



**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
2nd December, 1986 at 10.15 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Peter Leslie Crill, Esquire, C.B.E.**

All members were present with the exception of –

Senator Ralph Vibert – ill.

Prayers

Subordinate legislation tabled.

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely –

1. **Fire Service (General Provisions) (Amendment No. 8) (Jersey) Order, 1986. R & O 7578.**
2. **Health Insurance (Pharmaceutical Benefit) (Prescribed List) (Amendment No. 22) (Jersey) Order, 1986. R & O 7579.**
3. **Motor Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment No. 19) (Jersey) Order, 1986. R & O 7580.**

Matters lodged.

The following subjects were lodged “au Greffe” –

1. **Island Plan – Volume 2: plan and policies (P.105/86): third amendment. P.164/86.**
Presented by Senator John William Ellis.

2. **Draft Shops (Sunday Trading) (No. 8) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.165/86.**

Presented by Deputy Carlyle John Le Hérissier Hinault of St. John and referred to the Tourism Committee.

Draft Shops (Sunday Trading) (No. 6) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.115/86.

THE STATES referred the draft Shops (Sunday Trading) (No. 6) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 (lodged on 2nd September, 1986 by Senator Pierre François Horsfall) to the Tourism Committee.

Draft Shops (Sunday Trading) (No. 7) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 . P.148/86.

THE STATES referred the draft Shops (Sunday Trading) (No. 7) (Jersey) Regulations, 198 (lodged on 4th November, 1986 by Deputy David John de la Haye of St. Ouen) to the Tourism Committee.

76 Val Plaisant, St. Helier: purchase. P.145/86.

THE STATES acceded to the request of the President of the Public Works Committee that the Proposition relating to the purchase of 76 Val Plaisant, St. Helier (lodged on 4th November, 1986) be considered on 9th December, 1986.

Secondary education in the Island. Questions and answers.

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked Deputy Philip George Mourant of St. Helier, President of the Education Committee, the following questions –

- “1. In view of the fact that the Committee’s current proposals for secondary education in the Island have aroused such controversy, will the President confirm that no action will be taken until the States have been fully apprised of the proposed policy changes?”

2. As 'falling rolls' have been used as a major justification for the Committee's proposals, will the President inform the House what the Committee intends to do when secondary school numbers return to what has been considered normal before the so-called boom period?
3. Would the President accept that pastoral-type smaller schools are more efficient and more in keeping with the character of the Island, and why should a change be suggested which would mean slavishly following United Kingdom policies which have caused such concern on the mainland?
4. As the Education Committee's policy of supporting private fee-paying schools whatever their size appears to be contradictory to its present approach, will the President accept that the non-fee-paying sector might feel that there are two rules at Education, one for the parents who can afford to pay and the other for parents who look to the State to provide their child's education?
5. In view of the overwhelming rejection of the proposals by both parents and teachers, will the President now consider withdrawing the proposals and concentrate on restoring confidence both in the Committee and its policies?"

The President of the Education Committee replied as follows –

- “1. As clearly indicated in the Statement which I made to the House in July, the Education Committee has no intention of taking action to reorganise the non-fee-paying secondary schools without the knowledge and approval of the States.
2. The expression 'boom period' presumably refers to the secondary school population which arose from an annual birth rate in the Island in the mid-1960s in excess of 1,200 and annual immigration of children of school age at around 200. There is no evidence that

such conditions will return. Figures projected to the end of the century indicate that the secondary school population will only return to present levels, which are well below the peak secondary school population reached in 1978.

3. Small secondary schools, which have to provide for children of all academic abilities, can only be effective if they are given considerably enhanced resources. They will continue to be inefficient in their use of resources. The reference to 'United Kingdom policies' is assumed to relate to the guidance and advice given by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. In their inspections of secondary schools in Jersey the Inspectors have commended the pastoral organisations but have drawn attention to curricular weaknesses and shortcomings. In informal discussions with members of the Committee and in their published statements, Her Majesty's Inspectors have drawn attention to the vulnerability of small schools to lack of specialist teachers, staff changes and weaknesses and to the lower level of interaction between pupils of similar ability which is an essential ingredient of the educational process.
4. The fee-paying schools in Jersey are selective in their intakes and are therefore not required to provide the breadth of curriculum for the wide range of ability to be found in the non-fee-paying secondary schools. It is this factor which is significant, not the issue of parental income.
5. I shall shortly be making a statement to the House which will cover this particular point."

Secondary education in the Island. Questions and answers.

Deputy Corrie Stein of Grouville asked Deputy Philip George Mourant of St. Helier, President of the Education Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Is it true that the Education Committee originally proposed to form a sixth form college which would have included the sixth forms of Victoria College and the Jersey College for Girls as part of the 1986 Plans concerning reorganisation of secondary education?
2. Will the Committee provide statistics making clear to States’ Members the number of pupils in each secondary school for the past 25 years and actual and projected number of pupils of secondary school age for the next fifteen years?
3. On what statistical evidence did the Committee base its conclusion that a simple redefinition of catchment areas would be insufficient to overcome falling numbers in some secondary schools and allow for the preservation of the four present 11 to 16 secondary schools?”.

The President of the Education Committee replied as follows –

- “1. In the statement made to the House on 29th July I said that one of the options before the Committee had been the establishment of a sixth form college which would incorporate the sixth forms of the two Colleges and Hautlieu and be open to all Jersey pupils intending to take Advanced Level examinations.
2. The number of pupils in the non-fee-paying secondary schools and the Colleges for the last 25 years is provided in Table A. Table B gives the number of pupils since 1978, when the 14+ transfer started, and the projected numbers for the 11 to 16 schools, Hautlieu and the Colleges on the assumption that the proportion going to each remains approximately as at present with similar rates of immigration. The totals from 1997 onwards are based on the assumption that future birth rates will continue at approximately the same level as in 1984 and 1985.

3. The total number of pupils in the 11 to 16 schools in September 1986 was 2,264. If this number had been equally distributed between four schools then each would have had 566 pupils. It is estimated that the total will fall to a minimum of 2,110 in September 1989 which, equally distributed among four schools, would give 527/8. The estimates prepared for this answer indicate that the total may rise to 2,440 by the year 2000, giving an average of 610 in four schools. The intake to the four schools was 444 in September 1985 and the maximum predicted entry towards the end of the century is 540. An entry of 600 is considered by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools to be the minimum required to maintain four schools providing for the full ability range.

TABLE A.

JULY FIGURES UNTIL 1974.

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
d'Hautrée St. Helier Boys	500	506	510	507	521	510	512
Grainville St. Helier Girls	504	488	494	474	486	552	540
Les Quennevais						357	405
Le Rocquier							
Victoria College	340	374	369	370	366	361	384
Jersey College for Girls	327	339	363	312	323	315	371
Hautlieu Rouge Bouillon	374 334	364 351	349 370	331 357	406 234	387 245	320 289

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
d'Hautrée							
St. Helier Boys	537	558	594	635	668	713	744
Grainville							
St. Helier Girls	576	616	647	694	719	774	815
Les Quennevais	430	492	516	551	570	600	606
Le Rocquier							
Victoria College	385	405	406	392	408	425	443
Jersey College for Girls	341	328	323	329	361	377	403
Hautlieu							
Rouge Bouillon	597	590	637	644	663	668	699

JANUARY FIGURES FROM 1975.

	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
d'Hautrée						557	570
St. Helier Boys	847	787	711	666	588		
Grainville							
St. Helier Girls	908	936	922	901	816	723	687
Les Quennevais	661	753	786	817	819	765	737
Le Rocquier		205	384	579	726	784	731
Victoria College	475	510	528	504	593	615	627
Jersey College for Girls	424	452	485	564	504	495	511
Hautlieu							
Rouge Bouillon	726	669	596	474	459	467	493

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
d'Hautrée St. Helier Boys	566	584	586	571	550
Grainville St. Helier Girls	692	719	686	672	653
Les Quennevais	724	672	641	591	546
Le Rocquier	674	674	602	586	541
Victoria College	627	606	604	592	572
Jersey College for Girls	501	492	476	474	465
Hautlieu Rouge Bouillon	537	530	496	467	471

1. Hautlieu/Rouge Bouillon was an 11 to 18 school until 1968.
2. Les Quennevais opened in 1965.
3. St. Helier Boys became known as d'Hautrée in 1980.
4. St. Helier Girls became known as Grainville in 1982.

TABLE B.

Total Secondary Numbers since introduction
of the 14+ transfer and predictions to 2001.

	11-16 Schools	Hautlieu	Colleges
1978	2,963	474	1,068
1979	2,949	459	1,097
1980	2,829	467	1,110
1981	2,725	493	1,138
1982	2,656	537	1,128
1983	2,649	530	1,098

1984	2,515	496	1,080
1985	2,420	467	1,066
1986	2,290	471	1,039

Predictions –

1987	2,260	450	1,010
1988	2,175	415	1,000
1989	2,120	385	980
1990	2,110	370	960
1991	2,150	360	955
1992	2,200	350	950
1993	2,255	350	960
1994	2,295	360	970
1995	2,325	370	980
1996	2,365	380	990
1997	2,385	385	1,000
1998	2,410	395	1,020
1999	2,430	400	1,020
2000	2,445	400	1,025
2001	2,440	410	1,025.”

Tourism Committee – Paris and London Offices. Questions and answers.

Deputy Corrie Stein of Grouville asked Senator John Stephen Rothwell, President of the Tourism Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Could the President inform the States –
 - (a) what the top salary is in the Paris Office (in pounds sterling), and whether Social Security contributions are paid in addition to the salary. If so, what is the amount (also in pounds sterling);
 - (b) is this the only remuneration or are there any other elements comprising the total package?
2. Could the President also give the States the corresponding details in respect of the London Office?

3. (a) How many enquiries are received each year at the Paris Office by post and in person?
- (b) How many French tourists actually come to Jersey each year as a result of these enquiries?"

The President of the Tourism Committee replied as follows –

- “1. (a) At the outset I feel the House should be made aware that when the present posts were established in 1980, and the salary scales were re-examined by the Committee in 1982, due notice was taken of independent advice obtained by the former Treasurer of the States on the level of salaries applicable in Paris which would be commensurate with the task set for the Paris Office.

This advice was related back to the scales of pay in force at that time by the British Tourist Authority for staff employed in its Paris Office, further information from a French fiscal expert based upon 1985 figures and related to the average of salaries paid in France to executives who hold a similar position to that of our Manageress, indicates that the average wage offered ranged between 300,000 and 400,000 French francs in gross figures.

The overall percentage in private business for 1986 is between 5 and 8 per cent which should be added to the above figures. Therefore the Committee is firmly of the opinion that comparison with British Tourist Authority French salaries is fair and reasonable.

Even so the Committee was not over ambitious in setting the grades for the posts. Two of them are on a grade which is only one up from the British Tourist Authority's lowest post, that of a "Packer". One is in the Fourth Tier, and our

Manageress is allied to the Third Tier, with the salary being enhanced by approximately 11 per cent as the British Tourist Authority post does not call for any marketing skills which, of course, we require in great measure.

The holder of the Third Tier post at the British Tourist Authority is a French national as, of course, is our own Manageress. Her gross salary is based on British Tourist Authority rates applicable from June 1st, 1985 to June 1986 and even though her salary has been based on rates which are six months behind those now paid by the British Tourist Authority, no incremental payments will be awarded, and apart from any cost of living adjustments, the salary will not be reviewed until 1989.

Members were informed during the budget debate that the top salary is 370,500 French francs per annum, which with the present extremely poor performance of the pound against the French franc at 9.15 equates to a sterling conversion of £40,490. (Last year with the franc at 11.40 it would have been £32,500.) However, if one were to deduct her Social Security contribution of approximately 15 per cent and make allowances for French Income Tax and rent, her take-home pay would be in the order of 127,500 French francs which is about £14,000.

In accordance with French Law, Social Security is paid by the Committee, in addition to the salary, and amounts to 121,250 French francs equal to £13,250 per annum.

- (b) Additionally, under French Law, Luncheon Vouchers are provided equal to 15 francs per working day. A total annually of 3,600 French francs or £393. Part of the contract is the payment of Life and Health policies, which it

was agreed should be transferred from her previous employment – the total for these is 11,332 French francs per annum, equivalent to £1,238.

2. Comparisons with the London Office operation are difficult and irrelevant because the London Office is operated by an independent company, Wordsmith Marketing and Public Relations, engaged by the Committee under contract to provide a public relations and information service mainly for the United Kingdom.

The marketing and promotional work is carried out by our Jersey-based officers.

The Paris Office, or French Office as it should more correctly be called, “L’Île de Jersey”, is a limited liability company with a capital of 20,000 French francs, registered at the Paris Trade and Companies Register. It was formed by the Tourism Committee in January 1980, and registered in February of that year.

The present Manageress was registered as a Director to start the company, and appointed sole manager, responsible for all aspects of Jersey’s marketing strategy and implementation, and the provision of all information and secretarial services, as well as acting as the Committee’s French Public Relations and Press Officer, achieving about 9,500,000 French francs’ (£1,038,250) worth of free editorial and media coverage last year.

To give Members an indication of the wide range of activities carried out by the staff, all of whom are bilingual, copies of the 1985 report have been made available.

Of course it would always be possible to engage someone of a lesser calibre, at a reduced cost, but would this really represent value for money? France is an important and developing market, for which we are

expecting improved communications as a result of the part played by the Paris Office. Members will see the value of the French visitor in the answers to question 3, do we really wish to have anything less than the best representation in France? In our Paris Office Manageress we have someone who has had a long association with the Tourism Committee, has accepted legal responsibility in the formation of the company, and has aptly demonstrated her ability and loyalty to Jersey during that time, even though the contract can be terminated by either side with only six month's notice.

At this point perhaps it would be appropriate to remind Members that as recently as May 1984, the question of the Paris Office was debated by this House following the presentation by the Tourism Committee of a very full report (P.29/84).

On that occasion 41 members, amongst whom I was pleased to see the Deputy of Grouville, confirmed the action of the Tourism Committee in establishing office accommodation in France in accordance with a Report and Proposition of the Committee adopted by Act of the States dated 2nd May, 1978 (P.20/78).

3. (a)	Enquiries	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	(10 months)
	Post/Telephone	15,300	30,800	
	Callers	<u>9,500</u>	<u>8,200</u>	
	Total	<u>24,800</u>	<u>39,000</u>	

3. (b) Number of French visitors in 1985 –
- | | | | |
|----------|-------------|---------------|---------|
| Staying: | 100,000 | Day Visitors: | 120,000 |
| Value: | £22 million | | |
- (Source – Economic Adviser's Office).”.

Extra civil servants. Questions and answers.

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked Deputy Sir Martin Le Quesne of St. Saviour, President of the Establishment Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Would the President inform the House which Committees have requested 65 extra civil servants?
2. If the reply includes six staff requested by the Postal Committee for household delivery service, would the President attach to his answers the paper prepared by that Department to substantiate their request?
3. Will the President please explain why the system has been changed with regard to the publication of manpower statistics in the Budget?”.

The President of the Establishment Committee replied as follows –

- “1. The total number of extra employees which Departments consider that they will need in the period ending June 30th, 1987 was listed in paragraph 7 of my Committee’s Report to the States (R.C.21/86) which I presented last week. Twenty Departments had indicated that they expected to need such an increase. These figures between civil servants and other categories of employee were not broken down but if the Senator, or any other Member, would like that to be done I will be happy to arrange it.
2. Neither the Senator’s question nor my answer makes any reference to Postal employees, but the figure of 7 employees shown in my Report as likely to be requested by the Postal Committee do not include the 6 extra staff to which the Senator’s question refers.
3. The presentation of manpower statistics in a form which is both complete and readily comprehensible is not easy. Some Members, I am sure, will have noticed

that over the last few years the tables in my Committee's six-monthly manpower reports have been progressively refined. The tables in the Budget prior to this year duplicated the information in my Committee's six-monthly Reports. It was therefore thought likely to be more useful to Members to present the figures in the Budget by negotiating groups, which information is not available from our six-monthly Reports."

Duty on cigarettes, beer, wine and spirits. Questions and answers.

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked Senator Reginald Robert Jeune, President of the Finance and Economics Committee, the following questions –

- “1. Will the President inform the House as to the amount of duty payable on cigarettes, beer and wine and spirits in –
 - (a) The United Kingdom
 - (b) Guernsey
 - (c) The Isle of Man
 - (d) Jersey?
2. Is the President satisfied that the trade is not taking unfair advantage of any increases in impôt duty by increasing their margins unnecessarily?
3. In order to protect the Island's reputation, does the President believe that a Committee should be set up to enquire into the prices of these products in order to see whether profit margins should be reduced?"

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

1. Comparison of Duties on specific items

	U.K. £	I.O.M. £	Guernsey Present £	Guernsey Proposed £	Jersey Old £	Jersey New £
Bottle (75cl)						
Whisky/Gin						
40%	4.73	4.73	2.21	2.48	1.92	2.10
Bottle (70cl)						
Light Wine						
10%	0.68	0.68	0.385	0.427	0.296	0.326
Bottle (70cl)						
Sherry 17%	1.183	1.183	0.616	0.686	0.361	0.399
Pint:						
Pale Ale						
1034	0.166	0.141	0.105	0.114	0.037	0.040
Skol Lager						
1044	0.215	0.184	0.105	0.114	0.048	0.052
Packet:						
20 Cigarettes						
(Benson and						
Hedges)	0.927	0.927	0.257	0.285	0.133	0.146

2. I am aware that there have been occasions in the past when the trade has blamed an increase in impôts duty for a much greater increase in price, required to meet higher costs generally, but there is no evidence to suggest that margins have been increased unnecessarily as a result. That is not to say that margins in the United Kingdom are not lower than in Jersey, but in making such comparisons regard must be had for the different trading conditions prevailing. Even within the Island there is a considerable range of price, and therefore presumably also of margin.

I am heartened by the announcement by the trade that no upward price adjustment will be made, following

the recent duty increase, so long as existing stocks remain unsold. I would hope that if and when a price adjustment is necessary the trade will continue to take a responsible view in reflecting in that adjustment the relatively modest increase in impôts duty that has occurred.

I do not believe a case can be made for setting up an inquiry into the price of alcoholic drink and tobacco goods. There are on the Island a large number of independent traders and, unlike the petrol retailers, there is in the different prices charged evidence of keen competition for custom. In these circumstances there is every opportunity and incentive to shop around for the best buy.

Comparisons with the margins obtained by those selling other goods are difficult to make, but there is no evidence in the pattern of trade on the Island that would appear to justify singling out trade in alcoholic drink and tobacco goods for enquiry by a Committee of the States.

However, while not believing that a Committee of Inquiry is justified, I do see a need for the way the trade responds to the duty increase, both generally and individually, to be closely monitored, and for the relationship between prices in Jersey and the United Kingdom to be kept under review. I have asked the Economic Adviser to take on this task, to the extent that it is not already done, and to report back to my Committee as appropriate.”.

Secondary education in Jersey. Statement.

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

- “1. In the statement about Secondary Education which I made to the House on 29th July, 1986, I drew attention to the effects on the non-fee-paying

secondary schools of the fall in the birth rate over the past eight years and the need for the Committee to consider their reorganisation and the most effective ways of using their buildings and resources. Since July the Committee has continued its process of consultation and consideration of this problem. It is an indication of the difficult nature of the problem that once again that process of consultation has been accompanied with disturbance and anxiety.

2. The problem facing the Committee is two-fold. Firstly, the headteachers of the four 11-16 secondary schools have consistently reported to the Committee their dissatisfaction with the 14+ Optional Transfer System, a dissatisfaction which they said was shared by the great majority of the teachers in their schools. Secondly, it was becoming increasingly evident that those same secondary schools were facing difficulty in providing the full and appropriately varied curriculum which their pupils require. The fact that the intakes into the schools were numerically uneven made the problem worse; although this Committee tried in 1985 and 1986 to limit that imbalance, the heads of Le Rocquier and Les Quennevais continued to draw attention to the very real problems which they faced. Those problems can be summarised as follows –

the reduction in the numbers of pupils leads inevitably to a reduction in the number of teachers;

the smaller teaching staff is expected still to maintain the full curriculum for the whole range of ability;

the use of specialist teaching staff becomes less economic and effective;

within each teaching group there will be a wider range of academic ability;

the academically most able pupils form a smaller group within each age group and offer one another less opportunity for interaction and stimulus.

The Committee therefore sought advice on these problems from its own officers, from secondary headteachers themselves and directly and indirectly from Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

3. The Education Department advised the Committee that –
 - (a) the 14+ Optional Transfer System was working effectively so far as the most academically able pupils were concerned. If four secondary schools were to be retained despite the reduction in numbers, the 14+ transfer would be essential to protect the interests of the most able pupils;
 - (b) the reorganisation of the four secondary schools into three schools would make them stronger and more effective, enabling them to make better use of specialist teaching staff and to maintain a full curriculum, meeting the varied needs across the whole ability range;
 - (c) three larger secondary schools would be able to provide for their most academically able pupils up to the age of 16, thus making it possible to abolish the 14+ Optional Transfer System if the Committee so wished.

The officers of the Department set out in detail for the Committee all the options which lay before them and, in so doing, have given the Committee clear and impartial advice based on their professional knowledge and understanding and their perception of the needs of the Education Service in Jersey.

4. The Committee is required by Law to use the services of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the Education Service in Jersey. The judgements and advice of Her Majesty's Inspectors are based on their very wide experience and are both impartial and valuable. Informally, in local discussions, they have drawn attention to the vulnerability of the small secondary schools, and in published statements of Her Majesty's Inspectorate has very positively stated that all ability secondary schools, covering the age range 11–16 (which is what the four secondary headteachers wanted), should be at least of sixth form entry size. In Jersey that would mean an intake in each year of 150–160 pupils; in September 1986 the highest intake was 136 and the lowest 95.
5. The Committee consulted the secondary headteachers in June 1985, October 1985, July 1986 and November 1986. In June 1985 all the headteachers except the headmaster of d'Hautrée School, agreed that three secondary schools would be more effective than four, and that one of the four secondary schools should be closed. All the headteachers, with the exception of the headmaster of Hautlieu, believed that the 14+ Optional Transfer System should be ended. Between August 1985 and July 1986 some headteachers expressed views which were at variance with the advice given by them in June 1985. Following continued discussions the Committee met the five headteachers on 5th November, 1986. The Minutes recording that meeting show that the headmaster of Hautlieu expressed reservations about the removal of the 14+ Optional Transfer System, but supported the reduction from four schools to three, and the headmaster of d'Hautrée opposed the closure of a secondary school but supported the abolition of the 14+ Optional Transfer System. The other three headteachers expressed their support for both proposals with the headteacher of Grainville School seeking reassurances, which were given, that additional building would be provided at that school.

6. The Committee therefore believed that it should discuss with teachers and parents the desirability of ending the 14+ Optional Transfer System and closing d'Hautrée in order to make three stronger and more effective secondary schools. The response of the teachers shows a very great measure of support for the 14+ Optional Transfer System and the response of parents indicates a very strong preference for retaining four small secondary schools. The positions adopted by four of the five secondary headteachers have changed since their meeting with the Committee on 5th November, and those four have not publicly supported and do not now fully maintain the views which they clearly expressed within that meeting.
7. Following these consultations, and in view of the actions of the headteachers, the Committee believes that it must retain the 14+ Optional Transfer System and maintain four 11-16 secondary schools. In coming to that conclusion the Committee must draw attention to its consequences which will have implications for the Finance and Economics, Establishment and Housing Committees without whose help educational standards will fall. As the number of pupils reduces the Committee will need to employ additional teachers and provide more resources than the number of pupils would otherwise justify. In manpower terms retaining the present system will require more teachers working directly in the four secondary schools and more support staff to ensure that curriculum development and quality is maintained. Although this means that there will be duplication of staff and resources, the limit set to the teaching staff establishment by the Establishment Committee must be raised. The Finance and Economics Committee must make available, over a period of years, more money, not only for the salaries of additional staff, but also for further specialist equipment and for the extension of in-service education and training. The Housing Committee must accept that when the Education Committee identifies the need for specialist teachers who cannot be recruited within the Island present

restrictions placed upon recruitment from outside the Island must be relaxed.

The Education Committee will need to maintain a closer monitoring of the curriculum provided within the four schools to ensure that all pupils of whatever ability receive the best education that can be provided in these circumstances. It has been estimated that the additional manpower requirements will be not less than 20 teachers for the schools and 5 additional advisory support staff. (There may be other needs in terms of non-teaching staff.) The additional staff cost will be at least £3 million at current prices to cover the period when the schools are most at risk and further costs may well continue to the turn of the century. The other costs cannot be so easily quantified.

8. My Committee and I throughout have sought to maintain and improve the quality of education provided in the non-fee-paying secondary schools. If that is to be achieved without major changes in the system, then the support of the States as a whole and of the Committees which I have named, will be essential.”.

Family Nursing Services (Jersey) Law, 1986 (Appointed Day) Act, 1986.

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 1 of the Family Nursing Services (Jersey) Law, 1986, made an Act entitled the Family Nursing Services (Jersey) Law, 1986 (Appointed Day) Act, 1986.

Norman's Timber Yard, Pier Road, St. Helier and part of Field 380, La Rue à la Dame, St. Saviour: development and rezoning. P.147/86.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Island Development Committee –

- (a) agreed to rezone the site known as Norman's Timber Yard, Pier Road, St. Helier, shown on Drawing No. 01.188.1, from industrial use to use for States' basic loan or rental housing development;
- (b) authorised the Island Development Committee to acquire for housing development purposes the property known as Norman's Timber Yard, Pier Road, as shown on Drawing No. 01.188.1, from Norman (Holdings) Limited for the sum of £500,000 for the freehold interest;
- (c) authorised the Island Development Committee to make a payment of £200,000 to Norman (Holdings) Limited as compensation for the costs of relocation;
- (d) in the event of the States not agreeing the above basis for acquisition, authorised the Island Development Committee, in exercise of the powers conferred by Article 4 of the Island Planning (Jersey) Law, 1964, to acquire the land by compulsory purchase on behalf of the public in accordance with the provisions of the Compulsory Purchase of Land (Procedure) (Jersey) Law, 1961, as amended;
- (e) authorised the payment or discharge of expenses to be incurred by the States in connexion with the acquisition of the said property and all interests therein, from the Island Development Committee Major Reserve (Vote No. C094), each side being responsible for payment of its own legal fees;
- (f) authorised the Attorney General and the Greffier of the States to pass, on behalf of the public, any contracts it might be found necessary to pass in

connexion with the acquisition of the said properties and any interests therein;

- (g) contingent on the completion of the above acquisition of land, agreed to rezone from White Land to land for light industrial and warehousing purposes an area of 2.5 vergées, being part of Field 380, La Rue à la Dame, St. Saviour, as shown on Drawing No. 02.189.1.

Almorah Crescent, St. Helier: grant-aid. P.150/86.

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Island Development Committee, approved, in principle, the provision of grant-aid towards repairs and such special maintenance as is essential for the proper conservation of Almorah Crescent, St. Helier as a building of special architectural and historic interest.

Harbours (Amendment No. 17) (Jersey) Regulations, 1986. P.151/86.

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 4 of the Harbours Administration (Jersey) Law, 1961, as amended, made Regulations entitled the Harbours (Amendment No. 17) (Jersey) Regulations, 1986.

Draft Amendment (No. 8) to the Tariff of Harbour and Light Dues. P.152/86.

THE STATES, in pursuance of the Harbour and Light Dues (Jersey) Law, 1947, as amended, approved the draft Amendment (No. 8) to the Tariff of Harbour and Light Dues.

Controls over public entertainment: Committee of Inquiry. P.153/86

THE STATES, adopting a Proposition of the Education Committee, agreed that –

- (a) a Committee of Inquiry should be appointed under Article 30 of the States of Jersey Law, 1966, to inquire into the need for controls over public entertainment in Jersey and the areas in which and the manner in which any such controls should be exercised, and to report thereon to the States;
- (b) the Committee so appointed should be designated as a Committee of Inquiry for the purposes of Article 41 to 46 inclusive and Article 49 of the said Law.

THE STATES rose at 4.40 p.m.

R.S. GRAY,

Deputy Greffier of the States.