

Price : £2.25

THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
13th December 1994 at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Peter Crill, C.B.E.

All Members were present with the exception of -

Senator Corrie Stein - ill
Senator Nigel Lewis Quérée - absent
Jack Roche, Connétable of St. Saviour - ill
Shirley Margaret Baudains, Deputy of St.
Helier - out of the Island
John Nicolle Le Fondré, Deputy of St.
Lawrence - ill
Frank Harrison Walker, Deputy of St. Helier
- out of the Island
Jacqueline Jeannette Huet, Deputy of St.
Helier - out of the Island.

Prayers

Subordinate legislation tabled

The following enactments were laid before the
States, namely -

Post Office (General Provisions)
(Amendment No. 39) (Jersey) Order 1994.
R & O 8764.

Motor Traffic (Experimental Route)
(Designation) (Jersey) Order 1994.
R & O 8765.

House Committee - appointment of member

THE STATES appointed Kenneth Priaulx Vibert,
Connétable of St. Ouen, as a member of the House

Committee.

Establishment Committee - resignation of member

THE STATES noted the resignation of Carlyle John Le Herissier Hinault, Connétable of St. John, from the Establishment Committee.

Deputy Industrial Disputes Officer - resignation

THE STATES noted the resignation of Senator Vernon Amy Tomes from the post of Deputy Industrial Disputes Officer.

Establishment Committee - appointment of member

THE STATES appointed Senator Vernon Amy Tomes as a member of the Establishment Committee.

Tourism Committee - resignation of member

THE STATES noted the resignation of Senator Stuart Syvret from the Tourism Committee.

Matters presented

The following matters were presented to the States -

1. Jersey Training Agency: report for the year 1994.
Presented by the Policy and Resources Committee.
2. Jersey Council for Safety and Health at Work: report for the year ended 30th September 1994 - R.C.27/94.
Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee. THE STATES ordered that the said report be printed and distributed.
3. International Conventions and Agreements: progress report for the period ended 30th September 1994 - R.C.28/94.

Presented by the Policy and Resources Committee. THE STATES ordered that the said report be printed and distributed.

4. Longbeach and Puerto Seco, Grouville, development: compensation claim - R.C.29/94.
Presented by the Island Development Committee. THE STATES ordered that the said report be printed and distributed.

Matters lodged

The following subjects were lodged ``au Greffe" -

1. Draft Health Insurance (Amendment No. 8) (Jersey) Law 1994 (Appointed Day) Act 199 - P.165/94.
Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee.
2. States housing rental scheme: revision - P.166/94.
Presented by Deputy Alan Breckon of St. Saviour.
3. Health and social services in Jersey - P.167/94.
Presented by the Policy and Resources Committee.
4. Disabled Transport Allowance - P.168/94.
Presented by the Employment and Social Security Committee.
5. Golf course, Les Creux, St. Brelade - P.169/94.
Presented by the Sport, Leisure and Recreation Committee.

Jersey Airport Limited - questions and answers (Tape No. 265)

Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade asked Deputy Leonard Norman of St. Clement, Vice-President of the Harbours and Airport Committee, the following questions -

- ``1. Will the President inform the House what investigations have been undertaken into the

feasibility of incorporating
"Jersey Airport Limited"?

2. When will the Harbours and Airport Committee take a decision on whether to proceed with the formation of Jersey Airport Limited?
3. What advice has been sought on the legal standing of those who are currently employed by the Civil Service but might find themselves employed by a privatised airport authority?

The Vice-President of the Harbours and Airport Committee replied as follows -

1. At the Policy and Resources Committee meeting of Presidents and Chief Officers in early 1994, the priority for the airport development at £20 million was questioned in the light of the size of the capital programme. It was suggested that the States be asked to fund £10 million of the development and that the Harbours and Airport Committee should find the remaining £10 million. During investigations by the Committee it became clear that the best way to secure the £10 million of private funding for the development and for the capital requirements of Jersey Airport for many years to come would be to form the airport into a wholly-owned States' company. My Committee is undertaking two investigations at present -

- (a) the preparation of a draft memorandum and articles of association in conjunction with the Attorney General, the Chief Adviser and the Treasurer of the States;
- (b) an examination of all pieces of aviation legislation in order that the Attorney General may advise my Committee of its relationship with such a company and what other enabling legislation may have to be effected.

2. In consultation with the Policy and Resources and the Finance and Economics Committees, my Committee expect to bring recommendations to the States in the New Year on the appropriate way to proceed in the best interests of the Island, the airport, the staff and the travelling public.
3. The advice of the Attorney General has been sought as to the legal standing of all employees (not just civil servants) and when that advice has been received consultations will take place with the staff associations and unions involved. The best interests of all staff at the airport will remain one of our highest priorities."

Drink/driving - questions and answers (Tape No. 265)

Deputy Gary Matthews of St. Brelade asked Deputy Michael Adam Wavell of St. Helier, President of the Defence Committee, the following questions -

- ``1. Will the President inform the States how many people were stopped, arrested and prosecuted for drink/driving offences in December 1993 over the festive period?
2. Will the President inform the States what are his Committee's plans for warning people against drinking and driving this Christmas/New Year period?
3. Would the President agree that there is no safe limit regarding drinking and driving?"

The President of the Defence Committee replied as follows -

- ``1. During the period between 1st December 1993, and the end of the first week in January 1994, some 146 people were breath tested, of which 61 were arrested and subsequently 54 were charged.

While the question focuses upon drinking and driving during the festive season, I emphasise that this is a

problem which afflicts the Island throughout the year and, as an illustration of the extent of the problem, I would point out that during the first 11 months of 1994, a total of 403 people were arrested under the relevant legislation.

However, I must emphasise that policing is a last resort. People must behave in a responsible manner and consider the dire consequences of drinking and driving such as the side effects on the family, loss of a job, misery and suffering to injured people.

2. During the festive season, the Defence Committee will be promoting a range of measures which are intended to highlight the problems of drinking and driving and to act as a deterrent.

As part of their year-round campaign, the Road Safety Panel has undertaken sterling work in educating the public and in producing publicity material which will be widely distributed. A wrecked vehicle which only last week cost the life of a young man will be displayed at prominent locations, to demonstrate the dangers and consequences of drinking and driving.

Additionally, it is envisaged that both the States and Honorary Police will be undertaking co-ordinated road checks throughout the Island, which will be aimed at deterring people from drinking and driving.

3. Research clearly demonstrates that even low amounts of alcohol can increase the risk of accident involvement; however, the question of an appropriate legal limit remains a source of considerable academic and political debate throughout the world.

Notwithstanding the existence of a legal limit, the best advice which I and the Defence Committee can offer at this time is - don't drink and drive."

Senator Stuart Syvret made a personal statement in the following terms -

“It is with much regret that I must inform the House of my resignation from the Tourism Committee. It was not a decision taken lightly and now I feel that the States and the people of Jersey deserve an explanation.

As Members are, no doubt, aware events have reached this unfortunate stage as a result of a disagreement within the Arts Trust. Before I continue I feel I should, in order to avoid confusion, point out that the Arts Trust and The Jersey Arts Centre are two distinct organisations, and I make no criticism of the Jersey Arts Centre, the management and staff of which I have nothing but the greatest respect for.

The disagreement concerns three issues -

- (1) the efficiency of the Trust administration;
- (2) the awarding of a seven per cent pay rise to the administration;
- (3) the creation of the new post of assistant administrator at a cost of £14,000 per annum and the manner in which this post was to be filled.

I had begun to be concerned with the performance of the cost of Trust administration because I could see no evidence that a number of the core tasks of the Trust had been achieved, in particular the following -

the production of a calendar of Arts events.

the creation of a database of Arts organisations and facilities;

the production and distribution of a leaflet explaining and encouraging applications for grants.

This last point is of particular concern given that the Trust's constitution requires it to provide grants to

individuals and organisations active in the arts. It can hardly be a satisfactory state of affairs when, with the exception of the regular substantial grants given to such large undertakings as the Arts Centre etc., the Trust has disbursed more money in staff costs than it has in grants.

I was further alarmed when I discovered that the chairman and the treasurer had decided that the administrator should be awarded a seven per cent pay rise. I believe the administrator's salary to now be in excess of £23,000 per annum. The trustees were informed of the proposed rise under any other business so no detailed discussion took place. I only learnt of the excessive nature of this award after some weeks had passed.

Perhaps of the greatest concern to me was the manner in which the chairman, in conjunction with the administrator, sought to create a new post. On several occasions the administrator approached a trustee seeking his support for the appointment of an assistant administrator. He refused, instead explaining that there was an accepted procedure that should be followed before such an appointment could be made. Dissatisfied with this response the administrator sought the support of the chairman. The result was the attached letter of 14th November which was handed to me by the administrator on the evening of Monday 14th with the verbal instruction to respond by the following morning.

To say that I was shocked by the content of the letter would be an understatement. In it the trustees are asked to make an important decision involving the expenditure of £14,000 of Trust funds with only 12 hours notice and no discussion. This is doubly bad when one considers the following points -

The current operation of the Trust administration clearly required examination.

No attempt had been made to produce any evidence that a new post was even necessary.

No job description had been

produced. (There is little point in taking on a new employee before you have clearly identified what that person is going to be doing).

Even if all these stages had been gone through the post should then have been advertised and interviews held. There are many able and enthusiastic people in Jersey who would love such a job but had thus been denied the opportunity to apply. Whilst it might be acceptable for a private company to act in this way I would respectfully suggest that a public body such as the Arts Trust should be fairer by offering such opportunities to the public at large.

Unfortunately I must also point out that the person named in the letter as a suitable assistant administrator is a close personal friend of the current administrator.

The morning after receiving this letter I telephoned the chairman of the Trust and expressed such serious misgivings and requested an emergency meeting of the Trust. That meeting took place on the evening of 22nd November. All of the above concerns were discussed for some time with myself and another trustee arguing that the Trust needed to seriously examine its administration. The majority of the trustees gave the appearance of not being prepared to consider these issues and instead became angry that such criticisms should be made. It was at this point I described the attached letter of 14th November, which was signed by the administrator and sent out in the chairman's name, as grossly incompetent, for the reasons outlined above. The chairman and treasurer then announced their resignation. However, instead of doing this they and some of the other trustees set about seeking the removal of my fellow trustee and me, as can be seen from the attached letter of 1st December to Senator Shenton. I, believing my concerns to be justified, resisted such efforts and, along with Senator Shenton sought to heal the rift in the Trust. However, the other trustees were totally inflexible in their desire to arrange my removal from the Trust. The matter came to a head last Friday afternoon at an emergency meeting of

the Tourism Committee which I requested. At that meeting I put my case in the hope that the Committee would support me and thus persuade the other trustees to adopt a more reasonable attitude. However the vote went against me and I was left with no choice other than to tend my resignation.

If anything positive is to come out of this sad episode I hope it will be a recognition that the rôle of the arts in society is of greater relevance than that of a socially fashionable hobby; and that an important step towards actively fostering an appreciation of, and participation in the arts, would be to combat the impression that is sometimes given that the art world is dominated by elitist cliques.

Sir, I am extremely angry at this situation. Over 14,000 people voted for me because, I believe, they regard me as trustworthy. It is to them my first duty lies. I, for simply honouring their trust and seeking to do my public duty, have been made a scapegoat. I could not, in all conscience, turn a blind eye to such inadequacies in the way the Trust was functioning. I am aware that trusts are independent bodies and as such are not bound by States policies. But I would suggest that a public trust, such as the Arts Trust, which has a great deal of tax payers money entrusted to it, should operate with the upmost professionalism.

I am disappointed to have to leave the Tourism Committee and consequently, the Arts and Heritage Trusts. I felt I was playing a useful rôle within these organisations but I had to do what I felt to be right. No doubt certain people will now set out to vilify me because of any inconvenience this may cause but my conscience is clear. Article 17 of the Trusts (Jersey) Law 1984, which relates to the duties of trustees, states that a trustee shall act -

- (i) with due diligence; and
- (ii) as would a prudent person.

Others can say what they will about this episode. I know I have done my public duty.

I am aware that this chain of events will not make me popular in certain quarters. But I reject any attempt to blame me or my fellow trustee for this situation, for the blame lies elsewhere; older and, supposedly wiser people than me should be reflecting upon that fact instead of simply seeking to shoot the messenger."

Letter from Chairman, Jersey Arts Trust -

``14th November 1994

Dear Stuart,

I have spoken to some of you on the telephone recently and had already formed the impression that Sarah, who had been with us for over a year, needs help. This has become more urgent when Rod wants to hand back to Sarah all the Festivals and Street Theatre, that his staff have been handling at the Arts Centre, other than the Jersey International Festival. I think this is because the International Arts Festival is a very `hot potato'. Its success is essential. He has asked if he can take Sarah Johnson exclusively to help him for the International Arts Festival. If (as we hope) Friday clinches the Opera House, then next year will be busier than this year.

Sarah has found someone with whom she could work. Her name is Caroline Tomlinson and a photocopy of her CV is attached. I have interviewed Caroline with Sarah and taken up some references informally. I have no doubt that she will fit the bill admirably. She is at present working at the Planning Office and if we agreed, could start work at the beginning of December. She requires a salary of £14,000 p.a. and I have told her that, if we employ her, it will be on a strictly trial period (initially) of six months. I have spoken at some length with our Treasurer this morning and we are both happy to proceed, subject to the Trustees' approval. Will you please, on receipt of this letter, telephone Sarah on 617521 and say yes or no. A yes vote is recommended.

Yours sincerely,

S.E. Clarehugh

p.p. Francis Hamon
Chairman".

Letter from certain members of the Arts Trust -

``Dear Senator Shenton,

We, the undersigned members of the Jersey Arts Trust, have decided that the presence of Senator Syvret is no longer acceptable to us or to the way the Trust has operated to this date.

If the business of the Trust is to be conducted in the openly supportive way to which we have been accustomed, we would ask you to replace him on the Committee of Fidei-commis, by another nominee, say, Senator Jean Le Maistre. However, if he is to remain, then we will sadly be forced to resign en bloc.

We understand that the chairman and treasurer are in agreement with this letter and are willing to withdraw their resignations if you can arrange for the removal of Senator Syvret.
(c.f. letter attached from George Loraine explaining the circumstances of his resignation)

This is a matter of great urgency, and we believe it would not have come to this point had it not been for the behaviour and lack of trust shown by Senator Syvret.

We hope that the matter can be settled before the next meeting of the Trust which we have convened specially for Tuesday, December 6th.

Yours sincerely,

Signed Michael Munz-Jones
Philip Le Brocq."

Longbeach and Puerto Seco, Grouville - statement
by the Finance and Economics Committee

The President of the Finance and Economics
Committee made a statement in the following
terms -

Following the answers given by the President of the Island Development Committee to questions raised by Senator Shenton on the Longbeach development, I informed the House that the Finance and Economics Committee would conduct a thorough investigation into the circumstances surrounding the payment of £200,000 in full and final settlement of the developers claim.

My Committee has concluded its investigation, and now wishes the full facts to be communicated to the House. Before doing so, I wish first of all to address Senator Shenton's complaint that neither the Supply Day Report, nor anything said in the House, told him that he was wasting his time lodging the report since the money had actually been paid. Investigation has revealed that the Supply Day Report, agreed by the Island Development Committee on 1st September 1994, and forwarded to the Treasury for inclusion in the Supply Day booklet, included a reference to payment having been made, but that this was omitted from the report presented to the Finance and Economics Committee, and subsequently included in the Supply Day booklet. For this erroneous omission, and the confusion which has subsequently arisen from it, including my own impression that the money had yet to actually be paid over to the claimants, my Committee and I can only offer our unreserved apologies to the House. You may rest assured that steps have already been taken to ensure that future Supply Day reports will make quite clear whether payment has already occurred.

I am also concerned that the wording of the Supply Day report, the President of the Island Development Committee's answer, and, indeed, my own comment that I was unaware that payment had been made, have led this House, the media, and the general public of the Island to believe that the Solicitor General and the Controller of Audit were acting without authority in this matter.

As the following sequence of events shows, this was clearly not the case -

On 17th December 1993, both the

Solicitor General and the Controller of Audit attended a meeting of the Finance and Economics Committee. It was explained that whilst some £363,000 had been made in interim payments on agreed parts of the compensation claim, a total of £502,500 remained in dispute, and that, in the absence of agreement, the Island Planning (Jersey) Law 1964 contained provision for arbitration. The officers had received advice from counsel that the outcome of arbitration was uncertain, costs for each side would approach £100,000, and he valued the uncertainty at £100,000. A sum of £40,000 in fees was also being claimed which was not disputed in principle. My Committee decided to authorise the offer of a figure in full and final settlement in a sum up to £150,000. The exact figure was to be the subject of agreement between the officers advising the Island Development Committee.

The Island Development Committee met on 13th January 1994, and the Committee Act records that the Island Development Committee agreed to the Finance and Economics Committee's recommendation that up to £150,000 be offered as final payment. The Committee instructed its Chief Executive Officer that the claim for additional fees be the subject of detailed scrutiny.

The Island Development Committee's Chief Executive Officer, the Solicitor General and the Controller of Audit met on 25th January 1994 to discuss the final figure, and on 31st January 1994, the Solicitor-General wrote to the developer's advocate offering the sum of £100,000 in full and final settlement of the claim, together with an acceptance of liability in principle for fees to the extent that they were -

- (a) attributable to the modification and;
- (b) reasonable.

On 6th May 1994, the claimants offered to accept £225,000 in full and final settlement of the claim (by implication

rejecting the offer made on 31st January 1994). The Finance and Economics Committee was notified by the Controller of Audit of the receipt of this counter-offer at its meeting on 27th June 1994. The Act records that the Committee, having concurred with the advice of the Solicitor-General that it would be desirable to avoid a potentially prolonged and costly arbitration, agreed that it would be desirable to settle the matter without delay. The Committee noted that the officers involved in the negotiations were to meet on 28th June 1994, in order to consider the situation and to advise the Island Development Committee. The Committee authorised that, in the event that the Island Development Committee were to be advised to increase the final offer, an increased offer of up to a maximum sum of £175,000 could be made. In the event that the developer would only be prepared to accept an amount in excess of this, the Committee agreed that it would be prepared to meet at short notice.

The Island Development Committee met on 30th June 1994. The Act records that the Committee, having considered the advice of the Solicitor General, and the decision of the Finance and Economics Committee to seek a settlement to avoid arbitration proceedings, authorised its Chief Executive Officer to discuss and agree with the Attorney General a recommended settlement to avoid expensive arbitration proceedings. That recommendation was not to exceed £225,000 including fees and all other claims.

On 13th July 1994, the Solicitor General wrote to the developer's advocate offering £175,000, being the Finance and Economics Committee's ceiling of the amount which could be offered at officer level. The response was a without prejudice offer to settle for £200,000, on the proviso that this was not subject to any further negotiation.

On 22nd July 1994 the Solicitor General wrote to the Controller of Audit requesting that the Finance and Economics Committee meet to consider authorising this offer. This letter referred to the fact that the Island Development Committee had agreed to a settlement not to exceed £225,000, and that on this basis the Solicitor General did not think that further authorisation was required from the Island Development Committee. The letter was copied to the Chief Executive Officer of the Island Development Committee for information.

The Finance and Economics Committee met on 28th July 1994. The Act records -

'The Committee, wishing to avoid a potentially prolonged and costly arbitration, and recalling that the Island Development Committee had agreed to a settlement not exceeding £225,000 including all fees and other claims, accordingly authorised the offer of £200,000 without prejudice and in full and final settlement of all claims regarding Longbeach, Grouville.

The Controller of Audit was authorised to take the necessary action.'

The Solicitor General was informed of the Committee's decision and a written offer made to the developer's advocate. The offer was accepted on 29th July 1994. A cheque was drawn by the Controller of Audit, forwarded to the Solicitor General, and delivered to the developer's advocate in exchange for a signed discharge in respect of the compensation claim. On the same day, 29th July 1994, the Solicitor General wrote to the Controller of Audit and the Chief Executive Officer of the Island Development Committee informing them that the cheque had been paid over to the developer's advocate in exchange for a signed discharge acknowledging full and final settlement of the compensation claim which was also enclosed with the Solicitor General's letter.

On 12th August 1994, the Island Development Committee noted a report from its Chief Executive Officer stating that the claim had been settled at £200,000, bringing the total amount paid to settle the claim to £563,000. The report noted that the Solicitor General, the Controller of Audit and the Chief Executive Officer all agreed with this figure, and that the Treasurer of the States had already paid this amount at the request of the Solicitor General.

The Island Development Committee again met on 1st September 1994. The Act records -

‘The Committee recalled that it had decided that a settlement should not exceed £225,000 including fees and all other claims, and that a settlement of £200,000 had been successfully negotiated in full and final settlement of the claim in accordance with the Committee's wishes, and which was reported to the Committee on 12th August 1994. The Committee endorsed the action taken by the States' Treasury at the request of the Solicitor General in settling this amount.

The Committee decided to seek a Supply Day request in the sum of £200,000 to enable those monies to be transferred to vote No. 5207 - Legal Claims Contingency, in order to meet that claim.’

That concludes a summary of events as they occurred.

I should now like to turn to the merits of this matter, as it has been suggested that the settlement was not an appropriate one to reach. It is worth recalling that, once the States persuaded the Island Development Committee to reverse its original decision, a statutory right to compensation on the part of the developer arose. There can be no

dispute as to the liability of the States to pay, but only as to the amount which was payable. The House was told of this fact at the time, and I recall making my own warning of the potential costs involved.

The claim was some £906,000 whereas the final payments totalled some £563,000. This represents only 60 per cent of the claim, or put another way, the Officers who worked on the claim have saved the public £343,000. Having regard to the professional advice received, and the potential costs of an arbitration, it is the opinion of the Finance and Economics Committee that the settlement reached was entirely reasonable and proper given the initial decision of the States which gave rise to the legal liability to pay compensation in the first place, and I think the House should congratulate the officers for their efforts in this matter.

Now, I return to the question of whether the Solicitor General and the Controller of Audit were acting throughout this matter with all necessary authority. It is quite clear to the Finance and Economics Committee that both officers not only acted with the proper authority, but took all the necessary steps throughout the negotiations to ensure that the authority was properly obtained. Their actions are beyond reproach and any suggestion that may have been made otherwise is totally without foundation.

Finally, the Finance and Economics Committee is at present conducting a review of the Finance Law. I have asked, as a result of these investigations, that the review addresses situations such as this, and other examples are court costs and contractual claims, where a legal liability to pay arises. I do not feel that the Law as it stands provides adequately for such legal liabilities, and I hope to ask the House to consider proposals on this matter in the near future.

A full report on the Longbeach compensation claim is to follow from the Island Development Committee. The House will have the opportunity to consider this, together with the outstanding Supply Day request, early in the next session."

Longbeach and Puerto Seco, Grouville - statement by the Island Development Committee

The President of the Island Development made a statement in the following terms -

``My Committee will today provide Members of the States with a detailed report, following my answers to Senator Shenton's questions on 22nd November 1994. The report provides the background and circumstances on the compensation claim which my Committee inherited from the previously-constituted Committee. It also explains fully how my Committee has dealt with the matter since we were appointed in December 1993. We have tried to answer the very many supplementary questions which were unanswered on 22nd November 1994, both on points of detail and of principle. I believe it is important that Members have time to consider this report and have the opportunity to seek additional information from the Department should they require it.

It is also my intention to ask the President of the Finance and Economics Committee for an opportunity to debate our Supply Day request at a later date.

I must, however, today deal with one important aspect of my Committee's report. My answers to the questions of the 22nd November 1994, combined with the response of the President of the Finance and Economics Committee and the numerous supplementary questions which followed, created the impression that this settlement had been arrived at by the Solicitor General, entirely without authorisation by my Committee. The answers which I gave on 22nd November were drafted in a very short timescale, and have proved to be insufficient and have led to misrepresentation. The impression given was not correct and my Committee's full report

today is intended to put the record straight.

I would like to express my sincere apology to the Solicitor General and to the House for any embarrassment this may have caused."

Commissioners of Appeal for Income Tax:
appointment

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

(a) approved the appointment as a Commissioner of Appeal for Income Tax, for a three year period commencing 1st January 1995, of Mrs. Catherine Elizabeth Rees; and

(b) approved the re-appointment as Commissioners of Appeal for Income Tax, for a period of three years commencing 1st January 1995, of -

Mr. Harry Wookey Hall
Mr. Anthony John Cooper Paines
Mr. Arthur Stanley Le Ruez
Mr. James Shaw.

Limited Partnerships (Jersey) Law 1994
(Appointed Day) Act 1994

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 42 of the Limited Partnerships (Jersey) Law 1994, made an Act entitled the Limited Partnerships (Jersey) Law 1994 (Appointed Day) Act 1994.

Sport, leisure and recreation premises:
transfer of administration - P.170/94

THE STATES commenced consideration of a proposition of the Education Committee to approve the transfer of administration of sport, leisure and recreation premises from that Committee to the Sport, Leisure and Recreation Committee. After discussion, and on the proposition of Deputy Imogen Stephanie Nicholls of Grouville, the proposition was lodged ``au Greffe".

Adoption (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Law

199 - P.150/94

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Adoption (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Law 199 .

Public Service Vehicles (Fees) (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Regulations 1994 - P.152/94

THE STATES, in pursuance of Articles 49A and 54 of the Motor Traffic (Jersey) Law 1935, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Public Service Vehicles (Fees) (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Regulations 1994.

Family Allowances (Jersey) Regulations 1994 - P.154/94

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 7 of the Family Allowances (Jersey) Law 1972, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Family Allowances (Jersey) Regulations 1994.

Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme: further amendment - P.156/94

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Defence Committee, made an Act amending further the Act of the States dated the 4th day of December 1990, establishing a Scheme to provide compensation for victims of crimes of violence.

Loi (199) (Amendement) sur la Voirie - P.157/94

THE STATES, having accepted an amendment of Deputy Dereck André Carter of St. Helier that in Article 7 for the words ``le deliquant sera passible d'" there should be substituted the words ``il pourra infliger sur le délinquant", and subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Loi (199) (Amendement) sur la Voirie.

Powers of Attorney (Jersey) Law 199 - P.159/94

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Powers of Attorney (Jersey) Law

199 .

Licensing (No. 9) (Jersey) Regulations 1994 -
P.160/94

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 92 of the
Licensing (Jersey) Law 1974, as amended, made
Regulations entitled the Licensing (No. 9)
(Jersey) Regulations 1994.

States of Jersey Airport: operation of jet
aircraft - P.161/94

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the
Harbours and Airport Committee -

(1) referred to their Acts dated 19th
November 1969, 27th September 1988 and
31st March 1992, and agreed to
substitute for paragraph (1) the
following paragraph -

“(1) agreed that there should be no
operation of jet aircraft into
and out of Jersey Airport
between 22.30 hours and 07.30
hours local time except -

(a) in extenuating circumstances;

(b) jet aircraft which meet the
noise requirements of Chapter
3 of ICAO Annex 16 Volume 1;

(c) to allow the operation of the
existing service by a Boeing
737-200 aircraft.”

(2) rescinded their Acts dated 27th
September 1988 and 31st March 1992.

Compliments of the season

Senator Reginald Robert Jeune, on behalf of the
Senators, Connétable Leonard René Hamel of St.
Clement, on behalf of the Connétables, and
Deputy Robin Ernest Richard Rumboll of St.
Helier, on behalf of the Deputies, wished the
Bailiff and Lady Crill, the Law Officers and the
Officers of the States the compliments of the
season.

The Bailiff, in return, wished the Members of
the States and their families a Happy Christmas

and a peaceful New Year.

THE STATES rose at 12.10 p.m.

G.H.C. COPPOCK

Greffier of the States.