



**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
8th October, 1985 at 10.15 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Frank Ereaut.**

All members were present with the exception of –

Senator John Le Marquand – out of the Island.

Senator Reginald Robert Jeune – out of the Island.

Senator Anne Baal – out of the Island.

Leonard James Norman, Connétable of St. Saviour – out of the Island.

Fred Philip Webber Clarke, Connétable of St. Helier – out of the Island.

Edwin Le Gresley Godel, Connétable of St. Mary – out of the Island.

Arthur Philip Querée, Connétable of St. Ouen – out of the Island.

John Le Gallais, Deputy of St. Saviour – out of the Island.

Bertram Manning Le Maistre, Deputy of St. Mary – out of the Island.

Ronald Winter Blampied, Deputy of St. Helier – out of the Island.

Leonard Norman, Deputy of St. Clement – out of the Island.

Prayers

Attorney General and Solicitor General – congratulations on new appointments.

The Bailiff, on behalf of the Members of the States, congratulated the Attorney General on his appointment as Deputy Bailiff and the Solicitor General on his appointment as Attorney General when the Bailiff, Sir Frank Ereaut, retired at the end of the year.

The Attorney General replied, thanking the Bailiff and the Members for their good wishes.

Subordinate legislation tabled.

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely –

1. **Road Traffic (Public Parking Places) (Jersey) Order, 1985. R & O 7431.**
2. **Road Traffic (Trinity) (Amendment No. 7) (Jersey) Order, 1985. R & O 7432.**

Petition regarding Fort Regent membership (P.53/85): Report. P.114/85.

The Fort Regent Development Committee by Act dated 17th September, 1985, presented to the States a Report on the Petition regarding Fort Regent membership.

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

States' Meetings: printed record (P.102/85) – Establishment Committee comments. P.118/85.

The Establishment Committee by Act dated 23rd September, 1985 presented to the States the comments of the Committee on the Proposition relating to a printed record of States' Meetings.

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

Matters noted – land transactions.

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 30th September, 1985, showing that in pursuance of Standing Orders relating to certain transactions in land, the Committee had approved –

- (a) as recommended by the Public Works Committee, the sale to D.N.C. Investments, owners of Triple Cross Garage, Ingouville Lane, St. Helier, of 726 square feet of land and the purchase from D.N.C. Investments of 492.9 square feet of land, both areas shown on Drawing No. 1386/4, to enable the company to achieve a redevelopment of the site of the garage, subject to the payment by each party of £10.00, and on the basis of each party being responsible for the payment of its own legal fees;
- (b) as recommended by the Public Works Committee, the acquisition from the undermentioned property owners of land required in connexion with the provision of a footpath on the north side of the road from Five Oaks to Victoria Cottage Homes, St. Saviour, at the rate of £2 a square foot, on the basis of the Public of the Island assuming responsibility for all the costs involved in the preparation of a contract and also being responsible for all the costs of the accommodation works required, namely –
 - (i) Mr. Rodney John Blair Hickman and Mrs. Joanna Hickman, née Abbott, of Pierson Villa, Five Oaks, St. Saviour, 178.75 square feet of land for a consideration of £357.50; and
 - (ii) Mr. Francis Le Brocq of Aubrey House, Five Oaks, St. Saviour, 130.09 square feet of land for a consideration of £260.18;
- (c) as recommended by the Public Works Committee, the acquisition from the undermentioned property owners of land required in connexion with the provision of a footpath in St. Brelade's Bay, on the basis of the Public of the Island assuming responsibility for all the costs involved in the preparation of a contract and also being responsible for all the costs of the accommodation works, namely –

- (i) Miss Iris Désirée Perceval Judge of Shalimar, St. Brelade's Bay, 167.2 square feet of land at the rate of £2 a square foot, namely a consideration of £324.40; and
- (ii) Le Houmet Estates Limited, the ceding free of charge of 427 square feet of land at Le Houmet, St. Brelade's Bay, subject to the Public Works Committee constructing a wall along the southern side of the property;
- (d) as recommended by the Public Works Committee, the granting to St. Brelade's Small Bore Rifle Club of a nine year lease, commencing 30th September, 1985, of the tunnel currently occupied by the Club at St. Aubin, with rent reviews at the end of each third year tied to the increase in the Jersey Cost of Living Index;
- (e) as recommended by the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, the transfer of the lease of Warren Farm, Noirmont, St. Brelade, which had been granted in the sole name of Mr. A.W. Le Marquand, to the joint names of Mr. Arthur Walter Le Marquand and Mrs. Yolande Claire Le Marquand, née Goubert;
- (f) as recommended by the Housing Committee, the granting to Mr. Alfred George Hinds and Mr. Grant Howard Lees of a servitude to enable them to connect the drains of two houses constructed on Field 1356, St. Helier, into those which served Elysée Estate, subject to Mr. Hinds and Mr. Lees respectively each paying a charge of £250 and on condition that the Public of the Island was not involved in any legal expenses and that all areas affected were reinstated to the Housing Committee's satisfaction;
- (g) as recommended by the Education Committee, the granting to The Jersey Electricity Company Limited of a contract wayleave in respect of an underground cable through the property Overstrand, Tower Road,

St. Helier, subject to all costs incurred in drawing up the necessary contract being borne by the company;

- (h) as recommended by the Education Committee, the sale to Mr. Stephen John Espiner of an area of land, measuring approximately 400 square feet, running between Janvrin School and No. 77, St. Mark's Road, St. Helier, for a consideration of £1,000 plus the payment by Mr. Espiner of all legal expenses;
- (i) as recommended by the Education Committee, the lease from Mrs. Virginia Leslie Gothard, née Pratt, of No. 15, Palace Close, St. Saviour, for a period of two years with effect from 1st September, 1985, at a rent of £75 a week, for occupation by Mr. K. Reece, National Children's Home Superintendent, who had been seconded from the United Kingdom, and his family.

Matter noted – financial transaction.

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 30th September, 1985, showing that in pursuance of Rule 5 of the Public Finances (General) (Jersey) Rules, 1967, as amended, the Committee had noted that the Housing Committee had accepted the lowest of five tenders, namely that submitted by E. Farley and Son Limited, in the sum of £305,000 in a contract period of 39 weeks, for the construction of 12 flats in Phase III of the Hampshire Gardens Development.

Matters lodged.

The following subjects were lodged "au Greffe" –

1. **Draft Queen's Valley Reservoir (Jersey) Law, 198 . P.115/85.**

Presented by the Public Works Committee.

The States decided to take this subject into consideration on 19th November, 1985.

2. **Draft Borrowing (Control) (Amendment No. 2) (Jersey) Law, 198 . P.116/85.**
Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.
3. **Draft Agriculture (Loans) (Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P117/85.**
Presented by the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee. The States decided to take this subject into consideration on 22nd October, 1985.
4. **Education Committee Recreational Land and Facilities: use on Sundays. P.119/85.**
Presented by the Island Development Committee.
The States decided to take this subject into consideration on 12th November, 1985.
5. **Draft Queen's Valley Reservoir (Jersey) Law – reports on legal and financial implications. P.120/85.**
Presented by Senator Jane Patricia Sandeman.

Draft Queen's Valley Reservoir (Jersey) Law – reports on legal and financial implications. P.120/85.

THE STATES acceded to the request of Senator Jane Patricia Sandeman that the Proposition requesting reports on the legal and financial implications relating to the draft Queen's Valley Reservoir (Jersey) Law (lodged at the present Sitting) be considered on 22nd October, 1985.

Members present voted as follows –

“Pour” (23)

Senators

Shenton, Binnington, Sandeman, Horsfall, Rothwell.

Connétables

Grouville, St. Clement, St. Lawrence.

Deputies

Mourant(H), St. Ouen, Le Maistre(H), Quenault(B), Perkins(C), Le Brocq(H), Le Quesne(S), Le Fondré(L), Rumboll(H), Grouville, Thorne(B), Wavell(H), Billot(S), Carter(H), St. Martin.

“Contre” (19)**Senators**

Vibert, Ellis, Le Main, Manton.

Connétables

St. John, Trinity, St. Brelade, St. Martin, St. Peter.

Deputies

Morel(S), Roche(S), Trinity, Filleul(H), Vandervliet(L), Farley(H), Beadle(B), St. John, St. Peter, Mahoney(H).

Field 595, St. John. Question and answers.

Senator Jane Patricia Sandeman asked the Connétable of St. John, President of the Island Development Committee, the following question –

“In February, 1984, a Board of Arbitrators met to establish the value of Field 595 in the Parish of St. John which was acquired by the Island Development Committee by compulsory purchase. Prior to the Arbitration and specifically not affecting the award, the vendor of Field 595 had accepted certain terms offered by the Autorisé de la Partie Publique concerning the water supply, a greenhouse, the pump and pump-house. As these terms remain unfulfilled twenty-two months later, will the President say if his Committee intends to honour the agreement, carry out the work and, where necessary, reclaim the costs from the Parish of St. John?”

The President of the Island Development Committee replied as follows –

“1. As stated in Senator Sandeman’s question, the previous Island Development Committee acquired the

northern part of Field 595, St. John, in 1984 by compulsory purchase, and subsequently obtained the consent of the States to transfer that land to the Parish of St. John for housing development.

2. At the time of transfer, the then Island Development Committee requested the Parish to fulfil the undertakings made to the previous owner broadly as described by Senator Sandeman, i.e. –
 - (a) the provision of an alternative water supply to their adjoining property in place of a bore hole that existed on the acquired land;
 - (b) the relocation to their adjoining property of a greenhouse and its equipment;
 - (c) the relocation of two small sheds, one being a wooden ‘pump-house’ transferable from the bore hole when the alternative water supply had been commissioned – there was no request for the pump.
3. The Parish asked the architect in charge of that part of the village development to arrange the work required and the present position is as follows –
 - (a) a mains water supply was provided to the property of the former owner of Field 595 over six months ago, when the water supply from the bore hole was de-commissioned;
 - (b) the greenhouse was relocated at least 18 months ago and, incidentally, re-erected on a blockwork base which it did not have previously. Its oil tank, boiler and electrical supply have also been moved. Final connexion of the oil and electrical supply has just been completed. A piped water supply has been provided that did not exist previously;

- (c) the small wooden 'pump-house' associated with the bore hole mentioned earlier now lies within the boundary of one of the new dwellings built on Field 595. It was the intention that it should have been relocated at the same time as the bore hole was de-commissioned. Unfortunately, this was not effected before the contract for the dwelling concerned was passed and certain difficulties have been encountered over its recovery. Negotiations are proceeding and a new shed will be provided if this seemingly small problem cannot soon be resolved. The tool-shed was uplifted and relocated a long time ago."

Reservoirs: Questions and answers.

Senator Jane Patricia Sandeman asked Deputy Donald George Filleul, President of the Public Works Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Will the President give the capacity and yield of –
 - (a) Queen’s Valley Reservoir;
 - (b) Val de la Mare Reservoir;
 - (c) the extended Val de la Mare Reservoir?
- 2. Will the President give the States information concerning the loan required by The Jersey New Waterworks Company to finance the construction of Queen’s Valley Reservoir, i.e. the amount, source and duration of the loan and the anticipated rate of interest. Does the President agree that the interest payable on the loan has not been included in the estimated costs of £13.5m given to the States on 24th September, 1985?

3. Assuming that the consumer will be required to meet these costs, will the President say which firm of accountants has assessed the increased cost of water to the consumer. Will the President inform the States of the anticipated increased cost?
4. On 24th September, 1985, it was stated in reply to my questions that The Jersey New Waterworks Company Limited has already spent £860,000 on the construction of Queen's Valley Reservoir. The Jersey New Waterworks Company has also entered into a contract with Watson Hawksley, consulting engineers. Will the President, on behalf of the States of Jersey shareholders, consider applying to the Court for the appointment of an Inspector, under Jersey company law, to enquire into the legality and wisdom of The Jersey New Waterworks Company embarking on such expenditure before owning the land required for the construction of Queen's Valley Reservoir?"

The President of the Public Works Committee replied as follows –

- “1. The first figure requested by the Senator is the volume of water which can be held in a given reservoir and in each case this is –

- (a) Queen's Valley 250 million gallons;
- (b) Val de la Mare 207 million gallons;
- (c) Extended Val de la Mare 590 million gallons.*

- * This is calculated by adding the anticipated possible extra capacity of 383 million gallons if it proves possible to raise the top water level by 40 feet to the existing 207 million gallons.

‘Yield’ is derived from the volume of water storable in the reservoir plus the amount estimated to flow in and replace usage during a year or, to put it another way, the volume it can reasonably be expected will be available for use from that reservoir during a year.

But yield will depend on two factors –

- (a) the inflow from the streams and springs in the reservoir’s own natural catchment; and
- (b) the water which can be gathered from other sources and pumped to the reservoir, thus utilising its capacity to the full.

In this context it is important to know first what the natural catchment of each site will produce, and the facts are revealing. I have repeated the capacities for ease of comparison –

<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Natural Catchment Input</u>
Queen’s Valley, 250 million gallons.	200 million gallons per annum
Val de la Mare, 207 million gallons.	110 million gallons per annum.
Extended Val de la Mare, 590 million gallons.	110 million gallons per annum.

It can thus be seen that Queen’s Valley will receive 80 per cent of its capacity from its natural sources. Val de la Mare only gains 53 per cent in its present form. An extended Val de la Mare would only receive 18.6 per cent of its capacity from the local catchment.

In each case, the balance must be made up by transferring surplus supplies from more distant sources.

The figure of 450 million gallons has been quoted for Queen's Valley yield and this is the result of a considerable proportion of the precipitation in the East of the Island being available for collection relatively cheaply at Rozel and St. Catherine's Valleys where small retaining dams already exist; and from surplus water currently running to waste at Grands Vaux.

Val de la Mare is our largest existing storage facility and is a major unit in an integrated water supply system. It receives pumped water from a number of smaller sources which do not have sufficient storage capacity for their own supply potential. St. Peter's Valley, Pont Marquet, the various Company boreholes, the surplus from Grands Vaux and, of course, La Rosière Desalination Plant (at much higher cost) all contribute to the Val de la Mare reservoir which, to reach present capacity, needs to receive 97 million gallons in this way – but if extended would require 480 million gallons transferred from a distance in order to be filled. This volume is not currently available and a new small retaining reservoir would have to be built in Queen's Valley to accumulate sufficient of the readily obtainable local supply prior to being transferred to Val de la Mare.

It is technically possible to install new pumps and pipelines to carry out sufficient transfers to fill and, in good seasons, partially refill the Val de la Mare reservoir to produce an impressive yield figure, but the running costs of this option would be around £50,000 for, say, 300 million gallons and the supplies would then have to be returned to Augrés for treatment prior to final distribution. This is a solution unacceptable in economic terms and is a prime factor to be considered, together with £6½ million additional

cost – over the Queen’s Valley construction estimate – when opting for the latter solution.

We are saying that the yield of an extended Val de la Mare should reasonably be assessed at about the same figure as its enhanced storage capacity of 590 million gallons.

But the existing Val de la Mare resource of 207 million gallons, plus the more economical yield of 450 million gallons at Queen’s Valley totals 657 million gallons and this is the sensible and practical option which has been chosen to keep the cost of water to the consumer as low as possible.

It is regretted that this answer is lengthy and complex, but the subject is itself extremely difficult to understand and the response could not properly be made without full explanation.

2. The question of the financing of the Queen’s Valley project is a matter for The Jersey New Waterworks Company – it is to that Company that the Senator’s questions have been redirected. I am grateful to the Company’s Chairman, Jurat Peter Blampied, for providing the answer to Question 2 as follows –

‘The question suggests that the Senator believes that the Company will be seeking a loan to finance the construction of Queen’s Valley Reservoir within a short delay. This is not correct and the fact that it is not correct makes it difficult to answer the question.

I anticipate that the finance required to construct Queen’s Valley Reservoir will be obtained in tranches with the major requirements falling in 1987 and 1989.

The policy of the Company is to increase the cash flow that it enjoys at the present time in order to reduce the finance that we will eventually require. We have already achieved some measure of success.

I cannot state the amount of the finance that we will require in 1987 and 1989 because I cannot be certain. I can say however that I believe that it will be less than the full cost of the reservoir.

The source, duration and interest payable will be dependent on market conditions at the time when the finance that we require is raised, but I can say that it is our intention to make full use of the opportunities available in the financial markets to ensure that the funds are provided in a form which combines flexibility with recognition of the long-term nature of the Company's operations.

The interest payable will be charged in the profit and loss account and I confirm that it has not been included in the estimated cost of £13½ million to which the Senator refers.'

3. Once again, this question has been very courteously answered by Jurat Blampied –

'Samuel Montagu and Company Limited of London were appointed advisers to the Company on 1st July, 1985 on all aspects of financing Queens' Valley Reservoir and will be assisted by the existing professional advisers of the Company.

It is now being argued by the opponents of the decision to construct a reservoir in Queen's Valley that the water rate will have to be increased by 60 per cent or more.

I do not accept that an increase of 60 per cent or more is inevitable.

An increase of 50 per cent to the Company's charges should produce additional revenue in excess of £1½ million. If it proves necessary to raise as much as £13½ million in 1987 and 1989 by way of loan and if interest is payable at 11 per cent the additional revenue will be about the measure of the interest payable.

However this method of calculating the additional revenue required by the Company is too simple and denies the problem the sophistication that it requires.

It ignores the annual positive cash flow which the Company enjoys and which will finance part of the interest that will be payable year by year. It ignores also the steps being taken by the Company or which are contemplated to increase the current cash flow by the sale of assets.'

4. In November 1980 the House decided that a reservoir should be constructed in Queen's Valley by The Jersey New Waterworks Company which, at that time, possessed the authority to seek powers of compulsory purchase on application to the States, in each case where negotiations to acquire land proved fruitless.

In November 1981, this decision was confirmed and in addition the House, having heard from me that most of the landowners were prepared to negotiate for the sale of their land were the project to proceed, agreed to authorise the Company to use their compulsory purchase powers in respect of National Trust land. Two days later the Company's Board resolved to enter into a formal agreement with Watson Hawksley for the design and supervision of a dam at Queen's Valley.

It would have been irresponsible for the Company to have entered into such a project without wide ranging geological, engineering hydrological and environmental studies. Indeed the entire scheme had to be fully planned in every respect before its cost could be assessed and presented to the Committee for inclusion in its submission to the States. Messrs. Watson Hawksley were the major engineering consultants among a number of specialists retained to undertake this considerable task. In addition, the Company had to prepare detailed environmental assessments for submission to the Island Development Committee. The Company, as has been made clear above, had every reasonable indication of being able to proceed with the project and cannot, in any way, be criticised for carrying out investigations, preparations and costings, the absence of which would, I am sure, have been the target for severe criticism by the Senator during the debates on the project.

Indeed, I think the House will agree that the Company has, throughout the long delay to which it has been subjected since the States instructed it to proceed, acted with absolute propriety. Furthermore, it should be applauded rather than criticised for having taken the steps that it has to minimise the adverse financial and operational effects of this delay. My answer, therefore, is 'no' ”.

La Pouclée Farm, Richmond Road, St. Helier – housing development. Statement.

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

“The House will be aware that my Committee has before it an application for planning permission to construct 93 three-bedroomed dwellings with garages for sale under the States (Basic) Loan Housing Scheme, and 24 one-bedroomed flats for either sale or rental at La Pouclée Farm, Richmond Road, St. Helier.

The House will recall that on January 31st, 1984, it adopted a Proposition of the then Island Development Committee (P.103/83), which had been lodged on July 5th, 1983, that about seventeen vergées of land, comprising Fields 1226, 1226a, 1233 and a small part of 1232, be rezoned from ‘White’ land to use for States basic and supplementary loan, or States rental residential development. It was also intended that the site would be acquired by the Public of the Island, and developed by the Housing Committee to provide urgently needed housing. In the event, negotiations with the owner broke down over price.

The land has subsequently been acquired by a private development company which intends to construct houses, to a specification provided by the Planning and Housing Departments, for sale under the States Basic Loan Scheme. The acquisition of the land, and the form of development, have been sanctioned by the Housing Committee.

The application has given rise to representations from occupiers of property in the area, voicing concern not only about the effect of the development on the immediate locality, but also the impact that traffic generated by the development might have on the lower end of Queen’s Road at times of peak traffic flow.

In preparing its proposals, the development company, through its architects, has liaised closely with the officers of the Planning Department to ensure that

details of the layout and design of the housing estate are satisfactory. My Committee had sight of a draft layout prior to the submission of the planning application, and I will state that, subject to certain provisos that will be placed on the permit, the development scheme as proposed is acceptable to the Island Development Committee.

My Committee has considered the effect that the proposal will have on the roads in the area and whether the proposal should proceed in advance of the proposed road improvements to the Queen's Road/Rouge Bouillon junction. It is abundantly clear that the construction of a traffic roundabout at the junction is necessary now, and that any development, be it at La Pouquelaye or in any part of the north of the Island served by Queen's Road, will only exacerbate the delays that occur at that junction. Against this factor however, my Committee has to weigh the short-term need for new housing, which, despite the sterling efforts of the Housing Committee and, for that matter, the private sector, is still falling behind target. This was the problem that faced the previous Island Development Committee and the States before this land was zoned for housing purposes. I wish to inform the House that, taking all things into consideration, my Committee has reached the same conclusion, that its use for housing represents the paramount consideration.

When I bring the Island Plan to the House in the Spring of 1986, I will recommend, in the strongest terms possible, that a roundabout be constructed at the Queen's Road/Rouge Bouillon junction. I do not however consider it prudent to put that proposal to the States before the Island Plan because the justification for it is inseparably linked to other proposals in the Plan. My Committee is convinced that the House will understand the reasoning for this roundabout when explained in its wider context. In the meantime, it remains to be determined what should be done to alleviate the traffic problems in this area (not only

those occasioned by the La Pouclée Farm proposal) until this new junction is built. Planners and traffic engineers representing the Parish of St. Helier, and the Public Works and Island Development Committees have met to establish what can best be done to alleviate the problems involved, and proposals are being formulated that will be put to the Parish Roads Committee and the Public Works Committee in the near future.

In concluding, Mr. President, I would inform the House that the Island Development Committee has given full consideration to the highway factors, to the commitment conferred by the decision of the House in 1984, to the interests of those already resident in the area, to the interests of those who have placed deposits against the sale of the houses, and to the need to provide new homes in the Island, in deciding to grant planning permission for the construction of 93 three-bedroomed States (Basic) Loan homes at La Pouclée Farm, although it has deferred, for the time being, making a decision on the 24 one-bedroomed flats.

I would also add that, as for all applications, those persons who have made written representations will be notified individually of the Committee's decision giving the reasoning behind that decision, and the conditions that have been imposed on the permit."

St. James' Primary School Premises, St. Helier.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Education Committee –

- (a) approved the renewal of the lease from the Trustees of St. James' Church of the premises of the former St. James' Primary School for a period of three years commencing 1st August, 1985 at a rent for the first year of £5,408.13 with rent reviews to be applied from the commencement of the second and third years of the lease in accordance with the appropriate cost of living increases;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the necessary agreement;
- (c) authorised the Treasurer of the States to pay the rent as it became due.

**Broadcasting of the debate on the Review of Housing Policy.
P.96/85.**

THE STATES commenced consideration of a Proposition of Senator Richard Joseph Shenton that B.B.C. Radio Jersey should be asked to broadcast live the debate on the Housing Committee's 'Review of Housing Policy' (P.84/85).

After discussion Senator Shenton withdrew the Proposition.

**Assisted House Purchase Scheme: transfer of administration.
P.106/85.**

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Housing Committee, agreed –

- (a) to transfer the administration of the Assisted House Purchase Schemes for civil servants and teachers, from the Establishment and Education Committees, respectively, to the Housing Committee;
- (b) to amend the provisions of those Schemes, in accordance with the details set out in the report of the Housing Committee dated July 1985;

- (c) to authorise the Attorney General and the Greffier of the States to pass, on behalf of the States, any contracts, giving effect to a transaction approved by the Housing Committee, which arise from the operation of the Schemes.

Police – Staff. Deferred Supply. P.108/85.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee, acceded to the request for the following supplementary vote of credit to be voted out of the General Reserve –

Defence Committee	
Police – Staff (1201)	£168,500

Education Committee – structural maintenance. Deferred Supply. P.109/85.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee, acceded to the request for the following supplementary vote of credit to be voted out of the General Reserve –

Education Committee	
Structural Maintenance – general maintenance and emergencies (3096)	£28,500

Overseas Aid Committee – part costs of visit to Africa. Deferred Supply. P.110/85.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Finance and Economics Committee, acceded to the request for the following supplementary vote of credit to be voted out of the General Reserve –

Overseas Aid Committee	
Part costs of visit to Africa (6006)	£4,500

THE STATES rose at 12.55 p.m.

R.S. GRAY,

Deputy Greffier of the States.