

Price : £2.25

THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
22nd November 1994 at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Peter Crill, C.B.E.

All Members were present with the exception of -

Senator Nigel Lewis Quérée - absent
Iris Medora Le Feuvre, Connétable of St.
Lawrence - ill
Jack Roche, Connétable of St. Saviour - ill
Michael Adam Wavell, Deputy of St.
Saviour - out of the Island
Shirley Margaret Baudains, Deputy of St.
Helier - out of the Island
John Nicolle Le Fondré - out of the Island.

Prayers

Connétables of St. Lawrence and St. Saviour

The Bailiff, on behalf of the States, conveyed
to the Connétable of St. Lawrence and the
Connétable of St. Saviour the best wishes of the
Assembly for a speedy recovery.

Subordinate legislation tabled

The following enactments were laid before the
States, namely -

1. Motor Vehicles (Driving
Licences) (Amendment) (Jersey) Order
1994. R & O 8748.
2. Road Vehicles Lighting
(Amendment No. 17) (Jersey) Order 1994.
R & O 8749.

3. Motor Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment No. 33) (Jersey) Order 1994. R & O 8750.
4. Motor Cars (Driving Instruction) (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Order 1994. R & O 8751.
5. Motor Vehicle Registration (General Provisions) (Amendment) (Jersey) Order 1994. R & O 8752.
6. Health Insurance (Pharmaceutical Benefit) (General Provisions) (Amendment No. 4) (Jersey) Order 1994. R & O 8753.

Matter presented

The following matter was presented to the States -

Manpower report for the period January to June 1994. R.C.26/94.
Presented by the Establishment Committee.

Matters noted - land transactions

THE STATES noted an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 14th November 1994 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 purchase from Advocate Steven Alexander Meiklejohn, acting on behalf of the unknown owners, of the roadway adjoining Jane Sandeman Court, St. Helier (the former Le Brun's Bakery site in Brighton Road), shown hatched in red on plan No. 86-281-18, required in order to complete the construction of Jane Sandeman Court, for the sum of £3,260, with the Committee being responsible for the payment of legal fees;
- (b) as recommended by the Housing Committee, the purchase from Mr. Eric Le Saint of 865 square feet of land, being a footpath through Vicq Farm, La Rue de Maraval, Grouville, for the sum

of £865, representing a rate of £1 a square foot, with the Committee being responsible for all reasonable legal costs;

(c) as recommended by the Public Services Committee, the purchase from Mrs. Elizabeth Anne Barrow, née Gilberet, of approximately 298 square feet of land at Petit Desert, St. Saviour's Hill, St. Saviour, required to construct a footpath, for a consideration of £596, representing a rate of £2 a square foot, with the Committee being responsible for all reasonable legal fees and the cost of any necessary accommodation works;

(d) as recommended by the Island Development Committee, the lease to Mr. Philip John Rondel of Field No. 471B, Corbière, St. Brelade (measuring approximately three vergées), for a period of five years at an annual rent of £180 (representing a rate of £60 a vergée), to include the right to irrigate the field from the nearby pond. The Committee rescinded its Act No. 2(1) of 27th May 1994;

(e) as recommended by the Island Development Committee, the lease to Mr. Philip John Rondel of Fields Nos. 93 and 94, Les Quennevais, St. Brelade ('Lesquende' land) (measuring approximately seven vergées), for a period of five years from 1st December 1994, at an annual rent of £420 (representing a rate of £60 a vergée), subject to review at the end of the third year. (The Committee rescinded its Act No. 2(1) of 27th May 1994.

Matters lodged

The following subjects were lodged ``au Greffe" -

1. Hue Court, Dumaresq Street, St. Helier: approval of drawings and acceptance of tender - P.148/94. Presented by the Housing Committee.
2. Draft Post Office (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 1993 (Appointed Day) Act

199 - P.149/94.

Presented by the Committee for
Postal Administration.

3. Draft Adoption (Amendment No. 3)
(Jersey) Law 199 - P.150/94.
Presented by the Education
Committee.
4. Marine zone - P.151/94.
Presented by the Island
Development Committee.
5. Draft Public Service Vehicles
(Fees) (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey)
Regulations 199 - P.152/94.
Presented by the Defence
Committee.
6. Les Landes heathland area, St.
Ouen (P.51/94): amendment - P.153/94.
Presented by Senator V.A.
Tomes.
7. Draft Family Allowances (Jersey)
Regulations 199 - P.154/94.
Presented by the Social Security
Committee.
8. Population: Special
Committee - P.155/94.
Presented by Senator S. Syvret.

Lodged on 15th November 1994

The Budget 1995.

Presented by the Finance and
Economics Committee.

Arrangement of public business for the present
meeting

Senator Vernon Amy Tomes withdrew his amendment
to the Public Services Committee's proposition
regarding Les Landes heathland area, St. Ouen
(P.72/94 - lodged "au Greffe" on 24th May
1994) having lodged a revised amendment
(P.153/94) at the present meeting.

Arrangement of public business for the next
meeting on 6th and 7th December 1994

THE STATES confirmed that the following subjects
lodged "au Greffe" should be considered at the

next meeting on 6th and 7th December 1994 -

The Budget 1995.
Lodged: 15th November 1994.
Finance and Economics
Committee.

Hue Court, Dumaresq Street, St.
Helier: approval of drawings and acceptance
of tender - P.148/94.
Lodged: 22nd November 1994.
Housing Committee.

Draft Post Office (Amendment)
(Jersey) Law 1993 (Appointed Day) Act
199 - P.149/94.
Lodged: 22nd November 1994.
Committee for Postal
Administration.

Projet withdrawn

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

Population: Special Committee -
P.180/93.
Lodged: 9th November 1993.
Deputy S. Syvret of St. Helier.

Longbeach development, Grouville - questions and
answers (Tape No. 258)

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked the
Connétable of St. John, President of the Island
Development Committee, the following questions -

- ``1. Will the President confirm that -
 - (a) the two penthouse flats at
the Longbeach development,
Grouville, have not been occupied
by the site developer and his
family?
 - (b) that this is contrary to
information previously given to
the States?
2. Will the President inform the
States whether the firm of estate
agents advising the developers in their
claim for compensation from the States

has a beneficial interest in the development company or its holding company?

3. Will the President confirm that there was no reduction in the number of flats provided in the development as the result of the planning changes?
4. Finally, will the President inform the States who was responsible for conducting the compensation negotiations on behalf of the States; which Committees were consulted about the amount of compensation to be awarded; and which Committee or Committees finally approved the settlement reached?"

The President of the Island Development Committee replied as follows -

- ``1.(a) The occupation of the two penthouse flats at Longbeach, Grouville, is not a matter which is under the control of my Committee. To be helpful, I have, however, sought information from the Housing Department and I am advised as follows -

At the time of the development, it was clearly the intention of the developer to sell all the flats to persons qualifying within Regulations 1(1)(a)-(h). However, following an application from the developer, and in view of the fact that the site had a prior commercial use, the Housing Committee in accordance with its normal policy, accepted that the top two penthouse flats, which were the largest and most expensive of the development, could be occupied by persons who qualify under Regulation 1(1)(a)-(k), the remainder remaining (a)-(h). This decision was made in May 1993. In April 1994, the Housing Committee relinquished one of the (a)-(k) flats in return for one of the (a)-(h) flats being granted an (a)-(j) status. I am also advised by the Chief Executive Officer of the Housing Committee that the

developer himself currently occupies one of the penthouse flats and that he understands that a member of the developer's family has occupied the other penthouse flat, but that consent has been given for the flat to be occupied by a 1(1)(a) Jersey born resident.

(b) I have no recollection of personally giving any information to the States on this matter. If the Senator is referring to statements made by my predecessor, the former Connétable of St. John, the information which has been provided by the Housing Committee seems to be in line with my recollection of what he said.

2. The claim for compensation was submitted by Fontenelles Holdings Limited, who were represented at the various meetings by Advocate G. Fiott of Fiott and Huelin, Mr. R. Amy and Mr. B. Youd of Alex Picot and Company, Mr. A. Hill of Hill Associates, Mr. J. Wright of Gaudin and Company, estate agents, Mr. A. Wilson of Telemark (now in liquidation) and Mr. G. Pallot and Mr. J. Machin. I am unable to advise the Senator of their particular financial interests, if any, in the development. I am informed that this information may be included in the company file at the Financial Services Department which gives particulars of the registered shareholders on the various dates.
3. I confirm that there was no reduction in the number of flats in the development, the modification meant that two penthouse flats were constructed in the roofspace, whereas under the original design they were not. The developer argued that the flats were reduced in value because of intruding dormers. The developer argued that the flats were smaller in size and much less desirable. The developer also argued that they were delayed in their availability to the market and as a result of the fall in the value of property were devalued. None of these arguments have been accepted by my

Committee.

4. The total amount claimed totalled just over £906,000. The Island Development Committee initially employed its advisors, Drivers Jonas, who are experienced in construction industry claims, together with the Controller of Audit, States' Treasury, and my Chief Officer, who sought the advice from a Crown Advocate on particular matters. A sum of £364,000 was approved by the States and was paid on the basis of their recommendations, but without prejudice to the claim. This left a sum of over #= million in dispute. In November 1993 the detailed recommendations of Drivers Jonas were reviewed by a Queen's Counsel instructed by the Law Officers of the Crown. The QC recommended to the Finance and Economics and Island Development Committees in early 1994 that an additional £100,000 be paid in full and final settlement. This was approved by the Finance and Economics Committee on 17th December 1993 and the Island Development Committee on 13th January 1994. This amount was rejected by the developer. A further recommendation was made by the Law Officers to the Finance and Economics and Island Development Committees to settle the claim in order to avoid a costly arbitration, which was approved. My Committee agreed to this recommendation on 30th June 1994. The Solicitor General then advised the States Treasurer in a letter on 22nd July 1994 that the developer would settle for £200,000. I am advised that the States Treasury Controller of Audit reported receipt of this letter to the Finance and Economics Committee on 28th July 1994 who authorised the offer of £200,000 in full and final settlement of all claims regarding Longbeach, and requested the Controller of Audit to take the necessary action. I have since been advised that this was on the basis that this sum be paid immediately. I have now established that the Controller of Audit, States Treasury, drew a cheque for £200,000 on 29th July 1994 and this was paid over to the solicitor acting for the developer by

the Solicitor General the same day in exchange for a signed discharge. The agreement was ratified by the Island Development Committee at its meeting on 12th August 1994. My Committee was advised at this time that the Treasury had already paid it. My Committee was subsequently asked by the Treasury to submit to the Finance and Economics Committee a Supply Day request which is now lodged. I can advise the House that although my Committee had agreed to a settlement to avoid the expense of arbitration proceedings, neither my Committee nor my Chief Officer was informed of or asked to authorise the payment prior to it being made."

States loan housing - questions and answers
(Tape No. 258)

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton asked the Connétable of St. John, President of the Island Development Committee, the following questions -

- ``1. Will the President inform the States of the number of applications which his Committee has received during the past 12 months from private builders who are willing to provide houses under the States loan scheme for less than £100,000?
2. Will the President inform the States why his Committee considers that public money should be spent on the acquisition of expensive sites for housing development when there is a willingness on the part of responsible builders to build houses within the price range desired by the Jersey public?
3. Will the President inform the States of the amount spent to-date on all the proceedings that have taken place for acquiring the Lesquende land?
4. Will the President advise the States what benefit has accrued to the general public, and in particular to local persons seeking to acquire a home of their own, as a result of this discharge of taxpayer's money to

private individuals, without a single home being built?"

The President of the Island Development Committee replied as follows -

1. It is not necessary for an applicant submitting an application under the Island Planning Law for development consent to submit details of the price at which the developer is prepared to sell housing units.

My Committee's rôle is to ensure that sufficient land is available to meet the requirements of the population for housing. The Senator will be aware of the six monthly review of current and future developments which have so far indicated that sufficient land for housing is available up to the year 2000. I direct the Senator's attention to my Committee's report R.C.22 presented to the States on 6th September 1994.

The Property Management Office of the Island Development Committee has assisted the Housing Committee in negotiating with builders prepared to provide flats as part of development agreements on States' owned land below the figure the Senator quotes. We have had no contact with builders and developers over the past 12 months who have been prepared to propose formally that they would construct and offer houses for sale for less than £100,000. I am advised by the Chief Executive Officer of the Housing Committee that he has also not received any such formal proposals. However, on an informal basis, my officers have received approaches from a number of builders in the Island who have offered to purchase States owned sites for development of low cost housing.

2. There is no guarantee that builders who offer informally to construct houses at low cost on Category A zoned sites eventually offer them to the market on that basis. There is no provision under the Planning Law which would allow my Committee to require developers to sell

property which is constructed at private expense at a price which is below the market level. The Committee's present general policy is that housing land should be purchased for housing development where there is no reasonable prospect of a satisfactory development being undertaken in the absence of intervention by the States. There are also occasions when the Committee seeks to acquire property which is used for a purpose which is inappropriate in order to extinguish that use. In these circumstances, re-use for housing development may be appropriate. In the case of commercial sites this will inevitably lead to higher acquisition costs. My Committee is also not prepared to countenance piecemeal development and if it is the intention of the Senator to encourage the development of sites which are considered either not suitable for housing or not zoned for housing simply on the grounds that they are available then this is outside my Committee's policies.

3. A payment of £2.51 million was made to the owners of the Lesquende site in December 1992 when the land passed into public ownership following the vesting order in the Royal Court. This sum represented 75 per cent of the amount offered to the land owner under the compulsory purchase procedure Law and is a requirement of the Law. Since that time, the costs of the arbitration, which is an inevitable part of the compulsory purchase procedure, has to date been £399,000.
4. These fees have been expended for the purpose of fighting a fiercely contested arbitration in order to reduce as substantially as possible the claim which has been mounted by the claimant company. The claim is in excess of £14 million which exceeds the amount offered by the States, by over £11 million. The benefit to the taxpayer will not be known until the result of the arbitration is known. The Board of Arbitrators is at this very moment finalising its award. In the circumstances, I do not think that it

would be proper for me to enter into a discussion of the probable result or indeed to say anything which might be construed as an attempt to influence the Board. All that I can properly say is that once compulsory purchase proceedings have been set in motion the Committee has no option but to follow the procedure which has been laid down by law. If in any compulsory purchase case the acquiring Committee, having taken into account the amount claimed by the claimants and the resources which they are devoting to the arbitration, is of the opinion that it should not cut corners in contesting the claim, then it has no real option but to incur expense in doing so."

Mobility allowance for the disabled and the attendance allowance - questions and answers (Tape No. 258)

Senator Stuart Syvret asked Deputy Terence Augustine Le Sueur, President of the Social Security Committee, the following questions -

1. Will the President inform the States if it is his Committee's intention to give effect to the States' decisions of 11th November 1992 approving the introduction of a mobility allowance for the disabled?
2. If the answer to Question 1 is, in any way, negative, will the President explain why, after two years have elapsed, his Committee has still not sought the approval of the States for the principle of revising the agreed provisions of the scheme?
3. If the answer to Question 1 is affirmative, will the President advise when the mobility allowance will be available?
4. It has been suggested that the introduction of the mobility allowance as approved by the States would cost £4 million. Does the President agree with that estimate and would he explain how the estimated figure was arrived at?

5. Will the President explain the criteria used in assessing eligibility for attendance allowance?"

The President of the Social Security Committee replied as follows -

1. A detailed brief was referred to the Law Draftsman in December 1992, following the States decision on 11th November 1992, which supported amendments proposed by the then Deputy Stuart Syvret. In the 1993 Strategic Policy Review and Action Plan, Disabled Transport Allowance was in 39th position in the Law Drafting Programme. In the 1994 Plan, it had risen to 13th, but we are now advised that, due to staff shortages in the Law Draftman's Office, it is unlikely that drafting of this piece of legislation will begin this year. In essence, therefore, the Committee is pursuing the wishes of the States expressed on 11th November 1992, but is frustrated by delays in the Law Drafting Programme.
2. As I intimated in my reply to a question from Senator Syvret on 18th January this year, there are concerns about the funding of this allowance. When the States approved amendments to the scheme, members were not aware of the financial implications nor had the Finance and Economics Committee been able to consider the funding of such changes. During 1993, my Committee sought funds from States General Revenues through the Finance and Economics Committee. In view of the projected revenue figures, and the cash limits policies, it became clear that funds may not be available for these changes. With the appointment of my new Committee, a sub-committee set up to look at all aspects of the Disabled Transport Allowance has proposed a smaller scheme which is currently being considered by the Finance and Economics Committee. The intention of my Committee, as it was in 1992, is to set up a scheme that the Island can afford

and then to extend it as soon as funds permit. I am advised that the Finance and Economics Committee will be commenting on the report and proposition at their next meeting and it should be lodged shortly thereafter.

3. Disabled Transport Allowance will be available when the Law is passed by the States and when the necessary finance is available. From the Budget paper recently published, Members will be aware that some money has been allocated for this benefit in 1995, on the basis that legislation will have been approved perhaps in the second half of next year. At this point, I would also mention that my Committee has sought the advice of the Attorney General as to whether it would be quicker to introduce triennial regulations rather than a Law. His view is that no time will be saved as the Law drafting work is identical. A little time might be saved through avoiding consent by the Privy Council, but this time would be necessary to ensure that the administration and computer support is in place before the allowance becomes payable. In short, both processes are likely to take about the same time overall.
4. The cost of the proposed scheme agreed by the States has been estimated at £4 million. There is no method of accurately assessing the take up of benefits by those people over age 65 because there is simply no indication, anywhere, of the incidence of disability in Jersey. We have previously asked the Etat Civil Committee to consider questions in the Census on this subject, but have been unable to get their agreement to do so.

The estimate of £4 million was based on surveys of existing beneficiaries of Social Security under age 65, and the fact that with 11,910 people over the age of 60, including 3,122 over the age of 80 (1991 Census), it was possible that 2,000 people over the age of 65, may have difficulties in getting out and about. Without further information, I believe this estimate to be

reasonable. I doubt that it will be any less and it could increase over the years with the growth of numbers of elderly people in the population.

5. The criteria used in determining the eligibility for Attendance Allowance are of two distinct classes, namely lay conditions and medical conditions. The lay conditions principally relate to residence and income. To qualify a person must -

(a) be ordinarily resident in the Island; and

(b) be present in the Island; and

(c) have been present in the Island for a period of at least 26 weeks in the past 12 months; and also must -

(i) have been ordinarily resident in the Island during the five years immediately preceding that day; or

(ii) be born in the Island or be the son or daughter of parents at least one of whom was born in the Island;

(d) have an income of less than £31,539 a year.

Some of these residence and presence conditions may be varied by temporary absences and reciprocal agreements.

The medical conditions are considered by the Attendance Allowance Board, chaired by Dr. Jennifer Newell, following reports submitted by designated medical practitioners, and any representations made by the claimant's own doctors.

The main condition is that an Attendance Allowance is payable to any person who is severely disabled, physically or mentally, that he requires from another person -

(a) frequent attention throughout the day in connexion with his bodily

functions; or

- (b) supervision throughout the day in order to avoid substantial danger to himself or others; or
- (c) prolonged or repeated attention during the night in connexion with his bodily functions; or
- (d) supervision throughout the night in order to avoid substantial danger to himself or others."

Jersey Telecoms and Jersey Postal - statement

Senator Pierre François Horsfall, President of the Finance and Economics Committee, made a statement in the following terms -

``Jersey Telecoms and Jersey Postal are both valuable assets of the States of Jersey and make a significant contribution to its revenues. The Finance and Economics Committee believes that, while the present arrangements have worked well, there is a need for these departments to be able to act more independently in what is a rapidly changing international scene. It is thought that greater liberty and flexibility will bring many benefits to the departments, their staff, their customers and the people of Jersey.

As the arrangements are essentially financial in nature, it is the Finance and Economics Committee's intention to consult with the relevant Committees and, through them, their management and workforces, to explore the possibility of modifying the relationship between the Committees and the States in such a way that benefits will accrue to all concerned.

The intention is that the States will remain the sole owners retaining controls on profits returned to States' general revenues and on tariffs."

Sexual Offences (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 1994 - P.61/94 revised and P.135/94

THE STATES commenced consideration of the draft Sexual Offences (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 199

and adopted the Preamble.

Article 1 was adopted, the States having rejected an amendment of Deputy Gary Matthews of St. Brelade that in Article 1 for the words "eighteen years" there should be substituted the words "sixteen years".

Members present voted for the amendment as follows -

Members present voted as follows -

"Pour" (11)

Senators

Rothwell, Syvret, Tomes.

Deputies

Coutanche(L), Johns(H), Duhamel(S),
Matthews(B), Dorey(H), Breckon(S),
Grouville, St. Martin.

"Contre" (34)

Senators

Shenton, Jeune, Horsfall, Le Main, Le
Maistre, Stein, Chinn, Bailhache.

Connétables

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

Deputies

Rumboll(H), Norman(C), St. Peter,
H. Baudains(C), Le Sueur(H), St. Ouen,
Huelin(B), St. Mary, Crespel(H), Pullin(S),
Trinity, Carter(H), Routier(H),
Layzell(B), Huet(H), St. John.

Article 2 was adopted.

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Sexual Offences (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 1994.

Members present voted as follows -

``Pour" (35)

Senators

Shenton, Jeune, Horsfall, Rothwell, Le
Maistre, Stein, Chinn, Syvret, Tomes.

Connétables

St. Clement, St. Mary, St. Brelade, St.
Peter, St. Helier, St. Martin, St. John.

Deputies

Rumboll(H), H. Baudains(C), Le Sueur(H),
St. Ouen, Coutanche(L), Huelin(B), St.
Mary, Crespel(H), Pullin(S), Trinity,
Johns(H), Duhamel(S), Matthews(B),
Routier(H), Dorey(H), Layzell(B),
Breckon(S), St. Martin, St. John.

``Contre" (9)

Senators

Bailhache.

Connétables

Grouville, Trinity, St. Ouen.

Deputies

Norman(C), St. Peter, Carter(H), Grouville,
Huet(H).

Senator Terence John Le Main abstained from
voting.

Franchise (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Law 1994 -
P.104/94 and P.134/94

THE STATES continued consideration of the draft
Franchise (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Law 199 ,
having on 11th October 1994 adopted the
Preamble, deleted Article 1, adopted Article 2,
adopted Article 3 as amended, adopted Articles 4
and 5, adopted Article 6 as amended, and adopted
Article 7. Article 8 was referred back to the
Legislation Committee.

THE STATES adopted Article 8 (to be renumbered
Article 7), having substituted the following
amended Article -

``ARTICLE 8

(1) This Law may be cited as the Franchise (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Law 199 and shall come into force on such day as the States may by Act appoint and different days may be appointed for different purposes or different provisions of this Law.

(2) Any person who was ordinarily resident in the Island immediately before the commencement of Article 2 of this Law shall, for a period of two years following that commencement, be deemed to have the requisite residence qualification under sub-paragraph (b) of Article 3 of the principal Law as substituted by Article 2 of this Law."

THE STATES, subject to the sanction of Her Most Excellent Majesty in Council, adopted a Law entitled the Franchise (Amendment No. 5) (Jersey) Law 1994.

West of Albert Pier reclamation area, St. Helier - Phases II and III: purchase from the Crown of foreshore - P.120/94

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Island Development Committee -

- (a) authorised the purchase from the Crown of an area of foreshore, measuring 28.7 acres (64.5 vergées), situated west of the Albert Pier, St. Helier, shown hatched on drawing No. 439/1, required for the construction of Phase II of the land reclamation area and the proposed Phase III marina, for a consideration of £100,000, with each party being responsible for the payment of its own legal fees;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the said drawing on behalf of the States;
- (c) authorised the Attorney General and the Greffier of the States to pass on behalf of the public any contracts which it might be found to be necessary to pass in connexion with the said land and all interests therein;

(d) authorised the payment or discharge of the expenses incurred in connexion with the purchase of the said land, and of all interests therein, from the Island Development Committee's capital vote of credit - 'Acquisition of Land - Major Reserve' (Vote No. C.0904).

Camden, Westmount, St. Helier: purchase of land to the north - P.136/94

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Island Development Committee -

(a) approved the purchase from Mr. Jack Stratford and Mrs. Marie Louise Stratford, née Nelan, of an area of land measuring approximately 8,117 square feet, forming part of the garden of the property known as Camden, Westmount, St. Helier, situated to the east of Overdale Hospital, St. Helier (as shown hatched on drawing No. 443/1) required for the development of the health facilities at Overdale Hospital and the William Knott Day Centre for a consideration of £100,000, with each party being responsible for the payment of its own legal fees;

(b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the said drawing on behalf of the States;

(c) authorised the Attorney General and the Greffier of the States to pass, on behalf of the public, any contract which it might be found to be necessary to pass in connexion with the acquisition of the said land and all interests therein;

(d) authorised the payment or discharge of the expenses incurred in connexion with the said acquisition from the Island Development Committee's capital vote of credit 'Acquisition of Land - Major Reserve' (Vote No. C.0904).

Members present voted as follows -

``Pour" (21)

Senators

Horsfall, Le Main, Stein, Chinn, Tomes.

Connétables

St. Mary, St. Brelade, Trinity, St. John.

Deputies

H. Baudains(C), St. Ouen, Coutanche(L),
Huelin(B), St. Mary, Crespel(H), Pullin(S),
Trinity, Johns(H), Duhamel(S), Dorey(H),
Huet(H).

``Contre" (20)

Senators

Shenton, Jeune, Rothwell, Le Maistre,
Bailhache.

Connétables

St. Clement, St. Peter, Grouville, St.
Helier, St. Martin.

Deputies

Norman(C), St. Peter, Le Sueur(H),
Matthews(B), Routier(H), Layzell(B),
Breckon(S), Grouville, St. Martin, St.
John.

THE STATES rose at 5.30 p.m.

G.H.C. COPPOCK

Greffier of the States.