extra copy

6

**Blanc Pignon**
**La Ruelle Es Ruaux**
**St Brelade**
**Jersey JE3 8BW**
**CHANNEL ISLANDS**

**Tel: 01534 722993**

6 January 2004

Mr D Frigot
President
Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society
La Route de la Trinite
Trinity
JE3 5QJP

Dear Derek

Thank you very much indeed for your long letter, plus enclosures of the 31st ult.

First, thank you for taking the trouble to answer at length and in detail.

I do appreciate that there was a good deal of pressure to move forward. Perhaps unfortunately (as I see it) members were asked to take an irreversible step (leap in the dark?) before all the issues had been identified and discussed, so that there would be a clear view in the minds of the members of how they would stand either way on a vote.

If and/or when this comes forward again, and I agree that it is likely to do so, it might perhaps be better for Council to seek authority to make enquiries and to negotiate preparatory to putting the package (as a whole as it were) to the members who could then more accurately assess the benefits and disadvantages on a more dispassionate basis.

There are one or two issues that still bother me, in particular:-

(a) the derogation issue. It really passes belief that no one has any idea why the issue was put away: nor it seems can anyone tell you whether advising the Commission – as morally I am sure we ought to do – that the Society is considering opening (in terms) the closed nature of the herd, is the right way to proceed or whether it will merely raise a hornets nest. Can those who deal with these things tell us nothing? Members, before voting, do need to have a view on this.

(b) as to purity, I take your point, and I am sure that it would be possible to have "approved herds". Did not Maurice Bichard say that you could confirm this with DNA testing?

...../ I still worry

---

(c) I still worry about the "7/8ths" European Rule (if I am correct in my assumption) I suppose it would be possible, though perhaps complicated, to have "approved" and "non-approved" herds in the Island; but,

(d) has anyone any idea what the reaction of the States might be to subsidising a cattle owner with say a Holstein Great Grandfather? As a taxpayer, I might have reservations. E.E.C. law takes priority and the States might well have difficulty in subsidising "approved" herds and not in subsidising "non approved" herds.

Again, this is, with respect, something to put before members before they vote.

To change the subject, it is my view that although, obviously, you must abide by the wishes of the members (or resign), you have a duty, as President (and with your experience) to advance a view; and although I fear that I will not be able to attend the meeting on Friday 8th (age and flu – after effects!) if I were to do so, I would not vote for your removal from office.

As the discussion have now become so general – and please remember, I look at this as a lawyer not a breeder (as I think everyone knows) – if you wish to make the correspondence I have had with James and yourself available to members, I would have no objection.

With kind regards

Yours sincerely

**P.R. Le Cras**

P.S. As regards the numbers involved in going back several generations, perhaps the enclosed page 352 from Bill Bryson's "A Short History of Nearly Everything" will help. I hope Maurice Bichard is right about the DNA!