied that the information supplied in the forms will be an accurate record?
- (d) would the President explain to members how the enumerators were recruited and confirm the remuneration offered and the number of hours’ work required, including attendance at pre-census briefings?”

The President of the Etat Civil Committee replied as follows -

- “(a) The enumerators’ task of delivery of forms was completed on Wednesday 14th March. This was three days after Census day. Subsequently, the Census office has received a small number of calls from householders who required census forms. These were due to either the form delivered having been mislaid or damaged or the householder not having received a form, or a sufficient number of forms, in the first place.

Irrespective of the date of delivery of forms, it is important to bear in mind that the Census Form has to be completed in respect of, not on, March 11th. The detailed guidance notes as well as the various media releases make this point very clear. Notwithstanding this, the Committee is conscious that not everyone is able to complete their form that day, for many valid reasons. One of those could be not having a form to complete. The due date for return of forms was 19th March;

- (b) the delays arose for a number of reasons. For example, due to an outbreak of ’flu in the Island we encountered an unexpectedly high level of sickness in our enumerators. As members will also be aware we had to redeploy enumerators who live or work on premises with livestock. We also had to make time-consuming arrangements to avoid any enumerator going onto livestock premises. These factors, together with an already stretched Census team did contribute to delays in the distribution of forms. At all times we kept the Island community informed of progress through numerous media releases and statements.

Most significantly, our team of enumerators have located a substantially larger number of households than could have been expected from the estimated increase in population. This shows that our enumerators have seized our groundbreaking ‘seek out and find’ approach. This in turn is likely to mean that we have identified a higher proportion of households than ever before and the degree of under-enumeration is lower. I want to take this opportunity of publicly thanking our enumerators for doing such a thorough and diligent job, in sometimes difficult circumstances;

- (c) the question mentions that ‘many’ forms were returned before Census Day. The Census Office has reported that just over 10 per cent of forms were returned before March 11th. We are quite happy that forms completed a day or two before will not affect the inevitable small degree of inaccuracy in the final result. It is obvious that the forms submitted one or two days before were completed **as at** Census night. The only risk is that someone included as being present on Census day died unexpectedly in the intervening couple of days or a baby was born prematurely. I have checked with the Superintendent Registrar and he estimates that there were some five deaths and nine births in St. Helier over the three days up to Census night. To put it plainly, so few of these will have been missed because forms were returned early that any distortion of the statistics will be insignificant. Another minor statistical factor of which we are aware but is not worth pursuing is the few deaths occurring after Census Day relating to persons alive on Census Day, whose returns are never received. These matters will be taken into consideration when the final estimate of the extent of under-enumeration is prepared;

- (d) I am surprised that the Deputy is taking this Assembly's time with a question which I have already answered to him personally. Census Enumerators **are not** paid a rate per hour but a fee for carrying out the task (plus expenses). The enumeration of additional households and other performance over and above the basic requirement will be recognised by payment of bonuses. In our opinion, the basic fee is commensurate with the task and there is no conflict with States' policy on fair pay. In fact many of the enumerators were willing to take on the task due to the flexibility of the times over which they could perform the task.

The recruitment process, as for practically all States' positions, was through advertising in the media, written application, interview and assessment. BBC Radio Jersey played a valuable role in our recruitment drive. Parish Connétables were consulted before appointments were confirmed. If any member wishes to have details of the remuneration of enumerators I will be happy to provide the information in confidence."

### Condition of roads and footpaths - question and answer (Tape No. 640)

The Deputy of St. John asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier, President of the Public Services Committee the following question -

"Given that the Committee has responsibility for the maintenance of 160 miles of road and associated foot paths and that many of the roads are at the end of their useful life as they need re-surfacing, or in some cases reconstruction, would the President -

- (a) give members details of the proposed works programme for the next five years to bring our roads back into a condition that is acceptable to the tax-payer?
- (b) indicate how many miles of roads are proposed to be re-surfaced annually?
- (c) advise members whether the Committee intends to lodge 'au Greffe' a report and proposition on the principle of an accelerated road refurbishment programme in order that the Assembly may debate this matter?"

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

"(a) The following table outlines the expected area of carriageway that is planned for resurfacing, within the Committee's approved cash limits and the area that would be re-surfaced if an additional request already submitted to the Finance and Economics Committee was to be granted.

Resurfacing the areas of carriageway outlined above will -

| <b>Programme</b> | <b>2001</b> | <b>2002</b> | <b>2003</b> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expected         | 37700 sq m  | 35500 sq m  | 33500 sq m  |
|                  | (3.9)       | (3.7)       | (3.5)       |
| Requested        |             |             | 62000 sq m  |
|                  |             |             | (6.4)       |

| <b>Programme</b> | <b>2004</b> | <b>2005</b> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expected         | 31600 sq m  | 29800 sq m  |
|                  | (3.3)       | (7.0)       |
| Requested        | 65100 sq m  | 67600 sq m  |
|                  | (6.7)       | (7.0)       |

Resurfacing the areas of carriageway outlined above will not return the roads to what many would consider an acceptable condition within a period of five years. It would be necessary to resurface 120,000 square metres of carriageway each year for a period of eight years and then maintain 80,000 square metres a year thereafter, to achieve an average 20 years between resurfacings;

- (b) the figure in brackets in the above table indicates the equivalent length of roads, in miles, that would be resurfaced (assuming roads of an average 6 metres width);
- (c) the Committee has been discussing means of increasing investment in the road infrastructure with the relevant Committees. It is not merely a matter of resurfacing roads but in a number of cases, totally reconstructing roads and the structures such as walls and embankments that support them. It is the Committee's intention to carry out a comprehensive survey of the main roads to determine more accurately their condition. The results of the survey will allow the Committee to select the appropriate treatment for each area of road and target expenditure to ensure effective use of the funds. While these discussions continue and progress positively, as is the case at present, I see no reason to lodge a report and proposition on this matter."

### **The Cavern and the tanker service - questions and answers (Tape No. 640)**

The Deputy of St. John asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier, President of the Public Services Committee, the following questions -

- “1. In the President's reply to my questions on 13th March 2001 as to who was responsible for cleaning unsightly mess following spills from the cavern outfall, the President claimed that the Harbour Office had specialist marine equipment. Would he give members details -
  - (a) of the equipment;
  - (b) on how long it has been in the Island;
  - (c) of those trained as operators;and advise whether the staff at the Harbour Office are aware that this equipment is available?
- 2. Given the high rainfall over the recent winters would the President advise -
  - (a) whether the Committee intends lodging a report and proposition on a free tanker service for the many households unable to be connected to a mains sewer network, bearing in mind that these households may all be tax payers and should not expect to pay twice for a service when the majority of households have their sewage removed at no extra cost?
  - (b) If the answer to (a) is in the negative, would he give a reason why not?”

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

- “1. As part of the Harbours Environmental Audit plan, a water sampling programme is in place and sampling was carried out in the Elizabeth Marina just 24 hours after the last cavern overflow. The results indicated that the water quality was within EC Bathing Water limits. The effluent discharging from the outfall may equally enter the Elizabeth Marina or La Collette yacht basin depending on tidal conditions prevailing at the time. As the discharge was for a prolonged period until the cavern started to pump out, it is likely that the effluent also entered the Elizabeth Marina.

The Harbours Department Marina staff undertake regular patrols of the marinas and remove any floating debris that may have accumulated in the corners as a result of tidal movement and use marina craft and nets to remove the material. The previous answer referred to specialist equipment by which I

mean the craft and safety equipment required to work in the marine environment. My Department closely monitors the discharge from the culvert, however, the removal of liquid sewage from the marine environment is not possible.

I would point out to members that this situation prevailed before the cavern was constructed and combined sewage effluent and surface water discharged from the outfall on some 120 occasions each year. As I stated in the previous answers given to Deputy Rondel, since the cavern has been in operation it has stored approximately 220 million gallons of effluent that would have previously discharged to sea.

2. The Public Services Committee is not considering the provision of a free Septic Tanker Service at present. The Septic Tanker Service operated at a net cost to the Public Services Committee of £300,759 in 2000 and unless considerable additional funds were to be made available, a free service could not be operated. In addition, it is likely that there would be a considerable increase in demand for the service when it was on free offer, resulting in a requirement for more staff and vehicles.

Detailed consideration was given by the Public Services Committee in 1999 to the implementation of a sewerage charge that would have provided some level of equality between households connected to mains drains and those remaining on septic tanks by requiring all households connected to mains drains to pay a charge for that service. However, at that time, the Finance and Economics Committee, the Comité des Connétables and the Policy and Resources Committee were not in favour of introducing such a charge.

The Public Services Committee is of the view that there could be merit in such a charge as it would introduce an element of equality and it could provide funds to speed up the process of connecting additional properties to the foul sewer network.

The Committee will be discussing this issue on 9th April 2001.”

#### **Service level agreement with Jersey Bus - question and answer (Tape No. 640)**

Deputy Roy George Le Hérisser of St. Saviour, asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier, President of the Public Services Committee, the following question -

“Would the President indicate when the proposed Service Level Agreement with Jersey Bus will be implemented and if the Agreement is delayed, would the President provide the reasons for the delay?”

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

“The Public Services Committee is keen to publish its draft Bus Strategy, which includes provision for a Service Level Agreement with the operator of local bus services. It has delegated the development of the strategy to three members of the Committee, who have been joined by Deputy Derek Maltwood from the Finance and Economics Committee. The Committee has also appointed an independent accountancy firm to provide the Committee with the advice it needs on the financial aspects of the strategy, and this firm has held several meetings with the current operator of bus services, as well as with officers of the Public Services Department and the Treasury. The Committee has sought and obtained extensive legal advice from the Solicitor General, and is working with the Finance and Economics Committee on proposals for funding an improved bus service. As soon as the draft Bus Strategy matches the Committee’s expectations in terms of its ability to deliver improved and value-for-money bus services for the Island it will publish the strategy for consultation, after which it will present it to the States for debate.”

#### **Jersey Heritage Trust - questions and answers (Tape No. 640)**

Deputy Gerard Clifford Lemmens Baudains of St. Clement asked Senator Frank Harrison Walker, President of the

Finance and Economics Committee, the following questions -

- “1. With regard to the Ancient Monument Fund, would the President advise -
  - (a) the balance when handed over to the Jersey Heritage Trust?
  - (b) the balance each year to date?
  - (c) in the event that the balance is materially smaller than when handed over, what major items it has been spent on?
2. Would the President confirm that a confidential letter sent to him by the Gardien of Mont Orgueil Castle was passed on to the Director of the Jersey Museum Service against the wishes of the author?”

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

“1.(a) The balance received from the States of Jersey in February 1997 was £414,271;

(b) the balance at the end of each year is as follows -

|      |          |                  |
|------|----------|------------------|
| 1997 | £418,450 |                  |
| 1998 | £390,249 |                  |
| 1999 | £351,307 |                  |
| 2000 | £328,042 | (to be audited). |

(c) the fund is supplemented each year by a sum representing 23 per cent of admissions' income from both Mont Orgueil and Elizabeth Castles, together with bank interest. Income received into the fund each year is as follows -

|      |          |                  |
|------|----------|------------------|
| 1997 | £119,211 |                  |
| 1998 | £110,897 |                  |
| 1999 | £107,056 |                  |
| 2000 | £101,949 | (to be audited). |

Expenditure on works and insurance payments have been made in each year to the following value -

|      |          |                  |
|------|----------|------------------|
| 1997 | £115,031 |                  |
| 1998 | £139,099 |                  |
| 1999 | £145,997 |                  |
| 2000 | £125,214 | (to be audited). |

This expenditure covers a number of minor works items to both Mont Orgueil and Elizabeth Castles, none of which individually exceeds £25,000.

2. Yes.”

#### **Traffic in St. Helier - questions and answers** (Tape No. 640)

Deputy Gerard Clifford Lemmens Baudains of St. Clement asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier, President of the Public Services Committee, the following questions -

- “1. With regard to the recent widening of the pavements in Bath Street between Wests Centre and Minden Place, would the President advise members -
  - (a) of the details of any public consultation that took place;

- (b) whether the Committee sought comments from users of large vehicles, for instance hauliers and the Fire Service;
  - (c) whether the Committee is aware that lorries exiting Charles Street onto Bath Street now mount the pavement to get round;
  - (d) why it was considered necessary to make the pavements so wide, given that they only exist for a limited length?
2. With regard to the wide ranging changes proposed for traffic in Union Street, the Parade and Broad Street, would the President -
- (a) advise what public consultation is planned so that residents, traders and those who use these routes can have their concerns heard;
  - (b) advise whether the Committee has consulted with the Fire Service and other users of large vehicles such as cranes and plant to ensure that access is not impaired for them;
  - (c) inform members what research has been carried out to ensure that temporary road closures arising from a motor traffic accident or emergency road works for example, do not cause a gridlock;
  - (d) confirm to members that these proposals, and any others under consideration, will not increase the response times of the emergency services or adversely affect their ability to overtake traffic?
3. Would the President advise when he will be bringing proposals to the States so that members may debate the details of an integrated transport strategy?"

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

- “1. The works to which the Deputy refers were carried out by Planning and Environment Committee’s Urban Renewal Sub-Committee. While the Public Services Department was naturally involved in the carriageway and pavement designs, it would seem appropriate for questions about the works to be directed to the Committee responsible for them.
- 2. The works to which the Deputy refers are being planned by the Planning and Environment Committee’s Urban Renewal Sub-Committee as part of its ‘Street Life’ programme. Indeed, copies of the consultation leaflets produced by that Committee have been sent to all States’ members as well as to residents and businesses in the area. While the Public Services Department is naturally involved in the proposed carriageway and pavement designs, it would seem appropriate for questions about the works to be directed to the Committee responsible for them.
- 3. The Public Services Committee brought a wide range of proposals for an integrated Transport Strategy to the States in June 1999 (P.60/99). It is currently preparing detailed strategies for buses and for parking, and is working with the Finance and Economics Committee on funding mechanisms for transport improvements. A new policy on Speed Control together with improvements in taxi and cabs provision are being developed in association with the Home Affairs Committee. A cycling strategy is being developed in association with the Tourism Department. Each of these detailed strategies will be brought to the States as soon as the necessary research and consultation has been completed.”

**Report of the Review Panel on the Machinery of Government in Jersey - questions and answers** (Tape No. 640)

The Deputy of St. Peter asked H.M. Attorney General the following questions -



- “1. On 13th March, the Attorney General affirmed (last paragraph of his answer on constitutional issues) ‘There is no doubt in my view that the Crown will want to examine closely legislation which impacts on voters’ rights of representation.’

Regarding the recommendations in the Report of the Review Panel on the Machinery of Government in Jersey relating to a general election, the abolition of the Island-wide mandate and the election of the Connétables, would the Attorney General advise members whether, in his opinion, these recommendations are likely to be viewed by the Crown as inconsistent with the United Kingdom’s international commitments made on the Island’s behalf and if so, what aspects specifically might be so viewed?

2. On 11th October 2000, I wrote to the Attorney General asking him to advise me who he considered was the equivalent of a Minister of Justice for Jersey to whom the public can submit any grievance they may have relating to the law and its application? Would the Attorney General provide an answer to that question?”

H.M. Attorney General replied as follows -

- “1. On 13th March 2001, I was asked by Senator Syvret inter alia to give ‘a general assessment of the nature and scale of the legal and constitutional issues involved in giving effect’ to various changes including the make up of the States Assembly by the removal of the Senators and Connétables and I pointed out that the Crown would want to examine closely any legislation which impacted on voters’ rights of representation, to ensure that any changes introduced were consistent with the United Kingdom’s international commitments made on the Island’s behalf and with its consent. I confirm the answer which I gave to a supplementary question on 13th March to the effect that what I particularly had in mind in relation to that answer was Article 3 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. This Article provides as follows -

*‘The High Contracting Parties undertake to hold free elections at reasonable intervals by secret ballot, under conditions which will ensure the free expression of the opinion of the people in the choice of the legislature.’*

As I indicated on 13th March, the question of whether any legislation is or is not compliant with Protocol 1 of the ECHR is one which can only be assessed on the detail of what is proposed. I gave the example on the last occasion that there might be a problem if in the course of promoting the legislation, the States resolved to extend the life of the current Assembly, which might be argued to have an effect on the right of the population to free elections; but this is just one example and does not detract from the general principle that the assessment must be made on the detail of the legislation which is proposed. Inevitably, if there is to be a change in the composition of the legislature, questions of timing may arise in relation to the tenure of existing elected representatives. Such problems are not insuperable, but they will need to be considered.

There is good authority from the European Court of Human Rights that -

1. Member States enjoy a wide margin of appreciation in relation to the rights conferred by Article 3 of Protocol 1.
2. Any electoral system must be assessed in the light of the political evolution of the country concerned, and features which would be unacceptable in the context of one system may be justified in another, as long as the chosen system provides for conditions which will ensure the free expression of the opinion of the people in choice of the legislature. Any restrictions will be considered against a test of whether they constitute a disproportionate limit on the freedom of political expression.

One has to recall that the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms is a living document susceptible to interpretation in the context of the

particular case which is before the Court. Thus, laws which have the practical effect of disenfranchising groups of people may contravene Article 3 of Protocol 1 - for example an inadequate system of postal voting might prevent disabled or ill people from exercising their right to vote.

One can contemplate for example a potential argument that the loss of an island wide mandate has a practical effect of disenfranchising citizens. In my view, given the ECHR authority to which I referred earlier, this would be unlikely to succeed. Apart from anything else, the Clothier recommendations in this respect, if implemented, would not place the voter in any different position than voters in other European States including the UK.

I have also given consideration to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights.

In my view, it is unlikely that the Clothier recommendations relating to a general election, the abolition of the Island wide mandate and the election of the Connétables would be viewed by the Crown as inconsistent with the United Kingdom's international commitments made on the Island's behalf but I should emphasize that that is a preliminary view reached in the absence of consideration of the detail of any particular piece of legislation.

2. If a member of the public has a grievance about existing law, whether statutory or customary, he can make representations to one or more States members with a view to the States Assembly considering a proposition to have the law changed. If the grievance is about a decision of the Court which applies the law, the proper course is for the member of the public to appeal to a higher court."

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

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Criminal Justice (International Co-operation) (Jersey) Law 200-.

#### **Draft Housing (Amendment No. 15) (Jersey) Regulations 200- - P.30/2001**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Articles 10 and 15 of the Housing (Jersey) Law 1949, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Housing (Amendment No. 15) (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

#### **Draft Unlawful Public Entertainments (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.31/2001**

THE STATES, by virtue and in exercise of the powers conferred on them by the Order in Council of the fourteenth day of April 1884, made Regulations entitled the Unlawful Public Entertainments (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

#### **Draft Petroleum (Jersey) Law 1984 (Appointed Day) Act 200- P.32/2001**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 12 of the Petroleum (Jersey) Law 1984, made an Act entitled the Petroleum (Jersey) Law 1984 (Appointed Day) Act 2001.

#### **Draft Petroleum-Spirit (Carriage by Road) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.17/2001 (re-issue)**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 7 of the Petroleum (Jersey) Law 1984 made Regulations entitled the Petroleum-Spirit (Carriage by Road) (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

**Draft Petroleum Spirit (Storage) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.18/2001 (re-issue)**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 8 of the Petroleum (Jersey) Law 1984 made Regulations entitled the Petroleum Spirit (Storage) (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

**Gambling Control Committee - number and appointment of members**

THE STATES, in accordance with Article 28(2)(b) of the States of Jersey Law 1966, and on the proposition of Deputy Lyndon John Farnham, President of the Gambling Control Committee, determined that the Gambling Control Committee should consist of the President and three other members of the States.

THE STATES appointed the following as members of the Gambling Control Committee -

Senator Christopher Gerard Pellow Lakeman  
Deputy Imogen Stéphanie Nicholls of Grouville  
Deputy Jennifer-Anne Bridge of St. Helier

The Bailiff advised members that, in accordance with Article 36(1) of the States of Jersey Law 1966, the quorum for a Committee consisting of four members was two.

**Draft Currency Offences (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200- P.33/2001 - (re-issue)**

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Currency Offences (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200-.

**Projet de Règlements (200-) sur l'Etat Civil - P.34/2001 (re-issue)**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 71A of the Loi (1842) sur l'Etat Civil, as amended, made Regulations entitled Règlements (2001) sur l'Etat Civil.

**Overdale Assessment and Rehabilitation Unit: approval of drawings - P.35/2001 (re-issue)**

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Health and Social Services Committee -

- (a) approved drawings nos. 2985/01, 02A, 03, 04A, 05A, 06, 07 showing the proposed Overdale Assessment and Rehabilitation Unit;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the said drawings on behalf of the States.

**Commissioners of Appeal for Income Tax: re-appointment - P.36/2001 (re-issue)**

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee, and in accordance with Article 10 of the Income Tax (Jersey) Law 1961, as amended, approved the appointment as Commissioners of Appeal for Income Tax for a period of three years commencing 1st April 2001 of -

Mr. Peter George Farley  
Mr. Nigel George Pritchard  
Mrs. Catherine Elizabeth Rees  
Mr. Arthur Stanley Le Ruez

Mr. James Shaw.

**Ann Alice Rayner Fund: objects, purpose and administration - P.38/2001**

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee -

- (a) agreed that the objects and purpose of the Ann Alice Rayner Fund (hereinafter referred to as “the Fund”) should be -
  - (1) the provision of pecuniary relief to needy persons residing in Jersey; and
  - (2) such other objects or purposes of a charitable or philanthropic nature as the States might hereafter in their absolute discretion determine;
- (b) agreed that the Fund should be administered as follows -
  - (1) The income of the Fund shall be administered by four Jurats appointed from among their number by the Jurats of the Royal Court as may be necessary from time to time to form the Ann Alice Rayner Fund Delegation (hereinafter referred to as “the Delegation”).
  - (2) Two members of the Delegation shall form a quorum at a meeting.
  - (3) The Delegation may, at its absolute discretion from time to time, make grants, or loans to be secured on immovable property, on such terms and subject to such conditions as the Delegation may determine, out of the income of the Fund for the relief of needy persons residing in Jersey.
  - (4) The Delegation may from time to time propose to the States other objects and purposes of a charitable or philanthropic nature to be approved by the States for inclusion in the objects and purposes of the Fund.
  - (5) The Finance and Economics Committee may make such changes in the investments of the Fund as it considers necessary or expedient and, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, may, after consultation with Delegation, invest in immovable property situate in or outside the Island whether such property produces income or not. Any expenses incurred in making or changing investments as aforesaid shall be defrayed out of the Fund.
  - (6) Title to any immovable property acquired under paragraph (5) of this Act shall be vested in the States of Jersey for and on behalf of the Fund and the Finance and Economics Committee may authorise the Greffier of the States to pass any contract or to execute any deed required in connection with the acquisition or subsequent disposal of any such property.
  - (7) The Finance Economics Committee may, after consultation with the Delegation, at its sole discretion, approve the leasing to any person it considers suitable, for such period and on such terms as it thinks fit of any immovable property acquired as aforesaid and may authorise the Greffier of the States to sign any agreement or pass any contract in connection with any such lease. Any expenses incurred in executing any such lease shall be defrayed out of the Fund.
  - (8) The Delegation shall at least once in every year present to the Finance and Economics Committee an account of its dealings with the Fund, but it shall not be necessary to disclose in such account the name of any individual to whom a grant or loan has been made.
  - (9) The funds to be administered shall not include the specific legacies bequeathed to the States of Jersey by the will of the testatrix for the benefit of pupils of Victoria College; and
- (c) rescinded their Acts dated 16th November 1949 and 11th September 1979, concerning the

administration of the Fund.

**Draft Aerodromes (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.40/2001**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Articles 4 and 6 of the Aerodromes (Administration) (Jersey) Law 1952, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Aerodromes (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Regulations 2001.

**Beaumont Warehouse, St. Peter: lease from Channel Islands Co-operative Society Ltd. - P.43/2001**

THE STATES commenced consideration of Beaumont Warehouse, St. Peter: lease from Channel Islands Co-operative Society Ltd. - P.43/2001 (lodged "au Greffe" on 13th March 2001) and Senator Stuart Syvret, having declared an interest in the matter, withdrew from the Chamber.

The Bailiff ruled that membership of the Channel Islands Co-operative Society Limited should not be construed under Standing Order 44 of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey as being a direct pecuniary interest which was immediate and personal and not merely of a general and remote character, and accordingly other members of the States being also members of that Society did not need to declare a financial interest.

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Committee for Postal Administration -

- (a) approved the leasing by the public of the Beaumont Warehouse, St. Peter, from the Channel Islands Co-operative Society Limited for the purpose of accommodating the Jersey Post Promail, Philatelic and Disaster Recovery services, with effect from 25th March 2001 until 28th October 2005 at an annual rent of £126,150, the rent to be reviewed on 25th March 2004 in line with the Jersey Retail Prices Index and with each party being responsible for its own legal fees in relation to this transaction;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the lease on behalf of the public, and;
- (c) authorised the Treasurer of the States to pay the rent as it becomes due.

**Draft Social Security (Amendment No. 14) (Jersey) Law 2000 (Appointed Day) Act 200- P.44/2001**

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 19(2) of the Social Security (Amendment No. 14) (Jersey) Law 2000, made an Act entitled the Social Security (Amendment No. 14) (Jersey) Law 2000 (Appointed Day) Act 2001.

THE STATES rose at 13.45 p.m.

**M.N. DE LA HAYE**

*Deputy Greffier of the States.*