

**THE STATES assembled on Tuesday,
14th December 2004, at 9.30 a.m. under
the Presidency of the Deputy Bailiff,
Michael Cameron St. John Birt, Esquire.**

All members were present with the exception of –

Senator Richard Joseph Shenton – ill
Geoffrey William Fisher, Connétable of St. Lawrence– out of the Island
Jacqueline Jeannette Huet, Deputy of St. Helier– out of the Island
Roy George Le Hérisier, Deputy of St. Saviour– out of the Island.

Prayers read by the Greffier of the States.

**Budget 2005
Amendments and Comments**

THE STATES allowed the Comptroller of Income Tax to be present in the Chamber during the remaining consideration of the Budget.

THE STATES resumed consideration of the Budget 2005, and commenced consideration of the estimate of the income to be produced from Income Tax appearing on page 2 of the Budget, and, rejected amendments of Senator Edward Philip Vibert, (P.217/2004– Budget 2005: sixth amendments), that on page 2 of the Budget in the estimate of income from Income Tax, this be reduced by £4,913,000 by increasing –

- (a) the single person's tax exemption threshold from £11,020 to £11,640;
- (b) the married person's tax exemption threshold from £17,680 to £18,670;
- (c) the tax exemption threshold increment in the case of a single person aged 63 or more from £1,280 to £1,350;
- (d) the tax exemption threshold increment in the case of a married person aged 63 or more from £2,570 to £2,710; and,
- (e) the maximum child care relief from £6,150 to £6,490.

Members present voted as follows –

POUR: 13

Senator J.A. Le Maistre
Senator S. Syvret
Senator P.V.F. Le Claire
Senator E.P. Vibert
Deputy A. Breckon (S)
Deputy of St. Martin
Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (C)
Deputy C.J. Scott Warren (S)
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)
Deputy J.A. Bernstein (B)
Deputy of Grouville
Deputy of St. Peter

CONTRE: 32

Senator L. Norman
Senator F.H. Walker
Senator W. Kinnard
Senator T.A. Le Sueur
Senator P.F. Routier
Senator M.E. Vibert
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf
Connétable of St. Martin
Connétable of St. Ouen
Connétable of St. Saviour
Connétable of St. Brelade
Connétable of St. Mary
Connétable of St. Peter
Connétable of St. Clement
Connétable of Trinity

ABSTAIN: 0

Connétable of Grouville
 Connétable of St. John
 Deputy of Trinity
 Deputy of St. John
 Deputy T.J. Le Main (H)
 Deputy M.F. Dubras (L)
 Deputy J.L. Dorey (L)
 Deputy P.N. Troy (B)
 Deputy F.G. Voisin (L)
 Deputy J.B. Fox (H)
 Deputy J-A. Bridge (H)
 Deputy S.C. Ferguson (B)
 Deputy of St. Mary
 Deputy of St. Ouen
 Deputy P.J.D. Ryan (H)
 Deputy M.A. Taylor (C)
 Deputy G.W.J. de Faye (H)

THE STATES rejected an amendment of Deputy Geoffrey Peter Southern, (P.216/2004 – Budget 2005: fifth amendments), that on page 2 of the Budget, in the estimate of income from Income Tax, this be reduced by £2,938,000 by increasing –

- (a) the single person's tax exemption threshold from £11,020 to £11,380;
- (b) the married person's tax exemption threshold from £17,680 to £18,260;
- (c) the tax exemption threshold increment in the case of a single person aged 63 or more from £1,280 to £1,320;
- (d) the tax exemption threshold increment in the case of a married person aged 63 or more from £2,570 to £2,650; and,
- (e) the maximum child care relief from £6,150 to £6,350.

Members present voted as follows –

POUR: 15

Senator J.A. Le Maistre
 Senator S. Syvret
 Senator W. Kinnard
 Senator P.V.F. Le Claire
 Senator E.P. Vibert
 Deputy A. Breckon (S)
 Deputy of St. Martin
 Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (C)
 Deputy J.L. Dorey (H)
 Deputy P.N. Troy (B)
 Deputy C.J. Scott Warren (S)
 Deputy J.A. Martin (H)
 Deputy G.P. Southern (H)
 Deputy of St. Peter
 Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)

CONTRE: 30

Senator L. Norman
 Senator F.H. Walker
 Senator T.A. Le Sueur
 Senator P.F. Routier
 Senator M.E. Vibert
 Senator P.F.C. Ozouf
 Connétable of St. Martin
 Connétable of St. Ouen
 Connétable of St. Saviour
 Connétable of St. Brelade
 Connétable of St. Mary
 Connétable of St. Clement
 Connétable of St. Helier
 Connétable of Trinity
 Connétable of Grouville
 Connétable of St. John
 Deputy of Trinity
 Deputy of St. John
 Deputy T.J. Le Main (H)
 Deputy M.F. Dubras (L)
 Deputy F.G. Voisin (L)
 Deputy J.B. Fox (H)

ABSTAIN: 0

Deputy J-A. Bridge (H)
Deputy J.A. Bernstein (B)
Deputy S.C. Ferguson (B)
Deputy of St. Mary
Deputy of St. Ouen
Deputy P.J.D. Ryan (H)
Deputy M.A. Taylor (C)
Deputy G.W.J. de Faye (H)

THE STATES rejected an amendment of Senator Stuart Syvret, (P.218/2004 – Budget 2005: seventh amendment), that on page 2 of the Budget, in the estimates of income from Income Tax, the estimate from Income Tax be reduced by £900,000 by increasing the tax exemption threshold for persons aged 63 and over from £12,300 to £12,990 for a single person and from £20,250 to £21,380 for a married couple.

Members present voted as follows –

POUR: 16

Senator J.A. Le Maistre
Senator S. Syvret
Senator W. Kinnard
Senator P.V.F. Le Claire
Senator E.P. Vibert
Deputy A. Breckon (S)
Deputy of St. Martin
Deputy G.C.L. Baudains (C)
Deputy J.L. Dorey (H)
Deputy C.J. Scott Warren (S)
Deputy J.A. Martin (H)
Deputy G.P. Southern (H)
Deputy J.A. Bernstein (B)
Deputy of Grouville
Deputy of St. Peter
Deputy J.A. Hilton (H)

CONTRE: 30

Senator L. Norman
Senator F.H. Walker
Senator T.A. Le Sueur
Senator P.F. Routier
Senator M.E. Vibert
Senator P.F.C. Ozouf
Connétable of St. Martin
Connétable of St. Ouen
Connétable of St. Saviour
Connétable of St. Brelade
Connétable of St. Mary
Connétable of St. Peter
Connétable of St. Clement
Connétable of St. Helier
Connétable of Trinity
Connétable of Grouville
Connétable of St. John
Deputy of Trinity
Deputy R.C. Duhamel (S)
Deputy of St. John
Deputy T.J. Le Main (H)
Deputy M.F. Dubras (L)
Deputy L.J. Farnham (S)
Deputy J.B. Fox (H)
Deputy J-A. Bridge (H)
Deputy S.C. Ferguson (B)
Deputy of St. Mary
Deputy of St. Ouen
Deputy P.J.D. Ryan (H)
Deputy G.W.J. de Faye (H)

ABSTAIN: 0

THE STATES agreed the estimate of income to be produced from Income Tax appearing on page 2 of the Budget in the sum of £370,000,000 and, therefore, the total estimated income from Indirect Tax, Stamp Duty and Income Tax in the sum of £459,500,800.

Draft Finance (Jersey) Law 200- P.209/2004

THE STATES commenced consideration of the draft Finance (Jersey) Law 200-, (P.209/2004 lodged “au Greffe” on 23rd November 2004), and adopted the preamble and Articles 1 to 10 together with an amendment of the Finance and Economics Committee, (P.209/2004 Amd – draft Finance (Jersey) Law 200- (P.209/2004): amendment), that in Article 2, in substituted paragraph 5 –

- (a) in sub-paragraph (a), for the amount “£130.66”, there be substituted the amount “£136.01”;
- (b) in sub-paragraph (b), for the amount “£141.37”, there be substituted the amount “£147.16”;
- (c) in sub-paragraph (c), for the amount “£176.80”, there be substituted the amount “£184.04”;
- (d) in sub-paragraph (d), for the amount “£150.26”, there be substituted the amount “£156.42”;
- (e) in sub-paragraph (e), for the amount “£136.82”, there be substituted the amount “£142.43”.

The Draft Finance (Jersey) Law 200-, as amended, was lodged “au Greffe” in Second Reading.

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 25 of the Public Finances (Administration) (Jersey) Law 1967, as amended, declared that the Bill entitled the Finance (Jersey) Law 200-, (P.209/2004 lodged “au Greffe” on 23rd November 2004, by the Finance and Economics Committee), as it had this day been amended by the States, should immediately have effect as if it were a Law sanctioned by Her Majesty in Council.

**Draft Income Tax (Amendment No. 24) (Jersey) Law 200 P.222/2004
Amendment**

THE STATES commenced consideration of the Draft Income Tax (Amendment No. 24) (Jersey) Law 200, (P.222/2004 lodged “au Greffe” on 7th December 2004), and, adopted the preamble and Articles 1 to 21.

The Draft Income Tax (Amendment No. 24) (Jersey) Law 200, was lodged “au Greffe” in Second Reading.

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 25 of the Public Finances (Administration) (Jersey) Law 1967, as amended, declared that the Bill entitled the Income Tax (Amendment No. 24) (Jersey) Law 200, (P.222/2004 lodged “au Greffe” on 7th December 2004, by the Finance and Economics Committee), should immediately have effect as if it were a Law sanctioned by Her Majesty in Council.

Draft Income Tax (Prescribed Limit and Rate) (Jersey) Regulations 200- P.206/2004

THE STATES, in pursuance of Article 135A(4) of the Income Tax (Jersey) Law 1961, made Regulations entitled the Income Tax (Prescribed Limit and Rate) (Jersey) Regulations 2004.

Budget 2005 (continued)

THE STATES, having terminated the discussion on the Budget, agreed the summary of the estimated income and revenue expenditure for 2005 appearing on page 76 of the Budget as follows –

INCOME	£	£	£
Income Tax			370,000,000
Impôts Duties			53,166,000
Stamp Duty			16,000,000
Other Income			18,980,000

Trading Committees

Expenditure	67,348,900		
Income	77,543,100		
		10,194,200	
Estimated Transfer to Trading Funds		9,781,500	
Net return from Trading Committees			<u>412,700</u>

			458,558,700
LESS			
Non-Trading Committees			
Revenue expenditure	501,592,400		
Revenue Income	<u>89,586,700</u>		
Total Non-Trading Committee Cash Limits	412,005,700		
Appropriation to General Reserve	11,794,300		
Total Net Revenue Expenditure of Non-Trading Committees before Capital Servicing		423,800,000	
Capital Servicing			
Repayment of Capital Debt	33,500,000		
Interest Received on Capital Debt	490,300		
Net Capital Repayments		<u>33,009,700</u>	
Total Net Revenue Expenditure of Non-Trading Committees after Capital Servicing			<u>456,809,700</u>
Estimated Surplus on General Funds for the Year			1,749,000
Add:			
Estimated Surplus/(Deficit) in General Funds brought forward at 1st January 2005			(10,177,296)
Surplus to be transferred to the Capital Fund			<u>(8,428,296)</u>

THE STATES further agreed the estimated transactions of the capital fund for 2005 as follows –

	£	£	£
Estimated balance at 1st January 2005			28,343,495
Transfer to Strategic Reserve			0
Capital repayments and receipts			34,551,800
Transfer to the Income of the Revenue account (as above)			<u>(8,428,296)</u>
			54,466,999
Capital Expenditure as recommended by the Finance and Economics Committee	37,567,000		
Plus: Loan sanction repayments	<u>5,000,000</u>		
			<u>42,567,000</u>
Estimated balance at 31st December 2005			£11,899,999

Deputy Robert Charles Duhamel – attendance

Deputy Robert Charles Duhamel of St. Saviour, having returned to the Island, arrived in the Chamber during

consideration of the amendment of Senator Stuart Syvret, (P.218/2004 – Budget 2005: seventh amendment), and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

Matters presented

The following matters were presented to the States –

Management of sickness absence in the States of Jersey – Report of the Shadow Public Accounts Committee.

Presented by Deputy S.C. Ferguson of St. Brelade.

Draft Water Resources (Jersey) Law 200-: Shadow Scrutiny Panel Report.

S.R.3/2004.

Presented by Senator E.P. Vibert.

Sites of Special Interest and Buildings of Local Interest: financial implications (P.166/2004) – comments.

P.166/2004.
Com.(2)

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Draft Planning and Building (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200- (P.210/2004): comments.

P.210/2004.
Com.

Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.

Share transfer property: stamp duty (P.211/2004) – comments.

P.211/2005.
Com.

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 an Act of the Finance and Economics Committee dated 3rd December 2004, showing that, in pursuance of Standing Orders relating to certain transactions in land, the Committee had approved –

- (a) as recommended by the Environment and Public Services Committee, the lease to Silverwood Business Park Limited of the ground and first floor office accommodation at Broadcasting House, Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier (together with 6 associated car parking spaces), for a period of 13 months from 1st December 2004, at an annual rent of £23,000 payable monthly in advance, with no provision for a rent review, on the basis that the ingoing tenant would be responsible for meeting the service charge payments in respect of the communal facilities and charges associated with the building, and also for meeting the landlord's fees in respect of the preparation of the lease in an amount of £200; and,
- (b) as recommended by the Housing Committee, the lease to Mr. Nicholas Paul Hougardy and Mrs. Niamh Veronica Hougardy, née Hayes, of a strip of land (measuring 92.5 square metres located adjacent to the southern boundary of the property known as Tarawera, Le Mont Cochon St. Helier, to be used for the purpose of a private garden, for a period of 9 years from 1st October 2004, at an annual rent of £200 payable annually in advance to be reviewed annually in line with the Jersey Retail Price Index, on the basis that the Lessee would effect and maintain Public Liability Insurance cover for a sum of not less than £2 million and would be responsible for the public's legal fees up to a cost of £250.

Matters lodged

The following matters were lodged “au Greffe” –

Draft Public Finances (Jersey) Law 200- (P.180/2004): amendments.

P.180/2004.
Amd.

Presented by the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

States Members' remuneration: register. <i>Presented by the Privileges and Procedures Committee.</i>	P.225/2004.
Draft Housing (General Provisions) (Amendment No. 21) (Jersey) Regulations 200-. <i>Presented by the Housing Committee.</i>	P.226/2004.
Senators and Deputies: terms of office. <i>Presented by the Deputy A. Breckon of St. Saviour, and referred to the Privileges and Procedures Committee.</i>	P.227/2004.
Draft Civil Evidence (Jersey) Law 2003 (Appointed Day) Act 200-. <i>Presented by the Legislation Committee.</i>	P.228/2004.

Draft Education (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200- P.179/2004 – withdrawn

THE STATES, in accordance with Standing Order 22(1), gave leave to the President of the Education, Sport and Culture Committee to withdraw the draft Education (Amendment) (Jersey) Law 200-, (P.179/2004 lodged "au Greffe" on 26th October 2004.

Arrangement of public business for the next meeting on 18th January 2005

THE STATES confirmed that the following matters lodged "au Greffe" would be considered at the next meeting on 18th January 2005 –

Sites of Special Interest and Buildings of Local Interest: financial implications. Lodged: 28th September 2004. <i>Deputy of St. John.</i>	P.166/2004
Sites of Special Interest and Buildings of Local Interest: financial implications (P.166/2004) – comments. Presented: 23rd November 2004. <i>Environment and Public Services Committee.</i>	P.166/2004. Com.
Sites of Special Interest and Buildings of Local Interest: financial implications (P.166/2004) – comments. Presented: 14th December 2004. <i>Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.166/2004. Com.(2)
Planning applications: requirement to publicize. Lodged: 12th October 2004. <i>Senator P.V.F. Le Claire.</i>	P.175/2004.
Planning applications: requirement to publicize (P.175/2004) – comments. Presented: 23rd November 2004. <i>Environment and Public Services Committee.</i>	P.175/2004. Com.
Jersey Airport: Fireground Remediation – Deed of Settlement. Lodged: 19th October 2004. <i>Harbours and Airport Committee.</i>	P.176/2004.
Jersey Airport: Fireground Remediation – Deed of Settlement (P.176/2004) – comments. Presented: 23rd November 2004. <i>Environment and Public Services Committee.</i>	P.176/2004. Com.
Jersey Airport: Fireground Remediation – Deed of Settlement (P.176/2004) – comments.	P.176/2004. Com.(2)

Presented: 30th November 2004. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	
Draft Public Finances (Jersey) Law 200-. Lodged: 26th October 2004. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.180/2004.
Draft Public Finances (Jersey) Law 200- (P.180/2004): amendments. Lodged: 14th December 2004. <i>Presented by the Privileges and Procedures Committee.</i>	P.180/2004. Amd.
Draft Honorary Police (Jersey) Regulations 200-. Lodged: 9th November 2004. <i>Legislation Committee.</i>	P.193/2004
Compensation of victims of untraced drivers of motor vehicles: Agreement between the Home Affairs Committee and the Motor Insurers' Bureau. Lodged: 9th November 2004. <i>Home Affairs Committee.</i>	P.194/2004
Maritime House, La Route du Port Elizabeth, St. Helier: transfer of administration. Lodged: 16th November 2004. <i>Policy and Resources Committee.</i>	P.201/2004.
Maison St. Louis Observatory, Highlands Lane, St. Saviour and La Moye Weather Radar Station, La Fosse Voerin, St. Brelade: transfer of administration. Lodged: 23rd November 2004. <i>Harbours and Airport Committee.</i>	P.204/2004.
Share transfer property: stamp duty. Lodged: 23rd November 2004. <i>Deputy of St. Martin.</i>	P.211/2004.
Share transfer property: stamp duty (P.211/2004) – comments. Presented: 14th December 2004. <i>Presented by the Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.211/2005. Com.
Manual Workers' Joint Council: membership. Lodged: December 2004. <i>Policy and Resources Committee.</i>	P.219/2004.
Draft Finance (Jersey) Law 200-, (<i>third reading</i>). Lodged in second reading: 14th December 2004. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.229/2004.
Draft Income Tax (Amendment No. 24) (Jersey) Law 200, (<i>third reading</i>). Lodged in second reading: 14th December 2004. <i>Finance and Economics Committee.</i>	P.230/2004.

States' Committees access to the States property portfolio – question and answer (Tape No. 991)

The Deputy of St. John tabled the following written question of Senator Philip Francis Cyril Ozouf, President of the Environment and Public Services Committee –

“Would the President inform members whether the management of the States property portfolio is undertaken to ensure that Committees' property needs are assessed across the range of properties held within this portfolio, irrespective of Committees having particular administrative responsibility for specific properties within this range, so that possible land or property exchanges can deliver best value for money and benefit to the community, such as in the provision of a new Police Headquarters? If not,

would the President explain the reasons why?"

The President of the Environment and Public Services Committee tabled the following written answer –

“The Environment and Public Services Committee, through its Department of Property Services, seeks to monitor and advise on the efficiency in use of land and property occupied by the States. One of the key aims is to place property in the context of the States’ strategic policies and provide a framework in which individual property needs can be assessed and decisions taken as to the most efficient and financially beneficial use of land in the Public ownership. Without a central corporate property management function, the Committee can only seek the support of the States, the Finance and Economics Committee and the eight other property-administering Committees of the States in achieving effective property exchanges which provide value for money and benefit to the community.

In the case of the proposed Police Headquarters, Property Services reviewed 28 different options for a suitable site, some of which involved land exchange across Committees and one which involved the purchase of an adjacent property in private ownership. The owners of that particular property were prepared to exchange it for another site with development potential in the public ownership. Whilst this had some benefits, the ‘true cost’ of the land exchange added to the cost of construction of the new Headquarters exceeded the budget limit and did not receive the approval of the Finance and Economics Committee.”

Vessel the “Duchess of Normandy” – question and answer (Tape No. 991)

The Deputy of St. John tabled the following written question of Senator Leonard Norman, President of the Harbours and Airport Committee –

“Would the President inform members –

- (a) of the current value of the Duchess of Normandy and give details of what works have been carried out on the vessel over the last 3 years, such as new engines, replacement electronics, etc., and the value of the works carried out? and,
- (b) of the programme put in place to replace the vessel, if any?"

The President of the Harbours and Airport Committee tabled the following written answer –

“(a) In 2003, an independent Naval Architect’s valuation estimated a current market value of no more than £50,000 on the vessel. A secondary verbal valuation from the original builder of the vessel indicated that a market value of £40,000 was now more realistic.

Over the last 3 years, a total amount of £21,000 (average £7,000 per annum) has been spent on the Duchess of Normandy, excluding salary and fuel cost. These costs relate to licences, certification, equipment, hull and machinery maintenance. No major works, (such as new engines, or rewiring), has been undertaken for at least 7 years.

These works are all running costs and do not effect the status of the vessel which, to quote from the valuation, ‘in its current form would not satisfy the requirements of the Code of Practice for Small Workboats and Pilot Boats. Therefore, the potential market is very restricted. If the vessel were purchased for commercial operation, it would require issue of appropriate certification and considerable and costly modification would be necessary. Alternative sale for private pleasure use would also require extensive modification’.

- (b) The ‘Duchess of Normandy’ is being replaced through the implementation of the strategy to integrate the Pilotage Service within Jersey Harbours’ operations. From January 2005, having acquired the 2 pilot boats from the Company of Town Pilots, Jersey Harbours will use one of those boats, (which both meet Workboat Code of Practice standards), to fulfil the previous functions of the Duchess of Normandy.

This forms a tangible part of meeting our objective of offering a better, simpler and cheaper service.

Estimated savings of £120,000 per annum are being achieved as a direct result of the Pilotage integration and further savings achieved through the Marine Centre project, of which the Pilotage is a part, amount to a further £150,000. Furthermore, the work required to convert the Duchess of Normandy to workboat standards has not been necessary. These savings do indeed allow us to provide a better and safer integrated service.”

Oral questions

1. Deputy G.P. Southern to the President of the Finance and Economics Committee:

“Will the President advise members whether, when the Committee returns to the States with the Committee’s proposed Fiscal Strategy in February 2005, it will include detailed consideration of (a) a Land Value Tax and (b) a Monopolies Tax, as outlined in the discussion paper I produced on 3rd December 2004 and, if not, why not?”

Senator T.A. Le Sueur (President of the Finance and Economics Committee):

“The States, in debating Projet 106, the Fiscal Strategy, instructed my Committee, and my Committee will be bringing forward proposals in February, on a number of measures, including some form of uplift on land values arising from rezoning. Conversely, my Committee was not instructed by the States to bring forward a so-called Monopolies Tax and it is complying with the decision of the States. I have not been able to identify a Monopolies Tax in operation anywhere in the world, probably because, although it may appear superficially attractive, even a modicum of research would show that it could have detrimental economic consequences. Firstly, if all monopolies were taxed at a higher rate, then it takes no account of whether the monopoly is acting efficiently or abusing its dominant position and, by definition, both would be taxed. Second, if a monopoly is taxed at a higher rate, it will simply pass on the cost to consumers in terms of higher prices and that will simply add to inflation and the consumer will pay. If, Sir, the real aim of such a tax is to prevent the abuse of dominant market position, then my advice is that that should be dealt with through the introduction of a competition law, which gives the regulator the power to drive down the prices that the monopolies and cartels charge customers, thereby reducing inflation. That is just what the States has agreed to do, Sir.”

1(a) Deputy S.C. Ferguson:

“Does the President not accept that, in accepting the lesser of what he has been instructed to do by this body, he is not co-operating with the spirit of the widest possible investigation of all the possible tax raising measures that we should be engaging in?”

Senator T.A. Le Sueur:

“I am following the instructions of the States, and I believe that the States expect to have a detailed response to the matters that they raised last July. If there are other matters which I believe should be brought to their attention at the same time, my Committee will do that as well.”

2. Deputy G.C.L. Baudains to the President of the Privileges and Procedures Committee:

“Recently, members wishing to speak, despite having signalled their intention to do so for some time and instead been preceded by other speakers, have been denied the ability by the closure motion. Would the President therefore agree to bring forward for approval amendments to the closure procedure as a matter of urgency?”

Connétable D.F. Gray of St. Clement (Rapporteur for the Privileges and Procedures Committee):

“The Privileges and Procedures Committee introduced the closure motion in an effort to improve the efficiency of the States and cited the successful use of the closure motion in Guernsey and other jurisdictions as demonstrating that the Assembly would achieve time saving, in that where the arguments had been exhausted closure might be proposed. There have been three debates on the issue, all won by a significant majority. The Committee is already dealing with the issue with a degree of urgency. It has already met with the Bailiff to express members’ concerns and it has agreed to meet with all those who take the Chair and then report back to the PPC. The Committee has on several occasions requested that members give notice of closure, as occurs in Guernsey, but members have chosen to ignore this request. This action would undoubtedly allow several additional speakers to provide new information to a debate. The PPC is of the opinion that members should voluntarily implement this action immediately so that it can be assessed as a remedy to the claim that members are waiting to speak but do not get the opportunity as the closure is proposed with no notice. PPC would remind members that as a vote is taken

prior to a closure motion, it is in the hands of members as to whether the closure proceeds and, if it fails, a second closure can only be proposed after a further hour has elapsed. The Working Party on Public Business chaired by Deputy Troy, including the membership of Deputy Baudains, will schedule a meeting for early in the New Year and this item will definitely be on the agenda. The PPC will consider this issue again at its meeting on 13th January 2005 and Deputy Baudains is very welcome to attend that meeting. I assure members that the PPC will keep this matter under review prior to the debate on Standing Orders which is proposed to take place in May or June 2005.”

2(a) Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:

“I thank the Rapporteur for his helpful answer, Sir. As he will be aware, I actually welcome the guillotine motion. In fact, I was on the working party. But it was designed, I believe, to prevent debates rambling on long after their natural end. It is therefore more important than ever that members wishing to speak are able to do so as near possible as the order they indicate because of the closure motion, Sir. So would the Rapporteur look into ways the presiding person could perhaps be helped in this regard, because, for instance, last week I spent 40 minutes trying to catch the Bailiff's eye, during which time many other members were called. Had the guillotine motion been in operation on that, I could well have been counted out, Sir.”

Connétable D.F. Gray of St. Clement:

“We will certainly do that, Sir. We would hope that, with this modern electronic equipment we have, we could adapt it in some way to fulfil the Deputy's requirements.”

2(b) Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Is the Rapporteur aware of continuing dissatisfaction amongst many members with the conduct and effectiveness of question time? We have consistently had at least 12 oral questions, which have had to be raced through, and the convenience method of allocating a minute and a half by the Bailiff, whilst it does speed things up, actually produces limited answers and partial answers, which means that at least one supplementary is wasted allowing the President to answer fully the question.”

Connétable D.F. Gray of St. Clement:

“The PPC is always conscious of members' opinions and will certainly give due regard to Deputy Southern's request.”

2(c) The Deputy of St. John:

“Will the Rapporteur take back to his Committee for review not only similar remarks made by the previous speaker, but also that the Chair gives more latitude to the questioners. We are frequently, in my case, ‘cut off at the knees’, as my expression goes. Will you take that back to your panel and also, whilst I am on my feet, would you also look at the Chair, i.e., the President of the Chamber, finding some way that he can pick up when somebody wishes to speak and not necessarily look straight at the Senatorial benches or the Connétables before going to the Deputies? Thank you.”

Connétable D.F. Gray of St. Clement:

“I think, Sir, that the question about how the President conducts the meetings is entirely in his hands and I don't think the PPC should comment on that.”

3. Deputy G.C.L. Baudains to the President of the Home Affairs Committee:

“Would the President advise whether, of the other sites the Committee considered for a new Police Station, any were considered more suitable but rejected for other reasons and, if so, would she give those reasons?”

Senator W. Kinnard (President of the Home Affairs Committee):

“A total of 28 options have been assessed for their suitability for a new Police Headquarters. 25 sites were considered in September 2003 as a result of the site review initiated by the Policy and Resources Committee. Of these, 8 sites were considered worthy of more detailed investigation using the criteria which were set out in that report. Only 5 of those sites were in public ownership. The remainder were in parish or private ownership. In addition to the Esplanade Car Park south-east site proposed in the original feasibility study, 3 sites emerged which met the initial criteria in terms of location, size, access etc., and they were the Esplanade Car Park on the north side site, the Parish Yard at Westmount and the Summerland site. The Esplanade north and south-east sites were preferable from an operational point of view, but were less favoured because of what were seen as competing commercial demands, high site

value, large land take, temporary loss of public car parking, the need to fund and progress the public car park replacement, planning issues, impact on adjacent site values, bad neighbour issues and difficulties with access and egress. The north Esplanade site was the better option of the two. The Westmount Quarry is in parish ownership and would therefore have needed to be purchased. Additionally, the expensive rock stabilisation issues, poor operational position, required road improvements and poor use of a large site for which the parish had other options in train made this the least attractive site in terms of location and build costs. But out of the four sites that were given very close serious consideration, the Summerland site came forward as the preferred site with or without basement car parking, both in terms of cost, the fact that it was in public ownership and the ease of construction.”

3(a) Deputy L.J. Farnham:

“Is the Senator and her Committee satisfied that the urgently required new Police Station is going to be large enough to accommodate the needs of a modern police force in the medium term?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“Yes, Sir. It is obviously going to create some planning challenges – we are quite aware of that – but I think any of the sites would have done. We are satisfied that it will be able to provide a police headquarters which will be able to deliver the operational needs of the police force and, indeed, we have been very clear about saying when sites have not been able to meet our operational needs. For instance, at one point we were allocated a site on the island site and we were very clear, after doing a feasibility study, that that did not have sufficient space in order to have both an operational police headquarters and the necessary administrative buildings.”

3(b) Deputy G.C.L. Baudains:

“I would ask the President whether any problems have been created by an inability to swap land, because it has been suggested to me that the Committee was restricted in the sites it could consider to those because of that matter? I wonder whether the President could confirm or deny this and also could she advise whether properties such as the old Girl’s College were ever considered? It seems to me that would have made an ideal police station.”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“I will start with the issue around the old Girl’s College. Obviously we are trying to be restricted to the amount of time we take up on answering questions, but I have here, which I am quite happy to give to the Deputy and indeed to any other interested member, all of the sites that have been looked at and all of the reasons why they were considered either suitable or not suitable. Indeed, the Jersey College for Girls site is on that list. The main problem with that was, of course, that it has already been identified, certainly at the time it was looked at, for a possible housing site, but also it particularly has a listed façade which would cause particular problems for an operational police headquarters in terms of its ability to withstand explosion and blast and so on. As regards land swap issues, indeed some of the discussions that have taken place over sites have involved land exchange potentially across Committees, and also there have been discussions about the possible purchase of an adjacent property to the Summerland site, which is in private ownership. At the time, there was little room for manoeuvre, although the Home Affairs Committee might have preferred to have also had a larger site and, indeed, we did offer in exchange some of our own estate in order to try and achieve that. The true cost of the land exchange, unfortunately, added to the construction costs of the new headquarters, therefore, exceeded the budget limit that has been given to the Home Affairs Committee and did not receive the approval of the Finance and Economics Committee. However, Sir, I do have to say that Property Services are continuing to discuss any potential possibilities with the landowner concerned and will indeed report back to the Home Affairs Committee in January. But I must stress that the site that we have allocated is sufficient and police headquarters can be built on that site, but of course it would be less challenging, I suppose, from a planning point of view if there was perhaps a larger site with which we can work, but it is not absolutely essential.”

3(c) Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Would the President care to confirm or deny whether financial restrictions and the cramped site in fact will mean that the Committee cannot meet all United Kingdom guidelines as to the protection of the Police Station from terrorist acts, for example?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“There are a number of Home Office guidelines which relate to the nature of the building of a modern

police headquarters, which include certain parts of the building which are ideally meant to be on the ground floor; that there needs to be a certain sort of stand-off area so that the public does not have access to avoid incidents where perhaps the public may have access to the building by vehicle or whatever; and also there are guidelines in relation to the extent to which the building should be able to withstand something like an explosion. The current buildings, I have to say, we have particular problems with, because they have been found to be very inadequate in this particular circumstance, for this particular reason. The building in any city centre, whether that be in a town such as St. Helier or in a city centre in the United Kingdom, all police services are well aware that certain decisions have to be taken – assessments about risk – because it is not always possible for every item of the Home Office guidelines to be addressed when you are building on a confined site, particularly in an urban area. So we are quite aware of that, but one of the ways of dealing with that is where you have to compromise on certain guidelines; then obviously one does seek then in the design to overcome some of those substantial problems, and certainly, as far as my Police Chief is concerned, it is possible for us to do that and obviously the details in the design will seek to address the particular issues that are raised by the Deputy.”

3(d) The Deputy of St. John:

“My question in fact has been partly put, but will the President agree that the car park in the adjacent property would in fact, under any United Kingdom guidelines on building a police headquarters, be a real problem if it stays in its current position because it would fall smack into an explosion zone of any new police headquarters?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“Again, it is difficult to be absolutely definite about these issues because, again, the design – whatever design or the way in which the site is used – will obviously be utilised in such a way as to design-out any risks. So, as I say, every police headquarters that has to be built in an urban environment inevitably has to make certain compromises, but my Police Chief, working with the planning experts, is definitely confident that we can do what is necessary to overcome those problems.”

3(e) Deputy J.B. Fox:

“We have heard reassurances that the new proposed police station will cater for today’s needs, but can the President, in light of what two of her Committee members are also saying to us, give us some reassurance that we are not going to spend £20 million and then find out in subsequent years– whether it is 10, 15, 20 or 25 years– that in fact we are on too cramped a site; that we cannot expand upwards; or it does not fulfil the latest security needs, especially in this ever-changing world that we are accepting at the moment? If she cannot give that assurance, would it be better to spend a little longer looking at alternatives at this time rather than make a very costly mistake for the future?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“First of all, the cost that is proposed for this site – the building on this site – is actually less than the cost of the 4 other main alternative sites, so it is better value for money from that point of view. Also, I think members must be aware of a couple of issues. One is that the current site at Rouge Bouillon is also shared by the Fire Service and the police headquarters needs to be removed off that site so that the Fire Service can meet its commitments in terms of health and safety and its needs for training and so on. But once the police headquarters – although it is going to be in 2 phases, so what we are looking at here is the first phase obviously moving over to Summerland and the second phase will remain on Rouge Bouillon for the time until it is ready for them to move across – but, once they have moved across, then those completely obsolete buildings that the Police Service are currently operating in will obviously be demolished and flattened. There is then a larger area of the Rouge Bouillon site which is there to be utilised for some other source or some other strategic need. We are happy certainly that the site that we have got across the road at Summerland does meet the needs of the Police Service of today and for the foreseeable future as far as we can see it, but if there was a need to utilise something else across the road or for the Ambulance Service to perhaps move across the road, leaving another area on the Summerland site available to the Police Service, there are possibilities. These are all being looked at, but at the moment I can say that it will certainly meet the needs and into the foreseeable future of the Police Service. As I say, we have been very clear.”

The Deputy Bailiff:

“I think you have made your point.”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“I think we have been very clear at saying when a site does not meet our needs.”

3(f) The Deputy of St. John:

“One clarification, if I may. The President kept on saying ‘we are happy’. In fact, I dissented from the site, so she might want to clarify what she means.”

The Deputy Bailiff:

“She means the majority of the Committee.”

3(g) Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

“Would the President agree with me that, when she has got members of her own Committee asking her questions in question time, she actually needs all the help and friends that it can be possible to get? Would she agree that she does have friends on Finance and Economics and Environment and Public Services and would she agree that those two Committees are working hard to assist her in finding a solution for the Police Station and indeed have had a number of meetings to that effect? More seriously, would she agree with me that she would not rule out working with Environment and Public Services to put forward a compulsory purchase of an area if necessary to get the best opportunity for a long-term police station in the vicinity of Sacre Coeur if that was actually deemed necessary, as it is a commercial landowner in that vicinity, and would she agree that she would not actually rule compulsory purchase out?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“Yes, Sir, these discussions are obviously very much just in an initial stage, but it is certainly something that, if it was possible and we felt that we had to do it, we would not rule it out. I want also to address a point, if I may, Sir, quickly, from the earlier questioner about should we not take more time to seek what might be some ideal site in some members’ minds. Let me make it absolutely clear that the buildings are falling down. The external walls are inferior. They require external cladding. The flat roofs are the end of their lives. The building itself – the loadings – are insufficient. Filing cabinets and storage have to be in the corridors. We have to be careful about the limits on numbers of people in offices. If we stay in Rouge Bouillon, we have to have concrete pillars built in the admin building. The costs are a minimum, in terms of maintenance, of £2.5 and £3.1 million. It is crazy to make the Police Service stay in those buildings having to spend that kind of amount of money on essential maintenance to keep the building standing when we have a site which we feel is appropriate and perfectly adequate.”

3(h) Deputy J.A. Hilton:

“It was really a follow on from Deputy Fox’s question. What I want the President to confirm is that there are various units and departments scattered around and can she confirm to the Chamber that all those different departments and units will be housed under one roof in the new police headquarters?”

Senator W. Kinnard:

“Yes, Sir, certainly that is the whole aim. At the moment, the Police Service operates over a number of sites. It operates not just at Rouge Bouillon. There is also Thorpe House for the workshops. There is 46 Rouge Bouillon. There is the Summerland Knitwear factory, the old Arsenal. Obviously at the moment that leads to a great number of inefficiencies for the Police Service, and the whole idea of moving to the one site is to get all of them under one roof. If we had gone for the island site where there was a detailed feasibility study, we could not have achieved that, and that is why we rejected that particular site.”

4. Deputy G.P. Southern to the President of the Housing Committee:

“*[Aside]* Will the President explain to members why the contract for the redevelopment of Le Marais St. Clement described in P.200/2004 did not go through an open tender process but is described as a ‘negotiated’ contract?”

Senator T.J. Le Main (President of the Housing Committee):

“As described in the report accompanying P.200/2004, the Hodge Phase 2 site was rezoned under Policy H2 of the Island Plan. The Plan requires sites to yield 55% first-time buyer and 45% social rented housing, but flexibility between sites is permitted. The Hodge 2 site has been linked by a developer with the Jambart Lane site. Both sites being in St. Clement, and by agreement with the Housing and Environment and Public Services Committees, the former will be developed solely for social rented and the latter solely for first-time buyers. In order for this to be achieved, the same builder/developer needs to

be tied legally to delivering the required dwellings on both sites. As can be seen by the figures in the report, the building contract for Hodge provides 64 threebed, 9 fourbed houses, plus all infrastructures for a fixed price sum of £9,643,000. This price is considered by Housing, Finance and Economics and Environment and Public Services to be very competitive in comparison with recent tender prices. The price was negotiated with a contractor because to use another contractor would have freed the Hodge contractor who was also developing the Jambart site from the obligation to provide social rented housing at a significantly lower price than would otherwise be possible.”

4(a) Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Does the President not consider that in fact what is happening, where the Committee is dividing up one site for social and another site for private development, that goes against the thrust, certainly the spirit, of the law, which is to create more balanced communities in our society?”

Senator T.J. Le Main:

“No, Sir, I think this has been a very, very successful operation, and I must advise the members of this House that, in line with the Environment and Public Services Committee policy – and I have to give great credit to the President for being involved in all this – we have achieved some significant savings on social housing that will cost nothing in subsidy or public funding at all. These units are coming out at £132,000 and £30,000 a site. What I must advise the House and the members is that all the other sites under these rezoned sites that are coming on line, 45% will always be negotiated the same way. Significant savings, when you think that we are now providing social housing and no subsidy at £162,000 a unit. That, I think, is absolutely superb. The Finance Committee and certainly Senator Ozouf and his Committee are absolutely delighted that at long last we are providing social rented homes desperately needed at a cost that does not need any public subsidy.”

4(c) Deputy G.P. Southern:

“One more supplementary, Sir. Given the lower cost of social housing, does that also equate to a lower standard and is he in fact building-up a problem for the future in terms of maintenance, which is already woeful?”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“No, Sir. The Deputy knows very well, through having read Projet 200, that the Planning Committees have strict guidelines on the quality, and the same sort of quality applies to what is being constructed in the private sector. The quality has not been compromised in any shape or form and, as I say, when you think that some of these sites – particularly the 99 sites– were fetching around £100,000 a site and now the new policy – spearheaded by, as I say, all credit to Senator Ozouf working on this and certainly supported by the Housing Committee – has now made some significant savings on reducing land values.”

4(c) Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

“Would the President agree with me that there may actually be some confusion in members’ minds about this important issue and would he agree that the simple comparison to show the spectacular success of this policy is that the Christians Together Housing Trust and the Jersey Homes Trust – I think it is Christians Together Housing Trust – are buying three-bedroom properties of an identical standard for between £175,000 and £185,000, costs all-in, the full price; and would he agree that that price is in direct comparison to the first-time buyer prices of the other sites that are being sold at approximately (and I heard Senator Le Maistre say it) £300,000? So would he agree with me that that difference of £162,000 or £175,000 or whatever it is and £300,000 demonstrates an enormous success of the policy of the Housing Committee and Environment and Public Services working together?”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“Absolutely, Sir. I think that all the many officers that have been working behind the scenes – not the politicians but the officers – in achieving this need much congratulations. This is going to set guidelines for the future and the next set of land that is going to be rezoned, people are not going to get away with what they have done in the past, asking £90,000 or £100,000. When you think, Sir, that a vergée site, agricultural – low grade agricultural land – £3,000 or £4,000 and then getting £5,000 or £6,000 once rezoned. This will significantly benefit the community all-round.”

The Deputy Bailiff:

“Your answer, therefore, is yes, I think, President.”

4(d) Deputy J.B. Fox:

“I wonder if the President will give an assurance, with the extremely good value for money that we are being told about today, that he is not going to compromise the quality of such estates in relation to amenity space and the other things that we usually end up by having vandalism and crime at a later time if we have not got the amenities that are required?”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“I give the Deputy the same answer every time. I am not prepared to continue giving those assurances. I have given it time and time again. It meets all the criteria for all amenities and I am not going to continue on this old ‘in my previous life’ theme, Sir.”

Deputy J.B. Fox:

“I am sorry, Sir, but it is not the ‘previous life’, it is current.”

4(e) Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Since the President has started talking about housing trusts, does the President not accept that his policy of most new developments for rented social homes being through the trusts has resulted in the absence of his maintenance budget because actually these new houses, which are quite low maintenance, cannot be used to cross-subsidise the high maintenance older houses and in fact his policy is actually working against his best interests?”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“No, Sir.”

4(f) Senator P.F.C. Ozouf:

“Would the President agree that in fact it is not his Committee that deals with the issues of amenity facing standard, it is that of the Environment and Public Services under planning guidelines, and would he agree that Planning impose the same standards for buildings on first-time buyers and social rented in terms of amenity, in terms of quality of build, in terms of all of the other aspects of the planning and the quality between social rented housing and first-time buyers is identical and, therefore, even further reinforces the spectacular success of this policy?”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“Yes, Sir.”

The Deputy Bailiff:

“I think that is your answer, Deputy.”

Deputy T.J. Le Main:

“How do I get the message through to Deputy Fox, Sir? He has been told this several times?”

Deputy J.B. Fox:

“I keep seeing gaps, Sir, that is why.”

5. The Deputy of St. John to the President of the Harbours and Airport Committee:

“Would the President inform members of the sale price received for the *Duchess of Normandy* and give details of the tender process, if any, that was used and whether any commission was paid in connection with the sale?”

Senator L. Norman (President of the Harbours and Airport Committee):

“Yes, Sir. The *Duchess* was sold for £37,000. There was no tender process. It was sold through a local brokerage and a commission of 6% was paid to the brokerage.”

5(a) The Deputy of St. John:

“Could the President tell us how long the vessel was in fact on the brokerage list, whether or not it was advertised off-Island and the 6% equated to how much actually in pounds and pence, so how much did his Committee actually receive, shall we say, in the back pocket after the deal was done?”

Senator L. Norman:

“I wonder if the Deputy could explain what he means by the Committee receiving money in their ‘back

pocket' ”?

The Deputy Bailiff:

“He means what was the net price.”

Senator L. Norman:

“It was £37,000 less 6% equals £34,780, and the money has now been received. It was on the list of the brokerage for between 6 and 8 weeks before the successful offer was received. Was it advertised off Island? It was certainly on the website of the brokerage and therefore was accessible all over the world, Sir.”

The Deputy of St. John:

“I would like to thank the President for his replies. I could have gone a bit further, but I do not think there is any benefit in it and I know the House would like to move on to the next item and we might finish today.”

The Deputy Bailiff:

“Very well, that concludes questions.”

Progress and future programme of one of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels (Senator E.P. Vibert)– statement

Senator Edward Philip Vibert, one of the Chairmen of the Shadow Scrutiny Panels, made a statement in the following terms –

“Members of the States will find on their desks today the latest report from the Shadow Scrutiny Panel, which I chair, on the proposed Water Law, and which the Environment and Public Services wishes to introduce.

This is the second report from this particular Panel, the first being on the agri-environment scheme.

The Panel is still dealing with the Trust Port proposals of the Harbours and Airport Committee and a report on this should be issued in mid-January 2005. The Panel also plans to produce an interim report on the Draft Waste Strategy proposed by the Environment and Public Services Committee. This is expected to be published in mid-January.

The Environment and Public Services Committee will then make its final Waste Strategy available to the public and we will scrutinize that and present a report to the States. I cannot see this happening until mid-March 2005, as it may be necessary for more public hearings to be held.

Next year, the Panel expects to tackle the proposed Goods and Services Tax when the final version is introduced by the Finance and Economics Committee in February 2005. It also hopes to tackle the cost of fuel in Jersey, both for heating and motoring, after the report into this matter has been presented to the States by the Economic Development Committee.

The Panel has also been asked to look at early years education, the cost of the postal service and the restoration of Mont Orgueil Castle.

Members are reminded that the choice of subjects is entirely in the hands of the Scrutiny Panel working with the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

In January 2005, my one year term of office as Chairman comes to a close in accordance with the decision of the States setting up the Shadow Scrutiny Panel that Chairmen should rotate during this training period. I have made it clear to the Panel that if any of the members wish to take on the role of Chairman, I will be happy to hand this over to them. Obviously, I will remain on the Panel if such a change takes place. The States will be asked to deal with this in January 2005, when I hope that more members who are not that busy with Committees will come forward to take part in the process.

I would like to place on record my thanks for the enormous amount of work carried out by the Panel

consisting of Senator Jean Le Maistre, Deputy Phil Rondel, Deputy Rob Duhamel, Deputy Gerard Baudain and Deputy Bob Hill. They have taken on an enormous work-load in addition to their normal Committee work and worked way beyond the call of duty at weekends and with early morning meetings. No one has shirked the work at all, as can be seen by the remarkable output of the Panel.

Running parallel with the work of the panel has been the effort put in by our Scrutiny Officers. This has been a totally new role for public servants and I have to say that our officer team, who had to train from scratch to combine the role of scrutiny officers with that of researchers, report writers, hospitality organisers, transcript supervisors, press managers and organisers have shown a wonderful dedication to their jobs, working long hours, often at week-ends and in the evenings. It is a tribute to the basic training they receive in the public service that they have been able to adapt so quickly to their new tasks.

I regret that I am unable to name them individually in the States this morning because each one of them deserves special thanks.

Finally, sir, I wish to thank the president of the Privileges and Procedures Committee, Deputy Roy Le Hérisier and his Vicepresident, Deputy Bridge, for their great support and determination to ensure that scrutiny really delivers something meaningful to the body politic of Jersey; to the Deputy Greffier for her insightful guidance and finally, the President of the Policy and Resources Committee, Senator Frank Walker, for the full support of his Committee in this vital process.”

Draft Electricity Links with France (Protection of Submarine Cables) (Jersey) Regulations 200-P.184/2004

THE STATES, in pursuance of the Order in Council of the 28th March 1771, made Regulations entitled the Electricity Links with France (Protection of Submarine Cables) (Jersey) Regulations 2004.

Senator Jean Amy Le Maistre and the Deputy of St. Mary both declared an interest and withdrew from the Chamber prior to the consideration of this matter.

Fields 89, 89A, 90, 92 and 93, Le Marais, St. Clement: redevelopment approval of drawings – P.200/04

THE STATES, adopting a proposition of the Housing Committee, –

- (a) approved drawings Nos. 240 – 01 – A, 240 02, 240 03, 240- 04 – B, 240 – 05 – B, 240 – 06 – A, 240 – 07 – A, and 240 11 to 25 inclusive showing the redevelopment of Fields 89, 89A, 90 92 and 93, Le Marais, St. Clement, to construct 64 threebedroom houses and 9 fourbedroom houses for social rented accommodation;
- (b) authorised the Greffier of the States to sign the said drawings on behalf of the States;
- (c) agreed that, upon completion, the dwellings should be sold to the Christians Together in Jersey Housing Trust (CTJ), for occupation by persons in housing need, at a price to be agreed by the Finance and Economics Committee;
- (d) authorised the Attorney General and the Greffier of the States to sign any necessary agreements and pass any necessary contracts relative thereto; and,
- (e) authorised the Treasurer of the States to receive the income from the sale of the said homes.

Adjournment

THE STATES then adjourned, having agreed that outstanding matters of public business should stand over until Wednesday 15th December 2004.

THE STATES rose at 5.35 p.m.

M.N. DE LA HAYE

Greffier of the States.