

**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
19th June 2001 at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Bailiff,
Sir Philip Bailhache.**

**His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor,
Air Chief Marshal Sir John Cheshire, K.B.E., C.B.,
was present**

All members were present with the exception of -

Senator Corrie Stein - out of the Island
Senator Paul Vincent Francis Le Claire - ill
Harry Hallewell Baudains, Deputy of St. Clement - out of the Island
Robert Charles Duhamel, Deputy of St. Saviour - out of the Island
Philip Francis Cyril Ozouf, Deputy of St. Helier - out of the Island

Prayers

H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh - 80th Birthday

The Bailiff informed the Assembly that the following message had been received from His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh in reply to the greetings sent to him on the occasion of his 80th birthday -

“Your message of congratulations on achieving my 80th birthday is much appreciated.”

Connétable of St. Peter, Mr. M. C. Pollard - retirement

The Bailiff, on behalf of the Assembly, thanked Mr. Malcolm Cedric Pollard, Connétable of St. Peter, for his services to the Island over the past nine years and conveyed to him the best wishes of the Assembly on his retirement.

H.M The Queen's Birthday Honours List - congratulations to Mr. Philip Falle

The Bailiff, on behalf of all members and officers of the States, congratulated Mr. Philip Falle, political correspondent, Jersey Evening Post, on his appointment as a Member of the Order of the British Empire.

Subordinate legislation tabled

The following enactments were laid before the States, namely -

Road Traffic (Saint Clement) (Amendment No. 15) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 95/2001.

Road Traffic (Saint Brelade) (Amendment No. 11) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 96/2001.

Road Traffic (Saint Helier) (Amendment No. 9) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 97/2001.

Public Rank Taxis (Fares and Charges) (Jersey) Order 2001. R & O 98/2001.

Employment and Social Security Committee - resignation of member

THE STATES noted the resignation of Deputy Francis Gerald Voisin of St. Lawrence from the Employment and Social Security Committee.

Tourism Committee - appointment of member

THE STATES appointed the Connétable of St. Mary as a member of the Tourism Committee.

Matters presented

The following matters were presented to the States -

Population Policy: interim report - R.C.21/2001.

Presented by the Policy and Resources Committee.

Hautlieu School: approval of drawings: (P.83/2001) - comments - P.83/2001 Com.

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Parish Rates Review (P.41/2001): comments - P.41/2001 Com.(2)

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

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

Matters noted - land transactions

THE STATES noted Acts of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 4th and 11th June 2001 recording the following decisions of the Treasurer of the States under delegated powers, in pursuance of Standing Orders relating to certain transactions in land -

- (a) as recommended by the Tourism Committee, the renewal of the ground lease to Mrs. Gillian Geraldine Hidrio, née Carré, for the property known as Colleen's Café, Grève de Lecq, St. Ouen, for a period of three years from 25th December 2000 at a commencing annual rent of £4,000, to be increased to £5,000 on 25th December 2001 and to £5,500 on 25th December 2002, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same as the existing lease, with each party being responsible for its own legal costs arising from this transaction;
- (b) as recommended by the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, the lease to the Jersey Electricity Company Limited of the site of electricity sub-station No. 486, Abattoir Site, St. Helier, for a period of 99 years at an annual rent of £1 payable as a lump sum upon passing contract, and the grant to the company, free of charge, of wayleave rights in association with the sub-station, on the basis that the company would be responsible for both parties' reasonable legal costs arising from this transaction;
- (c) as recommended by the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, the renewal of the lease from the National Trust for Jersey of Fields Nos. 810, 811, 812 and 813, The Elms, St. Mary, for a period of five years from 26th December 2000 at an initial annual rent of £4,500, subject to a rent review to open market rental value on 20th December 2003, with all other terms and conditions remaining the same as the existing lease, with each party being responsible for its own legal costs arising from this transaction;
- (d) as recommended by the Public Services Committee, the purchase from FBF Developments Limited of 789 square feet of land to the north of the junction at Castle Street and Commercial Street, St. Helier (as

shown on Drawing No. 856/035), required for road widening purposes, for a consideration of £10, with the public being responsible for both parties' reasonable legal costs arising from this transaction;

- (e) as recommended by the Education Committee, the lease to the Jersey Electricity Company Limited of Electricity Sub-station No. 335 and the Ring Main Unit (RMU) at Hautlieu School, Wellington Road St. Saviour, as shown on the Company's drawing No. 44H24A as amended on 2nd October 2000, for a period of 99 years at an annual rent of £1 payable in a lump sum upon the passing of the contract, together with the grant of standard Wayleave rights, free of charge, to the Company with regard to Sub-station No. 335 and the RMU kiosk as shown on Wayleave Plan No. 25K (reference P1573/1455) date 3rd October 2000;
- (f) as recommended by the Public Services Committee, the entering into of a Deed of Arrangement with Miss Frances Mary Barrington Jupp and Mrs. Elizabeth Barrington Reid, née Jupp, the joint owners of Old Station House, La Rue à Don, Grouville, in order to define the boundary between that property and the road and footway known as La Rue a Don, Grouville, as detailed on Drawing No. 15/543/3, with both parties being responsible for their own legal costs;
- (g) as recommended by the Tourism Committee, the renewal of the lease to Mr. Richard Brian Ropert and Mrs. Harriet Jane Ropert, née Fane, of the Gunsite Café, Beaumont, St. Peter, for a period of three years deemed to have commenced on 25th December 2000, at a commencing annual rent of £7,000, to be followed by an increase to £8,000 on 25th December 2001 and £9,000 on 25th December 2002, on the basis that terms and conditions had been agreed between Mr. and Mrs. Ropert and Mr. David Patric and Mrs. Jane Cullen, née de la Haye, in relation to the assignment of the lease which was deemed to have taken place on 11th March 2001;
- (h) as recommended by the Tourism Committee, the renewal of the lease to Mr. Peter Gibbins and Mrs. Ann Huelin, née Gibbins, of Le Braye Café and land, Le Braye Slipway, St. Brelade, for a period of three years deemed to have commenced on 25th March 2000, at a commencing annual rent of £16,250, to be reviewed annually in line with the Jersey Retail Price Index.

Matters lodged

The following matters were lodged "au Greffe" -

Draft Powers of Arrest (Injunctions) (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200- P.88/2001.
Presented by the Legislation Committee.

Draft Marriage and Civil Status (Jersey) Law 200- P.89/2001.
Presented by the Etat Civil Committee.

Projet de Loi (200-) (Amendement) Sur La Voirie - P.90/2001.
Presented by Deputy G.C.L. Baudains of St. Clement, and referred to the Public Services Committee.

Arrangement of public business for the next meeting on 3rd July 2001

THE STATES confirmed that the following matters lodged "au Greffe" would be considered at the next meeting on 3rd July 2001 -

Appointments made by the States: review of procedures - P.85/2001.
Lodged: 5th June 2001.
Deputy R. G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour.

Field 1418, St. Saviour, Trinity: development in the Green Zone.
Lodged: 5th June 2001 - P.86/2001.

Planning and Environment Committee.

Draft Powers of Arrest (Injunctions) (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200- P.88/2001.

Lodged: 19th June 2001.

Legislation Committee.

Projets withdrawn under Standing Order 17(6)

THE STATES in accordance with Standing Order 17(6) noted that the following Papers were deemed to have been withdrawn -

Population policy - P.175/99.

Lodged: 26th October 1999.

Policy and Resources Committee.

Les Ormes Farm, Field 773, La Route de la Blanche Pierre, St. Lawrence: development in the Green Zone - P.82/2000.

Lodged: 6th June 2000.

Planning and Environment Committee.

Equalisation of Welfare - P.164/2000

THE STATES granted leave to the Connétable of St. Peter to withdraw his proposition regarding the Equalisation of Welfare (P.164/2000, lodged 'au Greffe' on 26th September 2001).

Change in Presidency

The Bailiff retired from the Chair prior to questions being asked, and the meeting continued under the Presidency of the Greffier of the States, Miss Catherine Mary Newcombe.

Assessment of businesses losses suffered by the owners of La Sirène Guest House - question and answer (Tape No.657)

Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier asked Deputy Terence John Le Main of St. Helier, President of the Housing Committee, the following question -

“On 8th June 2001 the Chief Executive Officer of the Housing Department wrote to all States’ members informing them of the Housing Committee’s progress in respect of the action it was charged to carry out following the approval of P.155/99 on 7th December 1999, namely the authorisation of the assessment by an independent firm of auditors of the business losses suffered by the proprietors of La Sirene Guest House, St Helier, prior to 16th February 1999, as a result of the redevelopment of the adjoining property, Kent Lodge. In his letter the outcome of the investigation is revealed, and the Committee indicates that it proposes to make a further ex gratia payment to the proprietors of the guest house.

- (a) Would the President explain why his Committee proposes to make this payment ‘in full and final settlement of all and any claims against the States, any Committee of the States and any department of the States arising out of the redevelopment of the Kent Lodge site’?
- (b) Does the President not consider that his Committee’s attempt to prevent the proprietors of the guest house from attempting to obtain a fair and public hearing in the pursuit of their grievances against other States’ departments may represent an infringement of their Human Rights?”

The President of the Housing Committee replied as follows -

“Before answering these questions I should inform the Assembly that whereas proposition P.155/99 was presented on the basis that the Committee was being asked to make an ex gratia payment, that is, not on the basis of any legal claim, lawyers for La Sirène Guest House Limited and its proprietors have now written to the Committee informing it that the lawyers are considering joining the Housing Committee and possibly others as parties to proceedings which have been brought by the Company and its proprietors against the Jersey Homes Trust. Although no details have been notified of any legal basis upon which such a procedure could be taken, this is nevertheless notification that legal proceedings may be brought and the Treasury has been asked to notify the States’ Insurers accordingly. It follows from the foregoing that there is a very definite limit to what can properly be said on this subject in this Assembly.

- (a) The Committee has been advised by the Law Officers’ Department that it is standard practice when making a payment in respect of a particular matter to make it in full and final settlement of all claims by the same claimant arising out of the same matter. Part at least of the rationale for this is that the person who is offering the payment should be able to assume that that is the end of the matter. If a payment is not in full and final settlement, there is nothing to prevent a claimant from accepting a payment which has been made in good faith and then coming back for more as often as he feels inclined.

The settlement provision has been expressed to cover the States, any Committee of the States and any department of the States because Committees are bodies of the States and departments are executive arms of the Committees. To restrict the settlement of the Housing Committee would leave it completely open to ask for a payment from some other Committee.

- (b) It is assumed that the reference to Human Rights is a reference to Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights, which provides, so far as it is relevant, that in the determination of his civil rights or obligations everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. To offer a payment in respect of a claim without an admission of liability and on the basis that it is in full and final settlement of all and any claims arising out of the same matter is not a breach of that article because it is entirely up to the person to whom the offer is made to reject it and to choose instead to exercise his entitlement to a public hearing.”

Delay in compiling a health and safety report relating to damage caused to a gable wall - question and answer (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier asked Senator Terence Augustine Le Sueur, President of the Employment and Social Security Committee, the following question -

“On 15th May 2001 I sought information from the President concerning the steps taken by his Committee under the Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law 1989, to ensure safety of property owners and construction workers during building works. Although I was careful not to name a specific instance of building works leading to damage to a property, the President inferred from a supplementary question I asked that I was referring to a particular property whose gable wall was undermined by a States’ sponsored housing scheme in February 1999, and he went on to state that ‘action was taken and is still ongoing in respect of that particular instance’.

Would the President explain how it is possible, more than two years after the event, for his Department to be still investigating the damage caused to a privately-owned property as a result of a States’ sponsored development, and would he indicate whether it is usual for there to be such delays in the compiling of reports under the Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law 1989?”

The President of the Employment and Social Security Committee replied as follows -

“In my reply to the question on 15th May 2001, I did not say that the matter referred to in the question was still being investigated, but that ‘action was still ongoing’.

The Deputy is aware, as he has already received a letter from me responding to a similar question, that I cannot discuss individual cases in this forum and that I am constrained as to the information I can divulge under the Health and Safety Law. If the Deputy is concerned about the speed with which health and safety incidents are investigated, I can assure him that in the majority of cases, the Health and Safety Inspectorate will normally have completed its investigations within three months and referred a report, where appropriate, to the Law Officers Department. Thereafter, legal processes can be complex and lengthy and, of course, any decision to prosecute rests with the Law Officers.”

Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) - questions and answers (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Alan Crowcroft of St. Helier asked Senator Jean Amy Le Maistre, President of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee, the following questions -

- “1. On 28th September 1999 in adopting P.33/99, Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), the States requested the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee ‘to take all possible steps to designate and maintain the Island of Jersey as free from the growing of GMOs’. Would the President explain what steps have been taken by the Committee to comply with this States’ decision?
2. In adopting P.33/99, the States further agreed that the Committee be requested to suspend the programme of scientific research into eelworm-resistant strains of the Jersey Royal. Would the President state when the research programme ceased, and explain what was done with the constructs, or prototypes of GM Jersey Royal plants which were seen growing in the glasshouses of IACR Rothamsted by the delegation of States’ members which visited the Research Station earlier that year?
3. On 11th May 2001, the Jersey Evening Post published an article which revealed that the Jersey Royal potato has been genetically fingerprinted in order to protect its provenance and its unique status. Given that this work has been carried out by the same organisation that was undertaking research into a genetically modified Jersey Royal potato, what assurance can the President give the States that no further work is being carried out on the development of a GM Jersey Royal?
4. Would the President state what is the total amount of the invoices from IACR Rothamsted to his Committee since the suspension of work on the GM Jersey Royal?”

The President of the Agriculture and Fisheries Committee replied as follows -

- “1. The Agriculture and Fisheries Committee enquired of and has been reassured by the Head of Biotechnology Safety at the Chemicals and Biotechnology Division of the Department of the Environment, Transport, and the Regions (DETR) that international legislation applies to all seed and plant material traded in Europe, and therefore applies to anyone trading plant and seed material in the Island. EU Directive 90/220 covers the deliberate release of live GMOs such as fruit, seeds and grains and products containing viable GMOs. DETR Inspectors have powers of inspection and enforcement under this Directive. All seeds or plant material used in the United Kingdom in GM trials must receive consent under the EC régime under Directive 90/220 administered by the DETR.

All seed and plant material available in Europe, and this includes Jersey, is audited and tested by DETR GMO inspectors for the presence of GMOs.

In addition the organic Dairy industry in the Island took steps to ensure that the imported processed feed for cows is certified free of GMOs.

2. The Agriculture and Fisheries Committee suspended the programme of research with immediate effect from the date of the States’ debate on 28th September 1999.

The GM lines that included ONLY the Jersey Royal’s own genetic code that existed at that time have

been maintained as a subculture in sterile tissue culture and also in tuber produced plants in order to ensure that the level of resistance can be monitored through the suspension, as this situation has never occurred before. The monitoring is not research or development in any way of the Jersey Royal lines, the tests require nematode bioassays and identification of gene expression in each generation. This serves to protect the Island's valuable investment of nearly 10 years.

It is quite possible that continuing research worldwide on GM related risks will reveal that the type of work undertaken by Rothamsted may well be considered safe and acceptable in achieving environmental objectives.

Had the project been followed through and been successful, as the Deputy knows only too well, the Island would have been able to remove its dependence on some 30 per cent of the farmed land requiring chemical treatment.

3. The article on 11th May referred to DNA fingerprinting that was carried out in 1993 which demonstrated at the time, as part of the original project, that there was a scientific procedure available which could prove that the Jersey potato was in fact a true Jersey Royal. This procedure is available at more than one laboratory.

Publicity through the Department's London-based PR Consultants was decided to be given to this procedure as it demonstrated how seriously the Island takes its unique potato variety having gone to the lengths of being awarded a EU PDO - Protection of Designation of Origin.

No further research has been carried out on Jersey Royals at Rothamsted since the end of September 1999.

4. Since January 2000 IACR-Rothamsted has required an annual fee of £28,000 to cover the staff, management and materials costs including an annual bioassay and the monitoring of the suspension of active research, which has never occurred anywhere else in the world before. To date £42,000 has been paid to IACR-Rothamsted since the suspension of the work."

Work permits for persons domiciled outside the European Union - questions and answers (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier asked Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade, President of the Home Affairs Committee, the following questions -

- “1. Would the President outline his Committee's policy in respect of the provision of work permits for the employment in Jersey of persons domiciled outside the European Union, and the relevant procedures that have been put in place by the Immigration and Nationality Department?
2. Would the President explain what criteria are used by the Immigration and Nationality Department in determining applications for such work permits, and would he confirm that any application for Polish staff, for example, will be dealt with according to its merits, and that it is not necessary for a local employer to recruit through any particular organization?
3. Would the President reveal the contents of the Letter of Intent which has been sent by his Committee to the National Labour Office in Poland?”

The President of the Home Affairs Committee replied as follows -

- “1. The policy of the Home Affairs Committee is to grant work permits in those areas where there is a clear shortage of appropriate staff who can be recruited from amongst those who do not require permits to work here. That would include British citizens and citizens of other European Economic Area countries (the EU plus Norway and Iceland). At present, hospitality and agriculture are the two principal employers of seasonal work permit labour.

The relevant procedures put in place by the previous Defence Committee and followed by the Immigration and Nationality Department under delegated authority are the Immigration (Work Permits) (Jersey) Rules 1995 (R&O 8845).

2. The criteria used by the Immigration and Nationality Department in determining applications for work permits are contained in the Rules. In essence, a genuine vacancy has to exist, there has to be no one free of permit who can fill the post, the wages and conditions of service have to be on a par with those enjoyed by others in similar employment here and the economy of the Bailiwick should benefit. The Committee may - and usually does - take into account the work experience of the would-be entrant and provision made for accommodating that entrant.

It is not necessary to recruit through a particular organisation. Individual applications can be, and are, processed. That said, there are clear advantages in recruiting through trade organisations such as the Jersey Farmers' Union and the Jersey Hospitality Association, both of which have much experience in the recruitment field and have developed partnerships with the Immigration Department. These partnerships have allowed the Immigration and Nationality Department to contain its staff numbers as workload has increased and has given the two industries more involvement in the recruitment and welfare of foreign nationals.

Indeed, welfare has been and continues to be the principal concern of the Committee. The close working relationship between the Immigration and Nationality Department and the trade organisations will, in the opinion of the Committee, be the best guarantee that attention is paid to providing pastoral care.

3. The letter of intent which my Vice President presented to the President of the National Labour Office in Warsaw last autumn was our commitment to work with the NLO wherever possible to provide a controlled stream of seasonal labour for the Island.

I might add that a lot of very hard work has gone into structuring and controlling the flow of seasonal labour, both from Poland and from the Utalii College in Kenya. The template used in this process has been taken on by other countries who are now recruiting from Poland.

So far this year, 924 work permits have been issued to 27 nationalities. Of those, 755 have been to Polish nationals and 63 to Kenyans.

Copy of letter from the President of the Home Affairs Committee to Ms. Grazyna Zielinska, President, National Labour Officer, Poland, dated 21st November 2000

May I first thank you for your kind invitation to Warsaw extended to me as President of the Home Affairs Committee in Jersey. Unfortunately, I am committed to filming in the United Kingdom this week but my Vice-President, Senator Wendy Kinnard, has kindly agreed to travel in my place. She will be accompanied by Deputy Ozouf of the Industries Committee and representatives from the Jersey Hospitality Association, the Chamber of Commerce and my Immigration and Nationality Department.

As you know, because you came to Jersey in August, we are a tourist island and our success is dependant upon finding quality staff. This year, for the first time in a while, we found ourselves short of labour because our traditional source, Madeira, was sending less workers abroad.

Approaches were made by the recruitment arm of the Jersey Hospitality Association to relevant offices in Warsaw and the shortfall was largely made up.

The experiment was very successful, so much so that the Jersey Hospitality Association in hoping to fill about 300 vacancies in 2001 from Polish sources. The Immigration and Nationality Department on behalf of the Home Affairs Committee has worked closely with the Jersey Hospitality Association and will continue to do so in the best interests of employer and employee alike.

It is the intention of my Committee to continue to support the initiatives being taken to recruit staff from Poland through the National Labour Office and to ensure that this is done in a controlled way which benefits both the industry and their employees.

I am sure that by building on the co-operation which already exists between us we will be successful.”

Policing of demonstrations - questions and answers (Tape No. 657)

The Deputy of St. John asked Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade, President of the Home Affairs Committee, the following questions -

- “1. With the ATTAC demonstration having passed peacefully, would the President explain why the Island has an agreement with police forces in the South West of England to assist our local police force when called upon? Why was it necessary to bring members of a Scottish force to the Island to assist?”
2. Would the President inform members of the cost of this operation to the tax payers of the Island, broken down in several parts, cost in overtime of the local force and the full cost of bringing officers from Scotland with their equipment to assist our local force?
3. Where were the visiting officers and men billeted on their stay in the Island?”

The President of the Home Affairs Committee replied as follows -

- “1. I am not aware of the agreement to which the Deputy of St. John refers. There is an agreement with the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary to assist in major crime investigations and it is necessary to have this liaison with a single force to ensure that ‘HOLMES’ technology and equipment is compatible. (HOLMES is a computer system designed to support murder investigations and the like.) There are no corresponding agreements for other force activities.

However, in the year 2000 the States of Jersey Police also obtained mutual aid from South Wales, Wiltshire, West Midlands and the Kent constabularies and the National Crime Squad. Although Strathclyde was not used in 2000, it has provided assistance in the past.

The current Chief Officer is continuing the practice of obtaining assistance from those forces that appear to have the skills and spare capacity at the appropriate time. In respect of the ATTAC demonstration, Strathclyde was chosen partly because of availability and partly because of its officers' experience in public order policing. Five Strathclyde officers took part in policing the demonstration and the force also supplied three communication specialists.

2. The cost of policing on 9th June 2001 was as follows -

Overtime for Jersey officers	£ 8,000
Strathclyde mutual aid	£ 2,800
Additional equipment	£ 5,000
Transport	£ 6,250
Total	£22,050.

All of which will be absorbed by normal policing budgets.

3. In town hotels.”

Number of road traffic accidents caused by excessive speed - question and answer (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Lyndon John Farnham of St. Saviour asked Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade, President of the Home Affairs Committee, the following question -

“In the States of Jersey Police Annual Report 2000, we are advised that a new database was introduced ‘to develop a comprehensive overview of ‘where’, ‘when’ and ‘why’ reportable road traffic accidents are occurring in Jersey. Some of the results reinforce familiar messages with speed topping the table of contributory causes every month last year and being by far the biggest cause of injury accidents.’

Would the President inform members -

- (a) how many accidents were caused in 2000 wholly or in part due to excessive speed?
- (b) would he express this as a percentage of all motor traffic accidents?”

The President of the Home Affairs Committee replied as follows -

“(a) and (b)

In Jersey last year there were 903 recorded accidents of which 383 were classified as injury accidents.

Of these 903 accidents, speed was recorded by the reporting officer as being a contributory factor in 144 of these cases. This represents 16 per cent of all accidents.

The second highest recorded contributory factor was that of alcohol which was recorded as a factor in 10 per cent of accidents in the year 2000.”

Outstanding applications for speed limits - question and answer (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Lyndon Farnham of St. Saviour asked Deputy Alan Simon Crowcroft of St. Helier, President of the Public Services Committee, the following question -

“Would the President inform members -

- (a) how many applications for reduction of speed limits are outstanding pending the outcome of the Island’s overall speed limits policy?
- (b) when the Committee plans to deal with this policy?

The President of the Public Services Committee replied as follows -

“(a) There are currently 18 outstanding requests for a lower speed limit on roads or areas of roads affecting nine parishes. Of these, one (Grouville Coast Road) was originally requested in 1996, eight requests are outstanding from 1997 to 99, and a further nine have been received since the beginning of 2000.

(b) The Public Services Committee met the Home Affairs Committee on 22nd March 2001 to discuss speed limits policy. We agreed that there was a need for more effective policing of the existing speed limits. As a consequence the Home Affairs Committee undertook to investigate the use of speed cameras and the introduction of penalty points. It was also suggested that there might be merit in having only two speed limits (25 and 35) rather than the four we currently have (15, 20, 30 and 40). The Committee will consider a paper on this proposal in July, after which it will produce a document for consultation, to be made public in the autumn. A firm policy will be brought to the States for debate once the results of the consultation have been assessed at the end of this year.”

Outsourcing of services, and regarding the administration of the scheme to provide financial assistance to persons aged over 65 years - questions and answers (Tape No. 657)

Deputy Roy George Le Hérisser of St. Saviour asked Senator Terence Augustine Le Sueur, President of the Employment and Social Security Committee, the following questions -

- “1. Would the President advise the States how many services or activities of the Employment and Social Security Department for which the Committee is responsible are outsourced, the total cost of such outsourcing and the number of staff which would be required by the Department to perform these services or activities in-house?
2. With regard to the decision of the States on 24th April 2001 to charge the Employment and Social Security Committee with the responsibility of administering for a trial period of one year a scheme providing financial assistance to certain persons over the age of 65 years towards the cost of dental and eye care, would the President advise members -
 - (a) whether or not the Department has appointed or intends to appoint any staff in support of this scheme on a temporary basis or otherwise, and, if so, the number and cost of such staff?
 - (b) whether it has been decided to outsource the administration of any part of the scheme and to whom and for what period and the terms and conditions proposed?
 - (c) the grounds on which, as it is understood that the Committee has declined the offer of the Connétables to assist with the administration, the Committee declined the offer?
 - (d) whether or not, having regard to the Committee’s previously declared preference for Westfield Health Scheme, it initially invited competitive offers from more than one company and, if not, why not?
 - (e) whether or not Westfield Health Scheme is likely to be prepared to undertake the management of the scheme for a single year and, if so, how will the terms and conditions of the scheme differ from the original proposal which was for a period of two years?
 - (f) what is the likely date that the scheme will commence?”

The President of the Employment and Social Security Committee replied as follows -

- “1. At present the following main services/activities are outsourced. Most have been so for many years and so it is difficult to be precise on the number of staff which would be required by the Department if they were administered in house.
 1. Pricing of all Prescriptions.
 2. The Jersey Dental Scheme (young persons).
 3. The Milk Subsidy Scheme (for senior citizens, expectant mothers and children under five).
 4. Contributions data processing.
 5. Technical support for the computer system.

The total cost of these services was £271,557 last year and probably saved a minimum of 20 staff. It also has to be remembered that staff costs are only one part of the equation. Were these functions to be carried out in-house, there would also be all the other usual costs for computer systems, stationery, postage, accommodation and other infrastructure costs.

In addition, from time to time, the Department outsources ad hoc work, for example, where the expertise does not exist in-house and a considerable amount of work is undertaken by numerous

groups on a voluntary basis, for example, scrutiny of pharmaceuticals before they go on the prescribed list.

- 2.(a) The Department has no authority to appoint any additional permanent staff in support of this scheme. It has been made clear that the Human Resources Committee will not approve any additional resource. The President of Human Resources has stated on numerous occasions that more work should be outsourced, preferably off Island.

What we have done recently in order to make some progress and get a better idea of likely uptake, is ask people to register with us. One part-time temp is being used to promote the scheme, process initial applications, set up a register and handle enquiries. The cost of the temp is up to £400 weekly depending on the hours required. The aim is to continue with this arrangement to deal with the initial influx of people who are currently entitled to the subsidy and, thereafter, the Department will absorb any new registrations.

- (b) It has been decided to handle initial registration and eligibility within the Department and to outsource the day to day administration of the scheme. Negotiations are underway with Westfield at the present time. The terms and conditions are currently being negotiated by a team which includes representatives from my Department and Treasury. However, the basis is that we pay an insurance premium of £109 per year for each person registered in the scheme. In return, Westfield take full responsibility for covering and managing the risk, and paying all claims up to a maximum of £172 for dental costs every year and £60 for optical costs every two years. I should emphasise that all Westfield's set up costs and administration are included within this premium. In addition, any moneys unspent at the end of the year will be ringfenced and 70 per cent returned automatically to the Committee. The remaining 30 per cent will form the basis of a buffer fund until such time as a normal claim pattern can be established.
- (c) The prime reason, and this has caused us the most difficulty to date, is the inability to predict the amount which will be claimed in any one year and the difficulty of covering expenditure above the cash limit in any one year. The conclusion that we all reached is that it would not be currently possible for the Parishes to cover the risk should demand exceed the funds available. The only way to do that at a time when we have a strict policy on cash limits is through an insurance based system. The alternative would be to reduce the level of benefits or stop paying claims part way through the year when the money ran out.
- (d) When we initially looked at all the options (in-house, through a voluntary organisation like Age Concern and outsourcing), we were clear that, if outsourced, it should be to a non-profit making insurance based organisation, prepared to take on a relatively small scheme; and

with experience of this type of scheme,
with a proven track record
with experience of operating on the Island, and which was prepared to insure the over 65's at a reasonable premium.

The options were very limited as a recent experience of re-tendering of the Jersey Dental Scheme had illustrated. Basically, no insurance based organisation tendered for it, so it was a question of seeking out organisations who would fit this criteria and trying to get them interested in taking the scheme on board. We were also aware of the annual cost of the Jersey Dental Scheme which runs at about £100 per person per year for basic cover of dental checks and treatment only so we were able to take a view on the level of any premium charged. The reason Westfield's premium is so low i.e. £109 to cover dental and optical costs is that they charge the same premium rate irrespective of age. In other words, unusually for insurance organisations, they do not increase the premium when someone retires or at any time thereafter, simply on account of age.

- (e) Yes, they are. Negotiations are underway but there is no doubt that the premium will increase if the contract is only awarded for one year. Any organisation, particularly a charitable one, has to cover its set up costs, administration and claims paid in the year. It cannot make a loss. There is some difficulty with the impact of Deputy Breckon's amendment to our original proposition because my Committee's

intent was to set the scheme up as a continuous one (and indeed the report made it clear that once committed to this arrangement, the States had to be prepared to continue funding it). The reason for the pilot was primarily to monitor the administration by Age Concern because of their inexperience of running a scheme like this. This is not the case for a professional provider like Westfield, and any contractual arrangements would agree the basis on which the contract would be terminated. Our intention was, and remains, for this to be a long-term arrangement, on a rolling two-year basis, but with the option for either party to terminate the arrangements on three months notice. I am currently seeking advice on this issue, to ensure that we are able to achieve best value for these arrangements. If necessary, I am prepared to come back to the States within the next few weeks to clarify the position.

(f) I cannot give a definite date until any contract is concluded.”

Re-branding of Jersey Telecoms - question and answer (Tape No. 657)

Senator Christopher Gerard Pellow Lakeman asked Deputy Paul Francis Routier of St. Helier, President of the Tele-communications Board, the following question -

“Would the President advise members -

- (a) when the decision to re-brand Jersey Telecoms was taken, and why?
- (b) the cost of re-branding?
- (c) the cost of the insert in the Jersey Evening Post on 7th June, 2001, and would he also provide details of the printing and distribution costs?”

The President of the Telecommunications Board replied as follows -

- “(a) the decision to re-position Jersey Telecoms’ brand was taken in October 2000. It was based on feedback from the Island-wide survey ‘Small World Big Future’ which identified a need to place a new focus on our customers. The re-positioning of the brand is an outward sign of this change in approach.
- (b) the cost of re-branding – including the JEP insert – is £99,568.32.
- (c) the cost to produce and print the JEP insert was £10,000 and the distribution costs were £2,000.”

Member’s interests in a subsidiary of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited - statement

Senator Frank Harrison Walker, President of the Finance and Economics Committee, made a statement in the following terms -

“On 7th March last year, during the debate on the election of the States appointed directors to the Board of the Jersey Electricity Company Limited, I stated that none of the candidates had any interest in Newtel Holdings Limited.

Unknown to me and unknown to the Deputy of St Mary, the arrangements he had put in place to transfer his 97 shares in Newtel to a blind trust, as used by United Kingdom ministers of the Crown to avoid possible conflicts of interest, had not been followed through. The Deputy was therefore, completely unknown to me, still the owner of those shares during the debate.

Deputy Maltwood has since sold his shares and no longer has any direct interest in Newtel whatsoever.

I apologise for unwittingly misleading the Assembly as does the Deputy of St Mary but there was no reason

for us to know that the transfer he had requested had not taken place prior to 7th March debate.

I can assure members that there was no intention on the part of either the Deputy of St Mary or myself to mislead the Assembly but it is right that I should apologise to the States and that I put the matter straight and that the record is corrected.”

Recent establishment of a First Time Buyers' List - statement

Deputy Terence John Le Main of St. Helier, President of the Housing Committee, made a statement in the following terms -

“Justified concern has been expressed by a number of States’ members on the important question of the allocation of properties to first-time buyers.

I apologise for the fact that my replies to supplementary questions at the States’ sitting of 5th June may only have served to complicate the issue in members’ minds. The purpose of the following statement is to clarify Housing Committee policy in this area.

Like so much else in Jersey, first-time buyer policy has its roots in history. It is therefore appropriate that I should briefly cover the historical background.

The States have, over decades, repeatedly endorsed the view that the Housing Committee should encourage the principle of home ownership by helping people onto the first rung of the housing ladder. Many sites have been re-zoned by the States, for exactly this purpose. The principle was reaffirmed as recently as 20th June 2000, when the Assembly, on a standing vote, approved a Planning and Environment proposition which precisely defined the term ‘first-time buyer’, as used in the 1999 rezoning proposition.

States’ involvement in the provision of first-time buyer properties began in the 1950s, and the first-time buyer Waiting List was established soon after. Since that time, considerable changes have occurred in the marketplace. The Committee has therefore felt justified in reviewing its policy and procedures in the light of changing circumstances and has taken the opportunity to correct a number of anomalies and unfairnesses.

Market fluctuations have always had an effect on policy. In 1991, the Waiting List was closed, in the expectation that the private sector would satisfy long-term demand for first-time buyer properties. It subsequently became evident that demand was not in fact being met from this source.

For a number of years after this, properties were allocated on the basis of a draw for each estate which came up for allocation. Since each draw was conducted separately, this practice led to widespread concern that luck played too large a part in the system. People might be unlucky in one draw after another, over a period of years, only to see themselves ‘overtaken’ by applicants who happened to strike lucky at their first attempt. Another consequence was that it was impossible for an applicant to assess how long their wait might be, which in turn made personal financial planning problematic.

In 1999, the Committee invited people to register their interest in becoming first-time buyers. It was made clear that the intention was to establish the level of demand for further rezoning, rather than to create a formal Waiting List. Even so, the response was significant, with nearly 700 names registered.

In April this year - conscious of the need to avoid the elements of unfairness and uncertainty described above - the Committee publicised its intention to re-open the Waiting List. The Committee was careful to contact everyone whose name was on the 1999 register, informing them that they would be placed on the new Waiting List. Advertisements were also placed in the media, inviting further applications. In the knowledge that the response-level was likely to be high, all applicants were clearly informed that initial precedence within the new list would be established by means of a one-off draw supervised as is usual in such cases by the Greffier of the States - and that any future applications would be added to the bottom of the list, with offers of property being made first, in each case, to those at the top.

The suggestion has been made that the Waiting List is raising expectations which the Committee cannot satisfy. Two points should be made here. Firstly, although there are 2,000 names on the list, many are not in a position to purchase immediately: 2,000 names do not equate to an immediate real demand for 2,000 homes. And secondly, the Committee's actions have not created demand, but merely recorded it. The history of housing prices gives clear evidence of high demand, especially for first-time buyer properties - demand which the Committee is obliged by States' policy to heed. The Committee accepts that it could never satisfy all such expectations, but it can assist a number of those people who find that the lowest rung of the housing ladder is always tantalisingly just out of reach.

It is important to stress that, although a draw has been held to establish initial precedence on the Waiting List, allocation of individual properties will not be done by means of a lottery, but by matching accommodation to reasonable requirements on a first-come, first-served basis. People who refuse an offer will retain their place on the list as long as they remain eligible for the scheme.

Although the Committee has at all times been concerned to implement established States' policy for targeted assistance in this area, it is also important to address the question of need. The first-time buyer scheme is not concerned with need in the sense in which that term applies, for instance, to social rented housing. By definition, aspiring purchasers under the scheme must be able to furnish a deposit and must have sufficient income to service a mortgage. Indeed, it would not be a kindness to people who were needy in the generally accepted sense, to saddle them with an unaffordable level of debt. In this context, it is perhaps more appropriate to talk in terms of demand and reasonable expectations, rather than need.

At the same time, the Committee has a duty to consider need in a more general sense, by matching properties appropriately to families according to their reasonable requirements for space. Thus, for example, three-bedroom properties will be offered mainly to families with children, with about one-quarter of such properties being offered to childless couples - in all cases, in order of precedence on the list. Equally, the position of single people has been made clear. This allocation process has been formalised, and notified to the Assembly.

It might at first glance be considered inappropriate to allocate any three-bedroom properties to childless couples. But the Committee felt strongly that - as happened so successfully as long ago as the Quennevais Park allocation, and others - there should be scope for families to expand, and grow into, rather than out of their accommodation. The Committee also believes that couples should not be penalised for behaving 'responsibly' by delaying starting a family until they could be decently housed. Similarly, in terms of need, the allocation process will make allowance for special needs, such as disability.

Financial need is another question. It has been suggested that people above a certain income or savings limit should be debarred from the scheme. This would be difficult to administer directly, since people's financial circumstances change considerably over time. Nevertheless, the Committee understands the concern being expressed.

A related concern - expressed both inside and outside the States, especially at times of great price volatility - has been that a few lucky applicants have made a 'windfall' profit, by selling on in the open market within a few years of making a subsidised purchase.

Having taken the first step, in conjunction with the Planning and Environment Committee, to establish a legal condition whereby properties subject to the policy could only be sold on to first-time buyers, in perpetuity, the Committee believes that an essential move has been made towards addressing these concerns. In essence, this reform means that first-time buyer properties, with their relatively narrow market for re-sale, will in future be inherently unattractive to speculators, and to people who would have no difficulty buying in the open market.

The Committee has had to steer a very careful course, between the danger of loading some people with an intolerable debt, and the danger of providing a benefit to those who had no need of it. Throughout, the Committee has sought to focus on the need to provide targeted support to families whose aspirations to home

ownership are perpetually thwarted by prices increasing just out of their reach . This principle of targeted assistance is entirely in line with long-standing States' policy. As recently as 29th May this year, a Statement from the Planning and Environment President reminded the Assembly of our commitment to the principle of affordable first-time buyer housing.

In the meantime, while continuing to concentrate on its core task of ensuring the effective provision and maintenance of high-quality rental accommodation to meet social need, the Committee is conscious of another group in society - those who may never be able to afford to purchase outright, but who might wish to take a greater stake in their homes. To this end, the Committee will be considering other options, such as shared equity, which may have merit on their own account, as a separate issue from the first-time buyer scheme itself.

First-time buyer policy has evolved over a period of years. In revising its policy in this important area, the Committee has been grateful to all those who have offered suggestions or criticisms, both recently and in previous years.”

Recent demonstration by the ATTAC group - statement

Deputy Alastair John Layzell of St. Brelade, President of the Home Affairs Committee, made a statement in the following terms -

“I thought members would like to know, officially, the arrangements that were put in place to deal with the demonstration by the French anti-capitalist group ATTAC on Saturday 9th June 2001. This was the first demonstration of its kind in Jersey and the record will show that the States of Jersey Police rose to the challenge of ensuring that it remained peaceful. It did this at comparatively short notice and in the absence of the usual public order legislation which, providentially, was not required.

The Home Affairs Committee was particularly pleased that the Chief Officer seized the initiative and arranged for one Inspector, four Sergeants and 23 Constables to be trained in public order duties. This meant that the 60 officers from the Strathclyde Constabulary, which he prudently reserved last month, were not needed.

I have written to the Convenor of the Strathclyde Police Board, Councillor Bashir-Maan, to thank him for his co-operation and for making available the five officers and three communications specialists who advised the Force on the day.

In the opinion of the Committee this was a splendid example of the use of our mutual aid arrangements. It means that our officers are now trained to deal with future public order events, and the need for mutual aid will be correspondingly reduced.

The Committee believes the actions of the police were proportionate and were broadly welcomed by the community. I was pleased to receive a letter from the President of the Chamber of Commerce who wrote -

‘The purpose of this letter is to thank your Committee and the States of Jersey Police for the skilful and professional way that the recent ATTAC visit to the Island was dealt with. As you know, we had a number of concerns at the Chamber, the outcome of which was as predicted, but nevertheless we consider the precautions well worth taking. I would like to give my thanks for the satisfactory conclusion of the ATTAC visit which, in large part, was due to the way it was handled by our authorities here.’

For the information of members, the cost of policing the demonstration was, in round figures, £22,000 and this will be absorbed by normal police budgets.”

Manual Workers' Joint Council: membership

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Home Affairs Committee referred to their Act dated 9th November 1961, concerning the membership of the Manual Workers' Joint Council, and their Act dated 16th January 2001, in which they approved the Employers' Side for 2001, and appointed Deputy Shirley Margaret Baudains of St. Helier as a member with immediate effect, in place of Deputy Robin Charles Hacquoil of St. Peter.

Parish Rates Review - P.41/2001

Comments - P.41/2001 Com.; Comments (P.41/2001 Com.(2))

THE STATES commenced consideration of the proposition of the Legislation Committee on Parish Rates Review, and Deputy Jeremy Laurence Dorey sought leave to propose that the States move on to the next item on the Order Paper. The President ruled that, in accordance with Standing Order 27(1), it appeared to her that the proposition was an abuse of the procedure of the States and it was therefore disallowed.

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Legislation Committee received the report of the Legislation Committee, dated 13th March 2001, and approved, in principle, the following proposals -

- (a) that appointments by Parish Assemblies of members of an Assessment Committee be staggered so that each autumn only a proportion of the Committee members are elected for a further three years; (Assessment Committee appointments - Section A);
- (b) that the Committee should undertake further consultation and, if appropriate, bring forward proposals in the draft legislation in relation to the method of assessment of the rateable value of any land or property where it is impossible to make any sensible comparison; (Rate Assessment method for non-comparative property - Section B)

Members present voted on paragraph (b) as follows -

“Pour” (45)

Senators

Horsfall, Le Maistre, Bailhache, Syvret, Norman, Walker, Kinnard, Le Sueur, Lakeman.

Connétables

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

Deputies

St. Mary, S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Routier(H), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), Grouville, Huet(H), St. Martin, St. John, Le Main(H), Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), St. Peter, Dubras(L), St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Troy(B), Voisin(L), Scott Warren(S), Farnham(S), Le Hérissier(S), Fox(H), Bridge(H), Martin(H).

“Contre” (1)

Deputy

Dorey(H).

- (c) that the occupier rate should be retained (Occupier Rates - Section C);

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (39)

Senators

Horsfall, Le Maistre, Bailhache, Syvret, Norman, Walker, Kinnard, Le Sueur, Lakeman.

Connétables

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

Deputies

St. Mary, S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Routier(H), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), Grouville, Huet(H), St. Martin, St. John, Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), Dubras(L), St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Troy(B), Voisin(L), Farnham(S), Le Hérisier(S), Bridge(H).

“Contre” (7)

Connétable

St. Helier.

Deputies

Le Main(H), St. Peter, Dorey(H), Scott Warren(S), Fox(H), Martin(H).

- (d) that exemptions from rating liability should continue to apply to Crown and States property used exclusively for public purposes - (Exemptions from Foncier and Occupiers Rate - Section D).

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (27)

Senators

Horsfall, Le Maistre, Norman, Walker, Kinnard, Le Sueur.

Connétables

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

Deputies

St. Mary, Trinity, Layzell(B), Breckon(S), Grouville, St. John, Vibert(B), St. Peter, St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Le Hérisier(S).

“Contre” (19)

Senators

Bailhache, Syvret, Lakeman.

Connétable

St. Helier.

Deputies

S. Baudains(H), Routier(H), Huet(H), St. Martin, Le Main(H), Crowcroft(H), Dubras(L), Dorey(H), Troy(B), Voisin(L), Scott Warren(S), Farnham(S), Fox(H), Bridge(H), Martin(H).

Change in Presidency

The Meeting resumed after the lunch adjournment, under the Presidency of the Deputy Bailiff, Mr. Michael Cameron St. John Birt, during consideration of the proposition of the Legislation Committee concerning Parish Rates Review.

Fields 960, 961, 962 and 967A, St. Mary: rezoning for extension of La Gigoulande Quarry - P.79/2001

THE STATES commenced consideration of a proposition of the Planning and Environment Committee to rezone approximately 25.5 vergées of land, including Fields 960, 961, 962 and 967A, St. Mary from the Sensitive Landscape Area of the Agricultural Priority Zone to land for stone quarrying as an extension of the Approved Quarry site, and rejected a proposition of Senator Jean Amy Le Maistre to move to consideration of the next item on the order paper.

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (14)

Senators

Le Maistre, Syvret, Kinnard, Le Sueur.

Connétables

St. Ouen, St. Lawrence.

Deputies

Grouville, Huet(H), St. Martin, Crowcroft(H), St. Ouen, Scott Warren(S), Le Hérissier(S), Martin(H).

“Contre” (29)

Senators

Horsfall, Bailhache, Norman, Walker.

Connétables

St. Peter, Grouville, St. Helier, St. Martin, Trinity, St. Saviour, St. Brelade, St. Mary.

Deputies

St. Mary, S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Routier(H), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), St. John, Le Main(H), Vibert(B), St. Peter, Dubras(L), G. Baudains(C), Dorey(H), Troy(B), Voisin(L), Fox(H), Bridge(H).

Senator Terence Augustine Le Sueur sought leave to propose an amendment that reference to Fields Nos. 960, 962 and 976A be deleted from the proposition, and the total area be amended accordingly. The Deputy Bailiff ruled, in accordance with Standing Order 18(2), that he was not prepared to dispense with the requirement for the amendment to be moved with at least four clear days notice and it was therefore disallowed.

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Planning and Environment Committee, rezoned approximately 25.5 vergées of land, as shown on Drawing No. 657/1, including Fields 960, 961, 962 and 967A, St. Mary from the Sensitive Landscape Area of the Agricultural Priority Zone to land for stone quarrying as an extension of the Approved Quarry site.

Members present voted as follows -

“Pour” (39)

Senators

Horsfall, Bailhache, Norman, Walker, Kinnard, Lakeman.

Connétables

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

Deputies

St. Mary, S. Baudains(H), Trinity, Routier(H), Layzell(B), Breckon(S), Huet(H), St. Martin, St. John, L Main(H), Crowcroft(H), Vibert(B), St. Peter, Dubras(L), St. Ouen, G. Baudains(C), Dorey(H), Troy(B) Voisin(L), Farnham(S), Le Hérissier(S), Fox(H), Bridge(H), Martin(H).

“Contre” (5)

Senators

Le Maistre, Syvret, Le Sueur.

Deputies

Grouville, Scott Warren(S).

States members income support and expense allowance: annual increases - P.74/2001

THE STATES commenced consideration of a proposition of the House Committee concerning States members' income support and expense allowance, and, adopting paragraph (a), agreed to suspend Standing Order 44(1) to allow members to consider a matter in which they had a direct pecuniary interest.

THE STATES proceeded to consider paragraph (b) -

- (b) to agree that for paragraph 3 of their Act dated 14th July 1998, as amended by Acts dated 8th December 1998 and 6th June 2000, with regard to the provision of an expense allowance and a minimum income for elected members of the States there should be substituted the following paragraph -

“3. The amounts of income support, allowable income and expense allowance shall be increased with effect from 1st January 2001 and on 1st January each year thereafter by 2.5 per cent.”.

The Deputy of St. Martin, in accordance with Standing Order 26, proposed that the question be referred back to the House Committee.

THE STATES, having noted the willingness of the President of the House Committee to accept a reference back, deferred further consideration of this matter.

Arrangement of public business for the next meeting on 3rd July 2001

THE STATES then adjourned, having agreed to consider the following items of public business set down for the present meeting as the first items of public business on 3rd July 2001 -

Committee of Inquiry: procedures for P.67/2001.
recruitment of Honorary Police Officers.
Lodged: 24th April 2001.
Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour.

Committee of Inquiry: procedures for recruitment of Honorary Police Officers (P.67/2001) - comments. Presented: 22nd May 2001. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.67/2001. Com.
Committee of Inquiry: procedures for recruitment of Honorary Police Officers (P.67/2001) - report. Presented: 29th May 2001. <i>Home Affairs Committee.</i>	P.67/2001. Rpt.
Draft Costs in Criminal Cases (Witnesses' Allowances) (Jersey) Regulations 200-. Lodged: 22nd May 2001. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.78/2001.
Hautlieu School: approval of drawings. Lodged: 29th May 2001. <i>Education Committee.</i>	P.83/2001.
Hautlieu School: approval of drawings: (P.83/2001) - comments. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.83/2001. Com.
Draft Companies (Amendment No. 6) (Jersey) Law 200-. Lodged: 29th May 2001. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.84/2001. (re-issue)
States Auditors - further extension of contract. Lodged: 15th May 2001. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i> <i>(Consideration in camera)</i>	P.77/2001.
Jersey Financial Services Commission: appointment of Commissioner. Lodged: 22nd May 2001. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i> <i>(Consideration in camera)</i>	P.81/2001.

THE STATES rose at 6.20 p.m.

C.M. NEWCOMBE

Greffier of the States.