



THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,  
16th June, 1981 at 10.15 a.m. under  
the Presidency of the Deputy Bailiff,  
Peter Leslie Crill, Esquire, C.B.E.

---

All members were present with the exception of –

Senator John Roland Christopher Riley – out of the  
Island.

---

Prayers.

---

**H.M. The Queen – loyal message of thanksgiving.**

THE STATES agreed that a message in the following terms  
should be transmitted to Her Majesty The Queen –

“To The Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty –

May it please Your Majesty –

Your Majesty’s faithful States of Jersey here assembled  
do give thanks to Almighty God for your safe deliverance  
from the outrageous incident which befell Your Majesty on  
Saturday last 13th June, and beg leave to express their  
admiration for Your Majesty’s exemplary and unbounded  
courage on that occasion.”

**Senator Mrs. G.C. Huelin – congratulations on award of  
O.B.E.**

The Deputy Bailiff, on behalf of all the Members,  
congratulated Senator Mrs. Gwyneth Clare Huelin, O.B.E., on  
being made an Officer of the British Empire in The Queen’s  
Birthday Honours List.

**Wedding of The Prince of Wales – Addresses.**

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of Senator Ralph Vibert, requested the Bailiff to send the following Addresses on the occasion of the forthcoming marriage of His Royal Highness, The Prince of Wales with the Lady Diana Spencer.

“To The Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty –

May it please Your Majesty –

The States of Jersey, in their name and in the name of the People of Jersey, beg leave humbly to express to Your Majesty and to His Royal Highness The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, their heartfelt congratulations on the occasion of the forthcoming marriage of His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales with the Lady Diana Spencer.

Proud of their long and deep attachment to Your Majesty’s Royal House, Your Majesty’s faithful States share in the great joy and happiness which this Union will bring to Your Majesty and to His Royal Highness The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.”

“To His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales –

May it please Your Royal Highness –

Her Majesty’s faithful States of the Island of Jersey beg leave, in their name and in the name of the People of Jersey, most respectfully to express to Your Royal Highness their sincerest congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of Your Forthcoming Marriage.

Deeply attached to Her Majesty’s Royal House, the States and People of Jersey have watched with admiration the assumption and discharge by Your Royal Highness of the many duties and responsibilities which are inseparable from Your Royal Station.

It is the fervent hope of the States and People of Jersey that Your Royal Highness and the Lady Diana Spencer may enjoy together long years of health and happiness.

And the States and People of Jersey pray that the Blessing of Almighty God may rest upon You Both.”

**Subordinate legislation tabled.**

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely –

Misuse of Drugs (Safe Custody) (Jersey) Order, 1981.  
R & O–6943.

**Matters lodged.**

The following subjects were lodged “au Greffe” –

1. Draft Merchant Shipping (Deck Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.68/81.  
*Presented by the Harbours and Airport Committee.*
2. Draft Merchant Shipping (Marine Engineer Officers) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.69/81.  
*Presented by the Harbours and Airport Committee.*
3. Draft Administrative Decisions (Review) (Jersey) Law, 198 . P.70/81.  
*Presented by the Special Committee to consider relationship between Committees and the States.*
4. Draft Fishing Vessels (Manning) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.71/81.  
*Presented by the Harbours and Airport Committee.*

THE STATES decided to take the above-mentioned subjects into consideration on 30th June, 1981.

5. Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited: acquisition of controlling interest. P.72/81.  
*Presented by Senator Richard Joseph Shenton.*
6. Development at Field 1007 – Mr. D.R. Manning. P.73/81.  
*Presented by Senator John Philip de Carteret.*

**Electrical Interconnection with France. Questions and Answers.**

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

- “1. As the Finance and Economics Committee has an obligation under the Electricity (Jersey) Law, 1937 to safeguard the public interest and bearing in mind that the States are being asked to agree in principle to the Jersey Electricity Company (a Company which is 51 per cent owned by the public) spending at least £10m (possibly £14m) on a project, will the President explain how the Committee was able to reconcile the following statements which appear on the face of it to be completely contradictory and to show an amazing change of mind on the part of the Company in such a short space of time?
- (a) in 1978, the Managing Director of the Company said that the Jersey Electricity Company *first* considered cable links with *France* in 1960, abandoned then in favour of building ‘La Collette’;
  - (b) in 1978, the Managing Director stated that the Company was *continually reviewing* the economic and technical feasibility of importing electricity, but that so far as the Company had decided that it was not financially worthwhile;
  - (c) in October, 1979, the Managing Director stated that for the Resources Recovery Board to talk of 1980s for a possible cable link was *nonsense* and furthermore that the *did not want* interference;
  - (d) however, in November, 1979, the Managing Director saw no practical solution to Jersey’s energy problem other than a link with France;
  - (e) in April, 1980, the new Chairman of the Company stressed that *much* more investigation was necessary.
2. The first sentence of the Report of the Jersey Electricity Company attached to the Finance and Economics Proposition (P.60) states –

‘Studies investigating the possibility of an interlink with France have been carried out on a number of occasions .....’.

Will the President tell the House –

- (a) when, where and what specific studies were carried out?
  - (b) who were the parties taking part and whom did they represent?
  - (c) when were the E.D.F. headquarters, which is the body responsible for any conclusive and firm agreements, contacted?
  - (d) whether he is prepared to make public the full report presented to the Finance and Economics Committee which convinced it to recommend the interlink, showing an appraisal of *costed* alternatives, including the benefits likely to be received by the public and consumers?
3. In its Report, the Jersey Electricity Company uses the words ‘In our discussions with Électricité de France .....’. Will the President assure the House that members of the Finance and Economics Committee, fulfilling its statutory obligation of safeguarding the public interest, were present at these very important discussions?
4. In 1976, the then President of the Finance and Economics Committee, in reply to my question on excessive profits, stated that ‘No major capital expenditure on generating plant is envisaged in the next 5 years ...’. The Company has increased pre-tax profits from £438,101 in 1974 to double (£990,545) in 1975 and now to £1,893,000, double again, in 1980. Will the President inform the House how the Company, in a monopoly position, justified these large profits to the Finance and Economics Committee and inform the House for what purpose they are being used?
5. The Managing Director of the Jersey Electricity Company, seeking to justify the recent tariff increases, stating ‘that tariffs would continue to increase *until* any alternative such as the underwater electricity cable with France was found’. Will the President inform the House, therefore, if the Jersey Electricity Company has received an assurance to the effect that either the production costs of nuclear power will remain stable for a set number of years or that the E.D.F. has guaranteed the Company a

fixed price or fixed percentage increase over a period of years?

6. If electricity from a nuclear station will be cheaper than that produced at 'La Collette' and therefore financially beneficial to the public, is the Committee in its recommendation disregarding that elsewhere in the world production costs of nuclear power rose by nearly 700 per cent in the past 10 years?
7. If half of Jersey's present annual electricity demand were in the future to be imported from French nuclear sources, as stated in the report, will the President inform the House of the result of the enquiries which the Finance and Economics Committee has made on the effect on jobs at the local Company?
8. Will the President tell the House whether any attempt has been made to estimate the effect, on electricity prices, of continued reliance on oil for between half and two-thirds of our electricity supply, if the cable link with France is established and, if so, what the effect will be?
9. It has been reported that the French are supplying large amounts of highly enriched uranium to politically unstable countries, which could then almost immediately produce nuclear weapons of greater power than the atom bomb used, for instance, on Hiroshima. Does the President not feel that the States has a moral obligation towards future generations and that therefore, in recommending that approval be given to a proposal that the Island should rely on the purchase of nuclear power from France, the Committee is not in fact safeguarding the public interest as it is required to do by law?"

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

“The Finance and Economics Committee has presented the Report to the States at the request and on behalf of the Board of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited, and because it approved in principle of the Report.

The Finance and Economics Committee discharges its responsibility to the States arising from Article 31 of the Electricity (Jersey) Law of 1937 not by seeking to become involved in the management of the company but by forming a

view as frequently as may be necessary as to whether any results of the company's management might be contrary to the public interest.

The approval of the States is requested by the Board because of the international nature of the proposed link with *Électricité de France*.

If the States approve the link in principle the Finance and Economics Committee, as stated in its explanatory note, will make a continuing assessment of the economic aspects involved.

The proposal put before the States is made as the result of the unanimous decision of the Board, four of whose members are members of the States, appointed by the States, namely Deputy Dupré, Senator Binnington, the *Connétable* of St. Helier and the Deputy of St. Peter.

As Deputy Dupré is not only Vice-President of the Finance and Economics Committee and able to act as *Rapporteur*, but also by virtue of his appointment by the States to the Board of the company, Chairman of the Board and thus is directly involved in its decisions and the reasons for them, it is appropriate that he should move the proposition, and he will also answer the questions raised insofar as they relate to the matters with which he is in the best position to deal, in particular the more detailed aspects of the proposed arrangement.

In reply, however, to Question 3, the Finance and Economics Committee as such has not been in contact with *Électricité de France*.

In regard to Question 4 the company's accounts are presented annually to the States. The Finance and Economics Committee has to date been satisfied that the profits are reasonable having regard to the company's present and future needs but it has been and remains open to any States member to present a proposition to the States under Article 17 of the Electricity Law to vary the company's tariffs if that member thinks that the profits are excessive.

And in reply to Question 9, I agree that we have a moral obligation towards future generations but I do not consider that linking to the power supply of a large, neighbouring and friendly nation fails in that obligation."

The Vice-President of the Finance and Economics Committee, in his capacity as Chairman of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited, made supplementary replies to the questions of Senator John Philip de Carteret as follows –

- “1. (a) Yes. Agreed.
- (b) Yes. Agreed. It was not considered that the cable link was financially viable.
- (c) Mr. Wade was quoted in the ‘J.E.P.’ on 11th October, 1979 as having said that ‘for the R.R.B. to talk of 1982 for a possible cable link is nonsense’. There is no need to retract from this statement because there was no chance that a cable could be installed in that timescale.
- To have two separate representations from Jersey during the negotiations with E.D.F. was likely to create misunderstandings.
- (d) Yes. We would agree that our investigations in the latter part of 1979 indicated that the interconnection with France was the right solution.
- (e) Yes. This again is a true statement and resources were allocated to carry out the necessary investigations, which are continuing.
2. (a) Studies were carried out in 1960 and 1975 but it was not until the latter part of 1979 that a cable link was first found to be economic. These investigations have been continuous since this period, during which time estimates of capital cost and E.D.F. electricity supply tariffs were related to the J.E.C. operating costs.
- (b) The studies were carried out by the J.E.C. and E.D.F.
- (c) Discussions were held with E.D.F. in Normandy in 1978 and with Paris officials since early 1980.
- ”



- (d) No. There is no intention to make public the full report presented to the Finance and Economics Committee as the negotiations that have been carried out, as is normal with commercial negotiations, are of a confidential nature.
3. Historically members of the Finance and Economics Committee are also members of the J.E.C. Board and, therefore, are fully informed of negotiations and, indeed, have met the E.D.F. representatives.
  4. –
  5. No. No such assurance is likely to be given by any undertaking. It is a fact that over the last 10 years the cost of nuclear fuel has not increased at the same rate as fossil fuels.
  6. The cost of generating electricity in nuclear power stations in 1977/78 was about 50 per cent lower than coal and oil-fired steam power stations. However, in 1979/80 the C.E.G.B. decided to change the method of comparing nuclear power station running costs with coal-fired stations. The new comparison takes into account the charges for de-commissioning, interest during construction, fuel costs, training and research and this different method of comparison does influence the cost of nuclear power when related to conventional generation.

The fact still remains that nuclear power in 1980, even with the new comparison, was approximately 32 per cent cheaper than oil-fired generation and 16 per cent cheaper than coal-fired stations.

If this comparison was based purely on fuel, nuclear running costs are 62 per cent cheaper than oil and 53 per cent cheaper than coal.

7. This is really a matter which should be left to the J.E.C. but it can be stated that as a result of the change there may be some re-deployment of certain personnel. J.E.C. have, however, given an undertaking to the trade unions concerned that there will be no redundancies.

8. As we have indicated before, the costs of fuel oil are increasing rapidly and the evidence that we have leads us to believe that electricity prices could be stabilised to a much greater extent.
9. —”.

### **Tourism advertising. Questions and Answers.**

Senator John Philip de Carteret asked Deputy Clarence Shepperd Dupré, President of the Tourism Committee, the following questions –

- “1. In the light of the unfortunate recession now being suffered by the tourism industry in the Island, will the President inform the House whether he stands by the replies to my questions of July, 1980 in which he referred to the ‘excellent service’ provided by the advertising agency used by the Tourism Committee for the past 20 years without the services from other agencies being considered in competition?
2. Will the President inform the House of the number and nature of new ideas and promotions suggested for 1982 by the present advertising agency since July, 1980?
3. Will the Committee consider appointing a firm of consultants experienced in this field to advise it on the introduction of a new, positive and dynamic approach to the Island’s tourism image for the 1980s taking all aspects such as air fares, present facilities, adequate leisure services and potential new markets for the future into consideration?”

The President of the Tourism Committee replied as follows –

- “1. The economy of every Western European country has been hit by the recession which has resulted in very high unemployment coupled with a strong £ relative to other European currencies. The tourism industry in the Island could not escape entirely from the consequences of the recession, which has been particularly severe in our main markets of the U.K. and France. In spite of the depression the advertising campaigns have continued to generate a satisfactory level of enquiries, comparable to those of recent years, and the Agency has maintained an excellent

standard of service. The replies to the questions in July, 1980 are still valid.

2. The Agency is retained primarily to undertake Press and Television advertising and its creative ideas have resulted in the Committee's campaigns being accorded various awards in advertising. The 1981 results will be monitored closely before any firm decision is taken regarding the strategy to be adopted for 1982.
3. The Committee proposes to appoint a working party to study various aspects for promoting the Island's tourism image; this working party will consult with other parties interested in the tourism industry."

### **Teaching Staff establishments – Statement.**

The President of the Education Committee made a Statement in the following terms –

“1. Following the fall in the birthrate in the 1970s there has been a continuing decline in the school population over the past five years. The total number of pupils in the non fee paying Primary schools has fallen from 4,658 in January, 1977 to 3,742 in January, 1981. Over the same period the Secondary school roll has moved from 3,390 in 1977 to a peak of 3,437 in 1978 and in 1981 stands at 3,296.

2. The Education Committee has been asked repeatedly by the Finance and Economics Committee to reduce the number of teachers in the non fee paying schools in line with the reduction in pupil numbers. The Establishment Committee has also, from time to time, drawn the Committee's attention to the proposition on public employment adopted by the States in 1979 and has called for reductions in the number of people employed by the Committee.

3. The falling numbers will continue for some years to come and will influence the educational system for the rest of this decade. Present projections are that by January, 1984 the Primary school population will be 3,639 and the Secondary School rolls will have fallen to 2,910. While this appears to be the lowest point for Primary rolls the Secondary school population will continue to fall for a further five years.

4. During the 1960s and 1970s teaching staff establishments were calculated on formulae that produced overall teacher/pupil ratios of 1:20.5 in Primary education and 1:13.5 in Secondary education. However, as numbers of children have fallen these ratios have tended to improve so that by September, 1979 the ratio in Primary schools was 1:19.5.

5. Early in 1980 the Committee considered a report from the Director of Education indicating that the problems of 'falling rolls' called for new criteria for determining teaching staff establishments and that those criteria should be set to meet the needs of the schools in terms of the curriculum and organisation.

6. Pending full consideration of the report the Committee began to tackle the problem and, in April, 1980, published the schools staffing establishments for September, 1980 which came closer to the overall ratio of 1:20.5. This led to protests from both the fee paying and the non fee paying schools and the Committee decided to declare a standstill and to maintain the 1979/80 establishments for a further year while Headteachers were consulted about new criteria. All 'additional' posts created by that decision were declared to be temporary and to be filled for one year only by teachers appointed on contracts ending on 31st August, 1981. Because of the standstill the staffing ratio in Primary schools fell to 1:18.8 in 1980/81.

7. Discussions with the Headteachers began in June, 1980 and were not completed until the end of April, 1981. The result of those discussions was –

agreement with the Heads of the Secondary schools on the staffing required to maintain agreed curriculum;

agreement with the College Heads to maintain the formulae used in the 1970s;

proposals by the Heads of Primary schools subsequently amended and agreed by the Headteachers and adopted by the Committee.

8. These last proposals established common principles for staffing all Primary schools and recognised the needs of the increasing number of small schools in which it is more difficult to maintain a full curriculum and in which the pupils

do not enjoy the benefits that come from the variety of teachers' skills and interests and the stimulus of greater numbers of pupils of similar abilities in the larger schools.

9. The application of the principles agreed with the Heads of Primary schools produced an overall ratio of 1:19.0 and required some reduction in the establishments of a number of schools. Overall the total teaching staff of the Primary schools will be reduced from 207 to 197 by September, 1981. In 5 schools a particular problem exists because there are, in those schools, a total of 8 permanently appointed teachers more than will be required in September. In the Secondary schools the 'curriculum staffing' required some 4 teachers more than provided by the 1:13.5 ratio. It is to be noted that if the Committee had reverted to the ratio of the 1970s there would have been an overstaffing of 24 teachers in the Primary schools.

10. As a first step the teachers in the five Primary schools were asked to consider moving to other posts and were given first choice of the known vacancies with special protection of salary and status. Altogether 9 teachers have taken this opportunity to change schools.

11. On 9th June, all remaining vacancies were advertised throughout the Education Service and all teachers are free to apply for these posts. Headteachers are now engaged in filling these vacancies and it is expected that most of the teachers who hold one year contracts will secure permanent appointments from September, 1981. Priority has been given to teachers completing their probationary year who have been guaranteed continued employment with the Committee. When all posts have been filled there will have been fewer staff changes than customarily occurred at this time of year during the 1960s and 1970s.

12. A small reserve of teaching posts has been created from which allocations can be made to meet special circumstances. From this reserve the Director of Education, after further discussions with Primary Heads, has allocated the equivalent of 8.0 full time teachers, distributed to 19 schools. In addition I have agreed to meet Headteachers' and Parent/Teachers' Associations if they believe due recognition has not been given to particular circumstances in their schools. So far requests have been made on behalf of two schools.

13. It could have been possible for the Committee to propose the closure of some of the smaller schools in order to produce a more effective and efficient system. Ideally no Primary school should fall much below 175 pupils (which would give a class for each age group) and the Secondary schools estimated that to maintain those figures we would need to close some 8 Primary schools and in due course 1 Secondary school. The Committee believes that such a course would not be acceptable to the public of the Island and has therefore to meet the needs of children by maintaining the smaller schools.

14. As the figures quoted in this statement show, the problems arising from falling numbers will be with us for some time to come. The Committee has to meet all the needs of the different areas of the Education Service. As numbers have fallen first in Primary and now in Secondary schools, so the demands of Further Education have increased as has the need to support more students in Higher Education. By comparison with England and Wales where the overall pupil/teacher ratio (combining Primary and Secondary) is 18.6:1 the Jersey ratio of 15.9:1 is clearly very good. A more direct comparison may be made with Guernsey where the Primary ratio is 20:1 and the Secondary ratio is 14.5:1; the Jersey equivalent being 19:1 and 13.5:1. Our own professional advisers and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools believe that our ratios are good enough to maintain high standards of education. The Committee wishes to maintain those high standards through this period of falling numbers and believes that they can be so maintained, given the support and goodwill of the teaching force.

15. I recognise that in such a period of contraction teachers develop proper professional anxieties. The Committee has consulted closely with the Heads about the ways in which the needs of the children can be met. Discussions are taking place with the Teachers' Associations to try to introduce a scheme for early retirement and an agreed policy for redeploying teachers within the Service. The Committee will continue those particular discussions and undertake further reviews and discussions during the coming school year.

16. Costs are rising in every area and the Education Committee must maintain a proper balance so as to ensure that the schools are provided not only with the teachers but also the resources and equipment required for children's education.

Over the years Jersey has quite properly invested a considerable amount of money in education and it can be very satisfied with the results. In no way does the Education Committee – and I am sure this Assembly – wish to reduce that level of expenditure and thereby lessen the quality of the Service.”

### **Energy Report.**

THE STATES accepted amendments of the Finance and Economics Committee to a Proposition of the Resources Recovery Board that at the end of paragraph (a) there should be added the words “subject to any specific proposal to this end being supported by a full report and financial appraisal” and that in paragraph (b) for the words “intention to maintain” there should be substituted the words “view that it is desirable that there be maintained” and that the end of paragraph (b) there should be added the words “subject to any specific proposal to this end being supported by a full report and financial appraisal”. The Resources Recovery Board then withdrew paragraph (c) of its Proposition and having re-lettered the original paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) and (c), (d) and (e) the States adopted them.

The Resources Recovery Board then withdrew paragraphs (g) and (h) and added the following paragraph –

“(f) to approve the principle of promoting energy conservation in the industrial, domestic and commercial sectors and to ask the Board to report back to the States as to the means by which this can best be achieved.”

whereupon the States adopted paragraph (f) and –

- (a) accepted a general policy of improving the security of energy supplies to the Island by promoting a greater degree of diversity in the sources of energy supply, subject to any specific proposal to this end being supported by a full report and financial appraisal;
- (b) placed on record their view that it is desirable that there be maintained all the existing types of energy supply presently available to the public of the Island, viz coal, oil, gas and electricity, subject to any specific proposal to this end being supported by a full report and financial appraisal;

- (c) placed on record their intention to ensure that adequate port facilities are provided to handle a diversified mix of imported fuels, including those required for the generation of electricity;
- (d) requested the Finance and Economics Committee, under the powers vested in it under Article 31 of the Electricity (Jersey) Law, 1937, enabling it to safeguard the public interest, to bring to the States a Report and Proposition on the establishment of an electricity power interconnection with Électricité de France;
- (e) required the Resources Recovery Board to produce further Reports regarding energy usage in the Island and to maintain and develop a co-ordinating stance between the Companies involved in the production and/or supply of energy in the Island;
- (f) approved the principle of promoting energy conservation in the industrial, domestic and commercial sectors and asked the Board to report back to the States as to the means by which this can best be achieved.

Deputy Jack Roche of St. Saviour having declared an interest in the matter, withdrew from the Chamber.

### **Electrical Interconnection with France.**

THE STATES acceded to the request of the President of the Finance and Economics Committee that the Proposition regarding the proposed electrical interconnection with France (P.60/81 – lodged on 26th May, 1981) be deferred from the present Sitting to that of 23rd June, 1981.

### **Provision of new Central Library.**

THE STATES, having rejected an amendment of Deputy Sir Martin Le Quesne of St. Saviour to a Proposition of the Education Committee that the existing paragraph should be numbered 1 and after the word Central there should be added “Lending” and that the following paragraph should be added –



- “2. to request the Education Committee to present to the States comparative estimates of the cost of –
- (a) retaining the use of the existing Library as the Reference Library/Reading Room; and
  - (b) incorporating those facilities in the new Central Library.”,

and having accepted an amendment of the Education Committee that all the words after “on” should be deleted and the words “a site in States ownership in the Dumaresq Street area” should be substituted, adopted the Proposition of the Education Committee and approved in principle the provision of a new Central Library for the Public Library Service on a site in States ownership in the Dumaresq Street area.

THE STATES rose at 6.05 p.m.

**R.S. GRAY,**

*Deputy Greffier of the States.*