

THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
10th November 1992 at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Peter Crill, C.B.E.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor,
Air Marshal Sir John Sutton, K.C.B.,
was present.

All Members were present with the exception of -

Thomas James Jordan, Deputy of St.
Brelade - out of the Island
Graeme Ernest Rabet, Deputy of St. Helier -
out of the Island
Evelyn Mabel Pullin, Deputy of St.
Saviour - out of the Island
Philip Roy Cabot, Deputy of Trinity - out
of the Island.

Prayers

Subordinate legislation tabled

The following enactments were laid before the
States, namely -

1. Pilotage (Dues and Fees)
(Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Order 1992
R & O 8470.
2. Banking Business (List of
Registered Persons) (Amendment No. 3)
(Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8471.
3. Companies (Qualifications of
Auditor) (Partnerships) (Jersey) Order
1992 R & O 8472.

4. Establishments for Massage or Special Treatment (Licence Fees) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8473.
5. Ancillary Dental Workers (Registration) (Fees) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8474.
6. Nursing Agencies (General Provisions) (Amendment No. 8) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8475.
7. Food and Drugs (Ice-Cream Stalls etc.) (Amendment No. 13) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8476
8. Island Planning (Tree Preservation) (Saint Helier) (No. 1) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8477
9. Island Planning (Tree Preservation) (Saint Saviour) (No. 2) (Jersey) Order 1992 R & O 8478.

Regulations of Undertakings and Development Law: quarterly manpower returns.
R.C.28

The Finance and Economics Committee, by Act dated 2nd November 1992, presented to the States a report analysing the quarterly manpower returns provided under Article 2A of the Regulation of Undertakings and Development (Jersey) Law 1973, as amended, for the quarter ended 30th June 1992.

THE STATES ordered that the report be printed and distributed.

Matters noted - land transactions

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 2nd November 1992, showing that in pursuance of Standing Orders relating to certain transactions in land, the Committee had approved -

- (a) as recommended by the Housing Committee, the sale to Miss Susan Ann Short of 371 square feet of land at the front of 14 Aquila Close, St. Helier for the nominal sum of £10, and 202 square feet of land at the side of 14 Aquila Close, St. Helier for the

nominal sum of £10, with Miss Short being responsible for all existing rights granted by the Public to other owners in the Aquila Close area and for all legal costs involved.

(The Committee accordingly rescinded its Act No. 2 of 9th March 1992, which was notified to the States on 17th March 1992);

- (b) as recommended by the Island Development Committee, the acquisition from Jardin du Cure Limited 249 square feet of land immediately in front of 31-33 New Street, St. Helier, for a consideration of £1,556.25 (£6.25 a square foot) required in connexion with road widening proposals, with the Committee being responsible for the payment of legal costs;
- (c) as recommended by the Harbours and Airport Committee, the lease to Channel Islands Marine Limited of the west side of E store on the New North Quay, St. Helier, for a period of nine years, commencing on the completion of the work on the building which was being paid for and undertaken by that company at a cost of £15,000. The rent would be at a rate of £12.69 a square foot, discounted by the company's investment over nine years and loss of the first year interest of nine per cent on capital to give a net rate of £8.72 a square foot, giving a rent for the first year of £6,627.44;
- (d) as recommended by the Housing Committee, the lease to the Jersey Electricity Company Limited of an electricity substation site at Leslie Sinel Close (the housing development on the former Channel Television site), Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier, for a period of 99 years, at a rent of £1 a year, and to the grant to the company, free of charge, of a wayleave for the associated cables.

Matter noted - financial transaction

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 2nd November 1992,

showing that, in pursuance of Rule 5 of the Public Finances (General) (Jersey) Rules 1967, as amended, the Committee had noted that the Education Committee had accepted the lowest of five tenders, namely that submitted by Mark Amy Limited in a contract period of 95 weeks, in the sum of £2,699,029 for the redevelopment of Rouge Bouillon School.

Matters lodged

The following subjects were lodged ``au Greffe" -

1. Draft Court of Appeal (Amendment No. 6) (Jersey) Law 199 P.170/92.
Presented by the Legislation Committee.
2. Draft Amendment (No. 15) to the Tariff of Harbour and Light Dues P.171/92.
Harbours and Airport Committee.
3. Education Law P.172/92.
Presented by the Education Committee.
4. Draft Medical Practitioners (Registration) (Amendment No. 3) (Jersey) Law 199 P.173/92.
Presented by the Public Health Committee.
5. 3, 5 and 7 Wesley Street, St. Helier: approval of drawings P.174/92.
Presented by the Housing Committee.
6. Draft Family Allowances (No. 2) (Jersey) Regulations 199 P.175/92.
Presented by the Social Security Committee.

THE STATES noted that the following subject had been lodged ``au Greffe" on 3rd November 1992 -

The Budget 1993.
Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Manpower returns: residential qualifications. P.120/92. Withdrawn

THE STATES noted that Senator Richard Joseph Shenton had withdrawn his proposition relating to the inclusion of non-residentially qualified and `j' category staff in manpower returns (lodged on 11th August 1992).

Arrangement of Public Business for the present Sitting

THE STATES confirmed that the following subject lodged ``au Greffe" should be considered at the present Sitting -

Elizabeth Harbour: lease of warehouse P.161/92.
Lodged: 13th October 1992 by Senator C. Stein.
Harbours and Airport Committee.

Draft Motor Traffic (No. 3) (Jersey) Regulations 199 . P.178/91 and P.199/91.
Withdrawn

THE STATES noted that in pursuance of Standing Order 17(6) the following subjects, which were lodged ``au Greffe", had been withdrawn -

Draft Motor Traffic (No. 3) (Jersey) Regulations 199 P.178/91.
Lodged: 17th November 1991.
Defence Committee.

Draft Motor Traffic (No. 3) (Jersey) Regulations 199 (P.178/91): amendment P.199/91.
Lodged: 17th December 1991.
Deputy P.A. Bailhache of St. Helier.

Homes for first-time buyers: private development. P.155/92

THE STATES on the proposition of the Connétable of St. John agreed to defer consideration of the proposition of Senator Richard Joseph Shenton regarding the private development of homes for first-time buyers from the present Sitting.

Members present voted as follows -

``Pour" (35)
Senators

Jeune, Binnington, Le Maistre, Carter,
Quérée, Chinn.

Connétables

St. John, St. Clement, St. Lawrence, St.
Mary, St. Ouen, St. Brelade, Trinity, St.
Martin, St. Peter, Grouville, St. Helier,
St. Saviour.

Deputies

Le Gallais(S), Rumboll(H), Norman(C), St.
John, St. Peter, H. Baudains(C), Le
Sueur(H), St. Ouen, Coutanche(L),
Huelin(B), St. Mary, Grouville, Clarke-
Halifax(S), Le Fondré(L), St. Martin,
Walker(H), Syvret(H).

``Contre" (14)

Senators

Shenton, Horsfall, Baal, Rothwell, Le
Main, Stein.

Deputies

Beadle(B), Wavell(S), Blampied(H),
Buesnel(H), Bailhache(H) S. Baudains(H), Le
Geyt(S), Crespel(H).

Arrangement of Public Business for the next
Sitting on 24th and 26th November 1992

THE STATES confirmed that the following subjects
lodged ``au Greffe" should be considered at the
next Sitting on 24th and 26th November 1992 -

THE BUDGET 1993.

Lodged: 3rd November 1992.

Finance and
Economics Committee.

3, 5 and 7 Wesley Street, St. Helier:
approval of drawings. P.174/92.
Housing Committee.

Draft Family Allowances (No. 2)
(Jersey) Regulations 199 . P.175/92.
Social Security Committee.

Law students attending Caen University.
Questions and answers (Tape No. 158)

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked Deputy Robin Ernest Richard Rumboll of St. Helier, President of the Legislation Committee the following questions -

- ``1. Will the President inform the House of the progress made by the Working Party established after I agreed to defer consideration of my Projet (P.62/92) regarding the requirement for trainee advocates to attend Caen University; in particular will the President confirm what measures the Working Party has taken to consult among the profession and among those most affected by the legislation - the students?
2. Will the President confirm, in view of the fact that students are now registering for the course at Caen, what prospects there are for a speedy resolution to this matter?"

The President of the Legislation Committee replied as follows -

``The Working Party on Caen, was established by the Legislation Committee in June 1992 to -

`investigate the desirability of amending the Advocates (Jersey) Law 1968, as amended, to remove from the qualifications for becoming an advocate of the Royal Court the requirement to obtain a `Certificat d'Etudes Jurisdiqes Franaise et Normandes' at the University of Caen'.

This is a Joint Working Party composed of three advocates nominated by the Law Society of Jersey and two members of my Committee assisted by the Attorney General. It was constituted following an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Law Society on 19th May 1992 at which a proposal put forward on behalf of my Committee was adopted.

That proposal was that -

- (a) the Legislation Committee would defer the debate on its amendment of the

Advocates (Jersey) Law 1968 so as to allow the continuation for the time being of the 'loophole' whereby students could qualify as solicitors of the Royal Court and subsequently apply for transfer to the Bar without the requirement of studying at Caen University;

(b) the Caen requirement, subject to concessions negotiated with the University of Caen, would continue in force for those who wished to study in Caen and to take advantage of the restricted (and published) syllabus under the Advocates (Examinations) (Jersey) Rules 1989;

(c) in the meantime the Legislation Committee and the Law Society would jointly examine the practicabilities of arranging tuition and examinations in Jersey on the civilian aspects of Jersey law. Such examination would also bear in mind the importance of securing that aspiring advocates would have a reasonable command of the French language.

Unfortunately, because of the illness of the late President who wished to participate fully in the discussions, the Working Party has only met twice, but these have been extremely fruitful meetings and have resulted in a proposal being agreed, in principle, which it is felt could be generally acceptable. I think that it would be premature for me to outline the proposal which is now subject to detailed study. I anticipate that the proposal must first be put to the Law Society for its approval prior to my returning to the House with the revised amendment to the relevant legislation.

The Members of the Working Party have been made fully aware of the views of the students, from written submissions and the report of the meeting between the Legislation Committee and representatives of the students on 11th May 1992 and have taken regard of these comments in their deliberations. I should perhaps, add that I do not agree that students are 'Those most affected by the legislation'. Those most affected are the people of the Island who

are entitled to know that those qualifying to practise as advocates are reasonably competent to advise them on the law of the Island.

I can assure the House that every effort is being taken by my Committee to resolve this situation with the greatest possible despatch. Until the recommendations of the Working Party have been finalised and agreed by all concerned the status quo will remain.

Protection of Employment Legislation. Statement

The President of the Defence Committee made a statement in the following terms -

“On 28th July 1992, the States adopted proposition P.72/92 of the Policy and Resources Committee and -

- (a) approved in principle the Policy and Resources Committee's report on the implementation of the Protection of Employment Opportunities (Jersey) Law 1988;
- (b) appointed the Defence Committee to be the responsible Committee under the Law; and
- (c) charged the Committee to prepare the necessary legislation on the basis of the guidelines in the Policy and Resources Committee's report.

The Law Draftsman set about preparing the necessary Regulations and Orders to put the Law into effect. This process involved consultation with the Attorney General, a group of chief officers, including the Chief Adviser to the States and the Isle of Man authorities. It soon became clear that there were legal and administrative difficulties if the States' decision was to be implemented.

The Committee could have presented the draft Regulations to the States without further consideration. To have done so would have been irresponsible in the light of the serious difficulties which had been identified.

It has become clear - and the advice on this point has been consistent - the 1988 Law was drafted to meet the perceived problems of the early eighties and was prepared with a view to targeting specific industries. The position the Island now faces is completely different in that unemployment exists across the board. Implementing the 1988 Law in current circumstances would present considerable practical difficulties.

Among the problems that have been identified are the following -

1. Each person who changed employment once the Law was in place would either need a permit issued by the Defence Committee if he was not exempt, or would need to go through a notification procedure involving his employer and the Immigration Department. Failure to do this would put the employee and employer in a position where they could be prosecuted.

Such a system, particularly for exempted persons, would be bureaucratic and would take up many hours for little or no return.

2. Because of the wording of the Law, it is not possible to make exceptions for seasonal workers although this was specifically referred to in the Projet - this will mean controlling jobs at a time of year when the Island does not have nearly enough local workers to meet demand. This could mean the issues of 10,000 permits merely because the Law requires it.
3. No exceptions could be made for part-time work - a permit would be required for each job undertaken irrespective of the hours worked.
4. No non-exempt person could start work before a permit application had been made, the matter considered by the Defence Committee and a permit issued. This would lead to significant problems in industries such as construction where traditionally staff are required at fairly short notice.

5. Most importantly, because of the way in which the Law is framed, the categories of employment that it is sought to control by work permits must each be prescribed by Regulations. Because the controls need to be exercised across the board, this will involve listing hundreds of categories without any guarantee that all employment has been covered.
6. A provisional estimate which has been discussed with States' Personnel shows that up to 11 extra staff, with some seasonal variation, would be required to provide a reasonable service. This figure compares favourably with Isle of Man staffing levels in their Work Permit Section.

In the light of those difficulties, as we see it there are three options open to the Defence Committee -

- (i) To press ahead and produce the Regulations within the framework of the present law. The Committee is reluctant to do this for the reasons I have just outlined. It is an impractical solution which will result in a bureaucratic nightmare and not achieve what the House asked for in the Project.
- (ii) The second option is to amend the present law. Certain elements can be altered with the approval of this House, for example, the matters which must be taken into account when considering an application for a permit. Other matters such as the requirement for exempt locals to undergo the notification procedure when changing jobs, the exclusion of seasonal workers and an alternative to the listing of all categories of employment would have to be put before the Privy Council for their approval. The result would be a poor compromise and only meet some of the difficulties.
- (iii) The third option, which would in

my view better meet the needs of the Island, would be to draft a new law with all possible speed. This is the responsible and sensible solution. It recognises that to achieve the aim of protecting job opportunities for local residents we must work within a Law which is enforceable and adaptable to today's needs, not yesterday's.

I shall lodge with the States next Tuesday, 17th November 1992 a report and proposition and will seek a date for debate before the end of this Session. The proposition will instruct the Law Draftsman to draw up the necessary legislation and to request the Policy and Resources Committee to put this item at the top of the list in their 1992/3 law drafting programme.

On the face of it, this might appear to be an unusual way of dealing with the whole matter in the light of the directions given to my Committee by the States. However, I trust that this House will see from my statement that there is no real alternative to the proposed course of action. It is the most sensible, expedient and practical way of producing the legislation asked for by this House."

Chief Adviser to the States of Jersey. Statement

The President of the Establishment Committee made a statement in the following terms -

“The appointment of Mr. G.C. Powell as Chief Adviser to the States of Jersey was agreed by the States on 13th October 1992, following acceptance of an Amendment by the Deputy of St Mary. The Amendment was to a report and proposition of the Establishment Committee (P.127/92) which in Appendix 2 laid out the principal responsibilities of the position.

The full thrust of the Deputy of St. Mary's report, concerned the title. There was no change to the responsibilities advocated in the Establishment Committee's report. The States approved these and they stand as originally laid out. I see no reason,

therefore, to repeat the accountabilities.

There are four immediate subordinates to the Chief Adviser to the States. These are, an Assistant Adviser - Economics, an Assistant Adviser - Policy, a Manager - Regulation of Undertakings, and a Personal Assistant to the Chief Adviser. Three of these immediate subordinates and their support staff are unchanged from the staff which supported Mr. Powell as 'Economic Adviser'. The only change is that an Assistant Adviser - Policy now reports to the Chief Adviser, the postholder having previously been directly responsible to the Policy and Resources Committee. The duties of the postholder will include the present duties as Executive Officer to the Policy and Resources Committee.

I can confirm that the organisation described to you does not involve any increase in staff costs to the States as a whole. Clearly the transfer to the Chief Adviser's office of the person holding the post of Assistant Adviser - Policy means simply a transfer of costs and clearer accountability.

No salary increases are planned.

Mr. Powell is firmly of the belief, and is fully supported by the appropriate chief officers, that his responsibilities can be carried out effectively by harnessing the appropriate resources available in the Treasury and the States' Personnel Department to tasks that would be initiated by himself following consultation with the Treasurer and the Chief Executive Officer, States' Personnel.

It will be right in the future to examine the evolution of the rôle of the Chief Adviser and the operation of his Department. The possibility of staff being seconded to his office to carry out specific tasks is also likely. Plainly, that would add to the salary costs for his Department on the assumption that the departments from which an officer was seconded do not continue to meet that cost. However, Mr. Powell believes that any secondment need not add to the States' salary bill as a whole."

Nuclear waste shipments. Statement

The President of the Defence Committee made a statement in the following terms -

“The House will know from media reports that a delegation representing the Island travelled to Paris last week for discussions with the Secretary General of the Inter-departmental Committee for Nuclear Safety about the transportation of plutonium from La Hague, and I am sure that Members would wish me to report on the outcome of those talks. The visit was arranged through the good offices of the French Consul to whom I would wish to express my gratitude for all her assistance. The delegation was received most cordially by the Secretary General and representatives from the Ministries of the Interior, Defence, Foreign Affairs and Transport, and of the Commissioner for Atomic Energy and Electricité de France. The Inter-departmental Committee has no real counterpart in the United Kingdom public service but is clearly at a high level of the French administration in that the Secretary General answers directly to the Prime Minister of France.

The Bailiff said that the delegation had not come to ask the French government to cease operating its nuclear installations nor to protest about the planned exportation of plutonium from La Hague; it had no authority to do so. Nevertheless some concern had been expressed in the Island and the delegation wished to have further information about safety and security matters generally and in particular in connexion with the proposed shipment of plutonium.

The delegation was given a detailed exposition of the structure of the French nuclear industry and precautions which had been taken over the shipment of plutonium. No purpose would I think be served by itemising the particular measures which had been taken, but I think it is sufficient to say that I and the members of the delegation were satisfied that all reasonable precautions have been taken to ensure the safe transportation of this dangerous material. The containers are of

massive steel construction designed to give a very high degree of protection against fire, impact and atmospheric pressure as the result of submersion. More importantly perhaps it was confirmed that safety measures have to meet the strict criteria laid down by the International Atomic Energy Authority which is an organisation under the umbrella of the United Nations. We were assured that inspections had taken place to ensure compliance with these international rules.

In response to questions about the frequency of the proposed shipments of plutonium to Japan the delegation was informed that there was no rhythm to it. Much depended upon the commercial requirements of the Japanese. It was likely that while the demand from Japan persisted, shipments would take place about every two years. The delegation was however informed of other European markets for the re-processed fuel, for example in Switzerland, Germany and Sweden.

The delegation questioned the Secretary General about the proposed route of the Japanese vessel. The route has not been published for security reasons but we were informed that the ship would avoid land so far as possible. Further, the Secretary General said that he would use his best endeavours to ensure that the ship gave the Channel Islands as wide a berth as possible.

Discussion also took place about the question of compensation in the event, which we believe to be unlikely, that a nuclear accident affecting the Island should take place. The 1960 Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy provides for compensation to be paid, without proof of negligence, by the operators of nuclear installations in countries that are parties to the Convention in respect of damage or injury occurring in the territory of another contracting party as a result of nuclear incidents at such installations. The Paris Convention provides that damage must be to the person or property and related causally to a nuclear incident. The Brussels Convention is supplementary to the Paris Convention, and its main purpose is

to increase the limit of compensation set by the Paris Convention. Jersey is a party to the two Conventions, as is France, although it should be noted that the limit of compensation established by the Conventions applies to all claims, whether domestic or relating to damage incurred in other member States, for compensation in respect of a specific incident at a nuclear installation. The limit does not apply to the total of claims which one member State may make upon another. It is thus unlikely that Jersey would be able to claim up to the limit set by the Conventions. The limits of the Conventions were increased by the 1982 Protocol to the Brussels Convention and the amount of compensation which could be claimed in relation to a nuclear incident in a member State was increased to the equivalent of £250m. This amount of compensation is available not only in the event of a nuclear incident occurring at a nuclear installation, but also in the event of a nuclear incident occurring during the course of transport of nuclear substances from a nuclear installation. While it is true that in theory the amount of damage which could be caused by a nuclear incident is almost without limit, my Committee considers that the provisions of these international agreements provide reasonable protection for the Island but will raise the issue of the £250 million limited liability being appropriate bearing in mind its 1983 valuation.

Finally I think I should take the opportunity of saying that my Committee deprecates some of the remarks attributed in the media to Deputy Syvret and in particular the quite unjustified criticism of the Bailiff by a Member of this House. To speak of political interference was quite out of place. As President of the Defence Committee I selected members of a delegation which in my judgment would best represent the interests of the Island.

The Defence Committee is charged by the House with responsibility for these matters and it was entirely right that I and my Vice-President should go. I asked the Bailiff to lead the delegation because I believed that the importance of the matter justified his presence. I asked the

Attorney General to join the delegation in his capacity as legal adviser to the States and the Greffier in order to give administrative assistance. Deputy Syvret is not a member of my Committee. He is of course perfectly entitled to express his views but he has no mandate for suggesting that his views are those of the Island's government. Responsibility for these matters is vested in my Committee.

Having said that, I repeat my comments printed in the Jersey Evening Post of 29th October where I stated recognition of the general level of concern amongst Islanders and in fact, recognise the important merit in these concerns being raised by both Senator Qu  r  e and Deputy Syvret although, as I stated, I had reservations over the text of Deputy Syvret's proposition which is before us today. I wish to state that, I had given serious thought to the constitution of the delegation which was to meet in Paris and in doing so, had given consideration to inviting other persons, one of whom was Deputy Syvret, and the Medical Officer of Health.

I felt that this would broaden the debate and perhaps delay the urgent assurances on safety procedures we were seeking.

I wish to inform the House that my Committee takes extremely seriously the responsibility it has in assuring all risk activities which might affect the Island are absolutely minimised.

I have invited Deputy Syvret, and indeed invite any other Member of this House, to meet with my Committee and raise any concerns they may have at any time."

New sewage inlet works and ancillary works,
Bellozanne: construction

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Public Services Committee, expressed their support for the Island Development Committee's intention to grant permission for the construction of a new sewage inlet works and ancillary works on land adjacent to the Bellozanne Sewage Treatment Works part of which land is situated within the Green Zone, as outlined on Drawing No. PSC 1/92.

Balloon Store, South Pier, St. Helier Harbour:

approval of drawings. P.176/92

THE STATES commenced consideration of a proposition of the Harbours and Airport Committee regarding the redevelopment of The Balloon Store at the South Pier, St. Helier Harbour. After discussion, and on the proposition of Senator Terence John Le Main, the proposition was lodged ``au Greffe".

Field 1587, Claremont Road, St. Helier:
compulsory purchase. P.177/92
Bagatelle Nurseries, Claremont Road, St. Helier:
compulsory purchase. P.178/92

THE STATES commenced consideration of propositions of the Island Development Committee regarding the rezoning and compulsory purchase of Field 1587 and Bagatelle Nurseries, Claremont Road, St. Saviour. After discussion, and on the proposition of the Connétable of St. Saviour, the propositions were lodged ``au Greffe".

THE STATES, acceded to the request of the Connétable of St. Lawrence that these matters be considered at the next Sitting on 24th and 26th November 1992.

St. Helier Waterfront Plan. P.123/92

THE STATES commenced consideration of a proposition of the Island Development Committee regarding the approval of Map 3-92 as the development plan for the St. Helier Waterfront area and accepted an amendment of the President of the Island Development Committee that after the words ``where they differ" in the proposition, there should be added ``subject however to the States confirming the site of the new housing to the west of Albert and the marina at Havre des Pas."

THE STATES, adopted the proposition as amended, and in pursuance of Article 3 of the Island Planning (Jersey) Law 1964, approved Map No. 3-92 as the development plan for the St. Helier Waterfront area, the proposals contained in that map to supersede those shown on the Island Map, 1-87 as amended, and the Town Map 2-87 as amended, approved by the States on 3rd and 10th November 1987 respectively, where they differ, subject however to the States confirming the site of the new housing to the west of Albert and the marina at Havre des Pas.

Members present voted as follows -

``Pour" (39)

Senators

Shenton, Binnington, Baal, Rothwell, Le
Main, Stein, Chinn.

Connétables

St. John, St. Clement, St. Lawrence, St.
Mary, St. Ouen, St. Brelade, Trinity, St.
Martin, St. Peter, Grouville, St. Helier,
St. Saviour.

Deputies

Le Gallais(S), Rumboll(H), Wavell(S),
Blampied(H), Norman(C), St. John, St.
Peter, H. Baudains(C), Buesnel(H), Le
Sueur(H), St. Ouen, Coutanche(L),
Huelin(B), Bailhache(H), Clarke-Halifax(S),
Le Fondré(L), St. Martin, Le Geyt(S),
Walker(H), Crespel(H).

``Contre" (7)

Senators

Carter, Quérée.

Deputies

Beadle(B), St. Mary, S. Baudains(H),
Grouville, Syvret(H).

THE STATES adjourned at 5.30 p.m. until
the next day, Wednesday, 11th November 1992.

G.H.C. COPPOCK

Greffier of the States.